

Effect of Balancing Data Using Synthetic Data on the Performance of Machine Learning Classifiers for Intrusion Detection in Computer Networks

Ayesha S. Dina, A. B. Siddique, D. Manivannan*

^aUniversity of Kentucky, Department of Computer Science, Lexington, Kentucky, 40508, USA

Abstract

Attacks on computer networks have increased significantly in recent days, due in part to the availability of sophisticated tools for launching such attacks as well as thriving underground cyber-crime economy to support it. Over the past several years, researchers in academia and industry used machine learning (ML) techniques to design and implement Intrusion Detection Systems (IDSes) for computer networks. Many of these researchers used datasets collected by various organizations to train ML models for predicting intrusions. In many of the datasets used in such systems, data are imbalanced (i.e., not all classes have equal amount of samples). With unbalanced data, the predictive models developed using ML algorithms may produce unsatisfactory classifiers which would affect accuracy in predicting intrusions. Traditionally, researchers used over-sampling and under-sampling for balancing data in datasets to overcome this problem. In this work, in addition to over-sampling, we also use a synthetic data generation method, called Conditional Generative Adversarial Network (CTGAN), to balance data and study their effect on various ML classifiers. To the best of our knowledge, no one else has used CTGAN to generate synthetic samples to balance intrusion detection datasets. Based on extensive experiments using a widely used dataset NSL-KDD, we found that training ML models on dataset balanced with synthetic samples generated by CTGAN increased prediction accuracy by up to 8%, compared to training the same ML models over unbalanced data. Our experiments also show that the accuracy of some ML models trained over data balanced with random over-sampling decline compared to the same ML models trained over unbalanced data.

Keywords: Intrusion Detection, Cyber Security, Data imbalance problem, Over-sampling, Under-sampling, Conditional Generative Adversarial Network (CTGAN), Machine learning.

1. Introduction

There has been a significant increase in the number of intrusions into computer networks over the past few years due in part to sophisticated tools to launch such attacks as well as a thriving underground economy to support such attacks [1]. According to a 2017 report [2], data breaches cost an average of \$141 per record. It is estimated that 60% of small businesses that suffer a data breach will cease operations within six months. Symantec's Internet Security Threat Report for 2017 indicated that the number and intensity of attacks were significantly higher than those in previous years [3] – zero-day attacks totaled more than three billion in 2016. Traditional tools such as firewalls can not cope with these sophisticated attacks. In order to fight network intrusions, hardware and software tools can be installed to continuously monitor the network.

James Anderson published a report on the need for detecting network intrusions in computer systems [4] in 1972 [5]. Since then, several intrusion detection systems (IDSes) have been proposed and implemented. These systems can be further classified as host-based, network-based, and hybrid [6]. System architectures can be centralized, distributed, or hybrid, based on how intrusion/attack events are collected, processed, and acted upon. Certain approaches are superior to others based on factors such as cost, performance, and

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: adi252@uky.edu (Ayesha S. Dina), siddique@cs.uky.edu (A. B. Siddique), mani@cs.uky.edu (D. Manivannan)

URL: <https://www.cs.uky.edu/~siddique/> (A. B. Siddique), <http://www.cs.uky.edu/~manivann> (D. Manivannan)

Preprint submitted to Elsevier

April 4, 2022

other metrics. These systems can be further classified based on the techniques used for intrusion detection – signature-based or anomaly-based. A Signature-based IDS detects attacks based on the signatures of previously known attacks. These IDSs cannot detect zero-day attacks. In contrast, anomaly-based IDSes are capable of detecting zero-day attacks by modeling users’ behaviors. In the training phase of an anomaly-based approach, legitimate users’ behaviors are first collected and analyzed in order to build a model of legitimate users’ behavior. The model is then used to determine whether the current observed behavior is that of legitimate user or not. Some methods used for such classification are [6]: **Statistical approach:** classification is based on univariate, multivariate, or time-series models. **Knowledge based approach:** expert system is used to model legitimate behavior according to a set of rules. **Machine learning based approach:** automatically classified based on some clustering algorithms. However, anomaly-based IDSes often generate more false positives and signature-based IDSes generally generate more false negatives.




Figure 1: ML models show poor performance on imbalanced datasets – no matter what type of machine learning model is employed. Synthetic data generation for minority classes can overcome the data imbalance issue, thus may yield improved classification performance of ML models.

ML based IDSes have been extensively studied in the literature. For example, following ML approaches have been tested by various researchers for intrusion detection: Artificial Neural Networks, Association Rules and Fuzzy Association Rules, Bayesian Networks, Clustering, Decision Trees, Evolutionary Computation, Hidden Markov Models, Inductive Learning, Naïve Bayes, Sequential Pattern Mining, and Support Vector Machine [7, 8, 9]. In many of the datasets used in such studies, data are not balanced. That is, instances of one class surpass those of another class [10]. The classes that have a high frequency of instances are called majority classes, while the classes that have a low frequency of instances are called minority classes. The ratio of samples between a minority class and those of in a majority class may be as small as 1:100, or as large as 1:1000, or even larger [11]. Figure 1 highlights that imbalance in the dataset may result in poor performance of ML classifiers. Many of the researchers have (i) ignored this problem, (ii) balanced data using over-sampling (e.g., by randomly replicating minority class samples) or under-sampling (e.g., by randomly eliminating majority class samples) techniques. Over-sampling and under-sampling help in balancing data. However, since the new samples added under over-sampling are exact copies of the original samples, it may cause overfitting. Similarly, since random data are eliminated from majority classes in under-sampling, the dataset may become too simple, with the same number of features and too little data to build an effective model, resulting in underfitting problem. In general, an overfit model has low bias and high variance, while an underfit model has high bias and low variance.

In this paper, to study the effect of balancing data on the performance of ML classifiers, we use (i) the most commonly used random over-sampling, and (ii) synthetic data generated using the Conditional Generative Adversarial Network (CTGAN) [12] for balancing data. CTGAN exploits a conditional generative adversarial network, learns from input data (i.e., both discrete and continuous features), and generates high-fidelity synthetic samples. We generate synthetic samples for all classes after training CTGAN on the training dataset. By discarding samples of the majority classes and keeping samples of the minority classes, we eliminate the data imbalance issue. It is important to emphasize that the new synthetic samples generated by CTGAN are not copies of the instances in the original dataset but look-alike instances. To the best of

our knowledge, this is the first time CTGAN has been used to generate synthetic data for balancing data related to intrusion detection.

We studied the effect of synthetic data generation approaches on the performance of various state-of-the-art ML classifiers through extensive experiments. We also compare how various ML classifiers perform on the original dataset. We use NSL-KDD (Network Socket Layer-Knowledge Discovery in Database) dataset in our experiments – a widely used dataset for studying intrusion detection. Specifically, we use the following state-of-the-art ML classifiers for conducting the experiments: Decision Tree (DT), Support Vector Machine (SVM), Random Forest (RF), Naive Bayes (NB), Feed Forward Network (FNN), Long Short Term Memory (LSTM), and Convolutional Neural Network (CNN). Our focus is on multi-class classification rather than binary classification – a challenging problem setup. A multiclass classification makes it possible to evaluate the performances of various models relative to different types of intrusions. Our experimental results show that on the NSL-KDD dataset, with data balanced using the synthetic data generated by CTGAN, some of the ML classifiers show an increase in prediction accuracy by as much as 8%. **Following is a summary of our contribution in this paper:**

- We show that using improved algorithms for generating synthetic data for balancing data could improve the performance of ML classifiers in predicting intrusions in computer networks more accurately.
- We use CTGAN to generate synthetic samples and balance the training samples in NSL-KDD dataset. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time CTGAN has been used to generate synthetic data for balancing data associated with intrusion detection. It is noteworthy to mention that CTGAN has been used for image augmentation in the literature.
- We use state-of-the-art classification techniques such as DT, SVM, RF, NB, FNN, LSTM, and CNN to classify the balanced input dataset. A wide range of evaluations show that ML classifiers trained on NSL-KDD dataset, with data balanced using CTGAN generated samples, perform better than the same ML classifiers trained on original NSL-KDD dataset, with data balanced using random over-sampling.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present our proposed approach as well as discuss the details of the ML classifiers used for evaluation. In Section 3, we present our experimental setup and results. In Section 4, we discuss related works, and Section 5 concludes the paper.

2. Proposed Approach and Classification Methods Used

In this section, we discuss how we model data, preprocess data, and use CTGAN to generate synthetic data to balance data in the NSL-KDD dataset. Then, we discuss various ML classifiers that we used in our experimental evaluation.

2.1. Modeling Data

We model the input data as a two-dimensional matrix $X = (x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_N)$, where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^D$ ($1 \leq i \leq N$) is a vector with D dimensional network feature space. Each x_i ($1 \leq i \leq N$) is associated with a label y_i and $y_i \in \{1, \dots, L\}$. In our case, N is the number of samples in the dataset and L is the number of distinct attack categories. The feature vectors are mapped to labels by a function $Y = f(x)$ that is unknown. As part of supervised learning, the training dataset is used to obtain an estimate of f . This estimated function is referred to as $\hat{f}(x)$. The goal is to make $\hat{f}(x)$ as close as possible to $f(x)$.

2.2. Preprocessing of Data

We transform all the categorical variables into numerical variables during the preprocessing step. For this transformation, we used label encoding [13, 14]. During this process, each label of a categorical feature is assigned a unique numerical value in alphabetical order. Imagine a two-dimensional matrix X containing column C_i . Column C_i contains four categorical labels such as *tcp*, *smtp*, *ftp* and *http*. These are different types of protocols. Label encoding will assign a value of 4, 3, 1, and 2 to the *tcp*, *smtp*, *ftp* and *http* labels in alphabetical order.

In the next step, we normalized the input data. In this study, we used L_2 normalization or Euclidean normalization [15]. We will use the same input matrix X and i^{th} feature C_i . The feature C_i is normalized according to Equation 1.

$$C_i = \frac{C_i}{\|C_i\|_2} \quad (1)$$

where

$$\|C_i\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^K c_{k_i}^2}$$

Where $C_i = [c_{1_i}, c_{2_i}, c_{3_i}, \dots, c_{K_i}]$, a vector of length K , and $\|C_i\|_2$ is the L_2 norm of vector C_i .

2.3. Synthetic Data Generation using CTGAN to Balance Data

Data imbalance occurs when the number of instances in some classes is significantly higher than those in other classes [11]. Consequently, ML models will be overwhelmed by the majority classes (which have higher instances when compared to other classes) and ignore the minority classes (which have fewer instances). There are several methods to overcome the imbalance problem, such as oversampling, undersampling, stratified sampling (SS), and so on [1], as we mentioned earlier.

In addition to oversampling, we used CTGAN [12] for generating synthetic data for balancing data. To generate synthetic tabular data from original tabular data, CTGAN uses a GAN-based (generative adversarial network) model.

CTGAN introduces **mode specific normalization**, which allows it to deal with columns with complex distributions. This procedure consists of three steps.

- Each continuous column C_i is identified by using a variational Gaussian mixture model (VGM) [16] to determine the number mode m_i and fit it in a Gaussian mixture.
- In order to compute the probability density for each mode, it computes the value of c_{i_j} in column C_i for j th row.
- Then, sample one mode using the calculated probability density and use the sampled mode to normalize the value.

A new row should be resampled in such a way that all categories from the columns are equally distributed at the time of training so that it can be used to capture the actual distribution of data during testing. Let k be the value of the i^{th} column C_i . Let \hat{r} be a generated sample, and the original value has to be matched with the generated samples \hat{r} in a way that the generator can be explained as the conditional distribution of rows given that particular value at that particular column, where

$$\hat{r} \sim P_g(row|C_i = k) \quad (2)$$

One of the most important tasks for the conditional generator is to learn the real distribution of data, i.e., $P_g(row|C_i = k) = P(row|C_i = k)$. The following equation can be used to reconstruct the original distribution.

$$P(row) = \sum_{k \in C_i} P_g(row|C_i = k)P(C_i = k) \quad (3)$$

In order to achieve this, three methods were introduced: conditional vectors, generator losses, and sampling-based training. Two fully connected hidden layers were used in both the generator and discriminator of the network architecture in order to capture all possible correlations between columns. In the generator, batch normalization and relu activation function are used.

2.4. Different ML models

In this subsection, we discuss different ML classification algorithms that we used to classify original input data, data balanced with over-sampling and data balanced with synthetic data generated with CTGAN.

2.4.1. Decision Tree (DT)

In many applications, DT has been used to classify different types of data such as power quality disturbance, parkinson's disease, product review classification, etc. [17, 18, 19, 20, 21]. A DT is tree structure, in which each leaf node represents a class label and each internal node is a decision node or a chance node [1]. DT constructs a tree by segmenting the feature space into several subregions. Hence, tree is constructed by recursively binary splitting of the feature space [22]. Two splitting methods are usually used to split the tree (e.g., cross entropy, gini index). We used gini index-based splitting [23]. Gini index can be calculated using Equation 4.

$$gini = \sum_{l=1}^L p_l(1 - p_l) = 1 - \sum_{l=1}^L p_l^2 \quad (4)$$

Where L is the number of classes, p_l is a set of items with class $l \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots, L\}$

2.4.2. Support Vector Machine (SVM)

SVM model is a renowned machine learning model that can be used for both classification and regression tasks. It is, however, primarily used for classification tasks [24, 25, 26, 27]. SVM uses Statistical learning theory to find the optimal hyperplane as a decision function in high dimensional space [28]. We assume a supervised classification problem, and consider a input set with N vectors from the d -dimensional feature space X . For each vector x_i , there is a target y_i [29]. The goal of SVM is to identify an optimal hyperplane that maximizes the separation margin. The data are first mapped to a high dimensional feature space using a kernel method, i.e., $\phi(X)$. The optimal hyperplane can be defined as

$$f(x_i) = w \cdot \phi(x_i) + b \quad (5)$$

Here $f(x)$ represents the discriminant function, w is weight vector and b is the bias. b minimizes a cost function. The cost function can be expressed as

$$\psi(w, \xi) = \frac{1}{2} \|w\|^2 + C \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_i \quad (6)$$

The cost function is obtained by ξ_i , which is slack variable, used for nonseparable data. The constant C is a regularization parameter to control the shape of the discriminant function.

2.4.3. Naïve Bayes (NB)

NB classifiers are a family of probabilistic classifiers based on Bayes' Theorem. NB classifiers, combined with kernel density estimation, can achieve high accuracy levels. NB is widely used by researchers to solve various classification problems that arise in their research [30, 31, 32]. NB classifier is based on conditional probability [33]. The probability of one attribute does not affect another attribute, given the class label. Therefore, the presence of a attribute in a class is unrelated to any other attribute. The Naive Bayes can be written as

$$P(L|C) = \frac{P(C|L)P(L)}{P(C)} \quad (7)$$

Where L is the class variable and C is the feature set $C_1, C_2, C_3, \dots, C_Q$. $P(L|C)$, $P(C|L)$, $P(L)$, and $P(C)$ are respectively the posterior probability, probability of feature set given class, prior probability of class, and prior probability of feature set.

2.4.4. Random Forest (RF)

Due to its simplicity and diversity, RF is also one of the most commonly used algorithms. Regression and classification can both be performed using RF [34, 35, 36, 37]. RF combines multiple decision trees to make more accurate, stable predictions. It builds a decision forest based on several decision trees usually trained with the bagging method. A bagging method, based on the concept that combining different learning models, increases overall performance. In our approach, we used the Gini Index (Equation 4) to determine how a node in a decision tree should be split.

2.4.5. Feed-forward Neural Network (FNN)

FNNs have been successfully used for pattern classification, clustering, regression, association, optimization, control, and forecasting [38, 39, 40, 41]. FNN contains one input layer, one output layer, and H number of hidden layers. Let $W_h \in \mathbb{R}^{Q \times P}$, and $W_o \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$ be the weight matrices for hidden layer and output layer respectfully where Q is number of input neurons, P is the number neurons in a hidden layer and M is the number of output neurons. Each row of these matrices represents a weight vector for a neuron. Now we can write the equation of output matrix of a hidden layer as:

$$H = f(XW_h + b_h) \quad (8)$$

Where $X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_N\}$ is the input matrix with N rows, b_h is the bias matrix and $f(\cdot)$ is the activation function of the hidden layer.

We can express the equation of the output layer as:

$$\hat{Y} = g(HW_o + b_o) \quad (9)$$

Where $g(\cdot)$ in the activation function of the output layer and b_o is the bias matrix of the output layer.

2.4.6. Long Short Term Memory (LSTM)

Although LSTM is a recurrent neural network, it is better in terms of memory than traditional recurrent networks. By memorizing certain patterns, LSTM is able to perform relatively better [42, 43, 44, 45]. LSTM can have multiple hidden layers and as data passes through each layer, the relevant information is retained and the irrelevant information is discarded. An LSTM consists of an input gate i_t , an output gate o_t , and a forget gate f_t . The equations for the LSTM gates at t time step can be expressed as:

$$i_t = g(W_i[h_{t-1}, x_t] + b_i) \quad (10)$$

$$f_t = g(W_f[h_{t-1}, x_t] + b_f) \quad (11)$$

$$o_t = g(W_o[h_{t-1}, x_t] + b_o) \quad (12)$$

Where $g(\cdot)$ is a activation function of a gate, W_x is the weight of the corresponding gate, h_{t-1} is the output of the previous LSTM block, x is the input vector at time t , and b_x is the bias for the respective gate.

2.4.7. Convolutional Neural Network (CNN)

In addition to computer vision, CNNs have shown outstanding performance in many other fields [46, 47, 48, 49]. Convolutions are used in this neural network to transform the input features into meaningful information, which is then used to build the subsequent layers of neural network computations. The convolutional layer is used to extract features, to perform linear operations, and is usually a combined convolution. In convolution, multiple kernels or filters are used. A convolutional operation is usually defined as:

$$\hat{Y} = x \times k + b \quad (13)$$

The kernel k has a dimension of $n \times m$. The input and bias are represented by x and b , respectively. The input and bias have the same dimensions k .

3. Experimental Results

In this section, we discuss evaluation criteria, dataset used, experimental setup, implementation details of classifiers, and performance of different classifiers.

Table 1: Performance metrics that are used for comparison

Criteria	Equations
Accuracy (Acc)	$\frac{TP+TN}{TP+TN+FP+FN}$
Precision (Pre)	$\frac{TP}{TP+FP}$
Recall (Rec)	$\frac{TP}{TP+FN}$
F_1 Score	$2 * \frac{\mathbf{Pre} * \mathbf{Rec}}{\mathbf{Pre} + \mathbf{Rec}}$

3.1. Evaluation Criteria

To evaluate the effect on the performance of various ML-classifiers, we used the following quantitative metrics: (i) Accuracy (Acc), (ii) Precision (Pre), (iii) Recall (Rec), and (iv) F_1 score [50, 51]. **Acc** is the measure of how well the algorithm correctly predicts the occurrence of an event. That is, an event is predicted as normal or type of intrusion. **Pre** of the prediction refers to how frequently the algorithm actually predicts types of intrusions. **Rec** refers to the proportion of actual intrusions that the algorithm predicted as intrusions. F_1 -**Score** is equal to the reciprocal of the arithmetic mean of **Pre** and **Rec**, which is the harmonic mean of both variables.

Table 1 summarizes how the metrics discussed above are calculated. We evaluated various ML models by counting True positives (TP), True negatives (TN), False positives (FP), and False negatives (FN). In this work, all of our classifiers are *multi-class*.

3.2. Dataset Used for Evaluation

In this work, we used NSL-KDD (Network Socket Layer-Knowledge Discovery in Database) [52] dataset, which is a widely used dataset in the intrusion detection literature. NSL-KDD dataset contains 41 features and it does not contain any duplicate records [53]. The dataset has one normal class and four attack type classes.

The four attack types [54] are:

- **Denial of Service (DoS) Attack** – blocking any resources or services in a system or network through malicious means.
- **User to Root Attack (U2R)** – the attacker uses a normal user account to gain access to the system and exploits vulnerabilities to take over the system.
- **Remote to Local (R2L) Attack** – unauthorized access to a remote system by sending data packets over a network to gain users’ or root’s access to do unauthorized acts.
- **Probing Attack** - these attacks gather information about potential vulnerabilities of target systems so that attacks may be launched on them later.

It is important to highlight that there is significant difference in the sizes of the training instances of **U2R** and **R2L** classes. The dataset consists of one set of training data (KDDTrain+) and two sets of testing data: (i) KDDTest+ and (ii) KDDTest21-. Table 2 shows distribution of instances for various attack types in the training and testing datasets.

Figure 2 shows partial T-Distributed Stochastic Neighboring Entities (t-SNE) [55] projection of the NSL-KDD datasets. Figure 2(a) presents projections for KDDTest+ test set, whereas KDDTest21- is presented in Figure 2(b). We can see in both projections, large portion of the dataset is occupied by normal and DoS class types.

3.3. Experimental Setup

To evaluate different ML models, we conduct three experiments. In the first experiment, we use the original training dataset NSL-KDD to train ML models. In the second experiment, we use random oversampling [56] to balance data and trained ML models on the balanced dataset. In the third experiment, we use CTGAN to produce synthetic samples to balance data and trained ML models on the balanced dataset. We call these three experiments as ORG, RndOSamp, and CTGANSamp, respectively.

Table 2: Data distribution in NSL-KDD dataset

Class	KDDTrain+	(%)	KDDTest+	(%)	KDDTest21-	(%)
Normal	67343	53.5	9711	43.1	13449	53.3
DoS	45927	36.4	7458	33.1	9234	36.7
Probe	11656	9.3	2421	10.7	2289	9.1
U2R	52	0.041	67	0.3	11	0.04
R2L	995	0.78	2887	12.8	209	0.83




Figure 2: T-SNE projection of NSL-KDD dataset.

3.3.1. Experimental Setup for Original Data (ORG)

In ORG, we utilize the original training samples from NSL-KDD dataset. The bar graph in Figure 3(a) shows distribution of samples under various classes in the original training samples. We feed these training samples to the state-of-the-art classifiers without adding any synthetic data to balance the data. As shown in Table 2, the normal and DoS class types are 53% and 36% of training samples, respectively. Whereas, Probe, U2R, and R2L are approximately 9%, 0.04%, and 0.83% of training samples, respectively.

3.3.2. Experimental Setup for Original Data Balanced with Random Oversampling (RndOSamp)

Random oversampling is a naive technique for balancing distribution of data under various class types. It involves duplicating samples randomly from minority classes to balance the dataset. In this method, each member of the population stands an equal chance of being selected for addition to the dataset. During the entire sampling process, each subject is independently selected from the other members of the population [57]. Figure 3 (b), shows the distribution of the training samples after applying random oversampling. Each class type has the same number of training samples. There are approximately 67000 samples for each class type.

3.3.3. Experimental Setup for Original Data Balanced with Synthetic Samples Generated using CTGAN (CTGANSamp)

In order to generate more realistic synthetic datasets, we use CTGAN [12]. CTGAN generates synthetic data from single tabular dataset. In the original training data, total number of samples for normal class type is 67343. And total number of samples for **Probe Attack**, **DoS Attack**, **U2R Attack**, and **R2L Attack** are 11656, 45927, 52, and 995 respectively. Since the number of samples for normal class type is already high, we decide not to add more synthetic samples to that class type using CTGAN. As shown in Figure 3 (c), the distribution of samples after balancing data using synthetic samples generated by CTGAN are 41149, 102589, 39483, and 55350 for the attack types **Probe Attack**, **DoS Attack**, **U2R Attack**, and **R2L Attack**, respectively.




Figure 3: Data distribution for various experimental setups.

3.4. Implementation Details of Various Classifiers

Using the NSL-KDD dataset, we investigate the performance of the following state-of-the-art classifiers: Decision Tree (DT), multinomial Naive Bayes (NB), Random Forest (RF), Support Vector Machine (SVM), Feed-Forward Neural Network (FNN), Long Short term Memory Network (LSTM), and Convolutional Neural Network (CNN). As we mentioned earlier, we evaluated the performance of these classifiers on (i) Original NSL-KDD dataset (ORG), (ii) NSL-KDD dataset balanced with random over-sampling (RndOSamp), and (iii) NSL-KDD dataset balanced with synthetic data generated by CTGAN (CTGANSamp).

We implement DT, NB, RF, and SVM algorithms using the scikit-learn python package version 1.1 [58]. We use the Gini index splitting criteria for DT and L1 regularization for SVM. When estimating a RF, we considered the number of trees in the forest to be 100. With respect to NB, we use alpha 1.0, as smoothing parameter.

The following three neural networks have been used: FNN, LSTM, and CNN. With FNN, we use three hidden layers, each containing 50, 30, and 20 neurons respectively; and the output layer had five neurons. In the final layer, we use softmax function to do the final classification. We use relu as activation function, adam as optimizer, and categorical cross entropy as a loss function. In total this network has 5285 trainable parameters. We design a two-layer LSTM. Each layer in the LSTM had 100 units. The activation function, optimizer, loss function and final layer are same as in FNN. Since, our dataset consists of one-dimensional sequence of data, we used a single one dimensional CNN (conv1D). We used 32 filters with kernel size of 3. We used maxpooling with pool size of 2. Next, we use a dense hidden layer with 100 neurons and the final layer had five neurons. Like FNN and LSTM, we used the same activation function, optimizer, and loss function for CNN. Each of these networks has been trained for 100 epochs with early stopping. We implement all three neural networks using tensorflow and Nvidia GPU driver version 455.32.00 with cuda version 11.1.

3.5. Results

The NSL-KDD dataset comes with two testing datasets (KDDTest+ and KDDTEST21-). Table 3 shows the performance of various state-of-the-art classifiers tested on KDDTest+ with ORG, RndOSamp, and CTGANSamp. It presents weighted-average scores [59, 60] of accuracy, precision, recall, and F_1 score.

Table 4 shows the performance of various classifiers on KDDTest21- with ORG, RndOSamp, and CTGANSamp. Performance of various classifiers, trained on dataset balanced with synthetic data generated using CTGAN (CTGANSamp), on both test datasets (KDDTest21- and KDDTest21+) shows an improvement in accuracy ranging from 1% to 8%. We notice that DT, LSTM, and CNN classifiers trained on CTGANstamp consistently outperformed their counterparts trained on ORG and RndOSamp in both KDDTest+ and KDDTest21- datasets for all the quantitative metrics: accuracy, precision, recall, and the F_1 scores. Similarly, we observe significant improvements in *recall* for all ML classifiers for CTGANSamp compared to ORG and RndOSamp. Using CTGAN to balance the original data, it is evident that the *FN*

Table 3: Performance of different ML models on KDDTest+ test set where models were trained with ORD, RndOSamp, and CTGAN

Classifier Name	ORG				RndOSamp				CTGANSamp			
	Acc	Pre	Rec	F_1	Acc	Pre	Rec	F_1	Acc	Pre	Rec	F_1
DT	0.7315	0.7144	0.7315	0.6830	0.7458	0.7992	0.7458	0.7036	0.7522	0.7995	0.7522	0.7203
SVM	0.7014	0.6547	0.7014	0.6561	0.6935	0.7169	0.6935	0.6964	0.7326	0.6869	0.7326	0.6842
RF	0.7393	0.8162	0.7393	0.6917	0.7355	0.7485	0.7355	0.6876	0.7394	0.8162	0.7394	0.6916
NB	0.6105	0.5395	0.6105	0.5254	0.4483	0.5695	0.4483	0.4937	0.6273	0.5168	0.6273	0.5592
FNN	0.7534	0.7304	0.7534	0.7200	0.7587	0.7567	0.7587	0.7399	0.7736	0.8081	0.7736	0.7372
LSTM	0.7629	0.8010	0.7629	0.7260	0.7498	0.7899	0.7498	0.7130	0.7762	0.8182	0.7762	0.7462
CNN	0.7505	0.6887	0.7505	0.7021	0.7517	0.7849	0.7517	0.7156	0.7717	0.8037	0.7717	0.7344

Table 4: Performance of different ML models on KDDTest21- test set where models were trained with ORD, RndOSamp, and CTGANSamp

Classifiers Name	ORG				RndOSamp				CTGANSamp			
	Acc	Pre	Rec	F_1	Acc	Pre	Rec	F_1	Acc	Pre	Rec	F_1
DT	0.4917	0.5956	0.4917	0.4573	0.5248	0.7344	0.5248	0.5020	0.5423	0.7560	0.5423	0.5345
SVM	0.4349	0.5120	0.4349	0.4248	0.4823	0.5585	0.4823	0.4910	0.4993	0.5664	0.4993	0.4761
RF	0.5036	0.8085	0.5036	0.4846	0.4963	0.6804	0.4963	0.4772	0.5043	0.8092	0.5043	0.4855
NB	0.2659	0.3144	0.2659	0.2023	0.2772	0.3006	0.2772	0.2787	0.3503	0.2402	0.3503	0.2699
FNN	0.5344	0.5975	0.5344	0.5148	0.5464	0.6425	0.5464	0.5548	0.5719	0.7656	0.5719	0.5569
LSTM	0.5535	0.7528	0.5535	0.5370	0.5279	0.7265	0.5279	0.5088	0.5774	0.7837	0.5774	0.5752
CNN	0.5289	0.5558	0.5289	0.4997	0.5315	0.7352	0.5315	0.5236	0.5661	0.7575	0.5661	0.5531

number is low and the TP rate is high. It is also important to highlight that the accuracy of all the classifiers is consistently better when they were trained on CTGANStamp compared to when they were trained using ORD and RndOSamp. When all the classifiers are compared for F_1 score, it can be observed that all the classifiers either show better or competitive (e.g., within 1.5 percentage point) performance when trained employing CTGANStamp versus ORD and RndOSamp. However, the precision for CTGANSamp is not as good as it is for ORD or RndOSamp for SVM and NB classifiers. Additionally, the experimental results we obtain also show that accuracy of some classifiers decrease under RndOSamp compared to their accuracy under ORD. Overall, it can be conclusively claimed that all the classifiers show significant improvement for various metrics on both datasets. Under CTGANSamp, in the following, we further discuss quantitative results

As shown in Table 3, accuracy of DT for ORD is 73.15%; it increases around 1% under RndOSamp (i.e., 74.58%); it further increases to 75.22% under CTGANSamp. For the dataset KDDTest21-, we can observe similar trend. Accuracy of DT for ORD, RndOSamp, and CTGANSamp are 49.17%, 52.48%, and 54.23%, respectively, as shown in Table 4. For KDDTest+, CTGANSamp’s F_1 scores for the classifiers DT, NB, LSTM, and CNN are significantly higher than the competing methods ORD and RndOSamp. For instance, the classifier NB achieved 55.92% F_1 score for CTGANSamp, while ORD and RndOSamp achieved 52.54% and 49.37%, respectively. Table 3, shows, in the case of some classification methods such as SVM, RF, and FNN, ORD and RndOSamp achieved the highest F_1 scores. However, they differ slightly from CTGANSamp’s F_1 scores. As we can see, the difference between ORD and CTGANSamp for RF is 0.01%. Table 4 shows that there are significant improvements in CTGANSamp F_1 scores for DT, RF, FNN, LSTM, and CNN compared with ORD and RndOSamp. In the same dataset, for SVM and NB, RndOSamp achieved the highest F_1 scores. Again, there is a slight difference between CTGANSamp and RndOSamp which is




Figure 4: Qualitative analysis of the CNN classifier trained with ORG, RndOSamp, and CTGANSamp.

around 1%. Table 3 indicates that the accuracy of NB for RndOSamp on KDDTest+ decreases by 16% compared to ORG. The performance of the NB classifier is determined by the distribution of the training dataset. When duplicate samples are used to balance the training samples and change the distribution of the true dataset, the NB become more biased to some identical samples, therefore, achieved lower accuracy upon testing. Several other classifiers in Table 3 also decrease the overall accuracy, including SVM, RF, and LSTM for RndOSamp. As shown in Table 4, the overall accuracy for RF and LSTM decrease to 0.73% and 2.56%, respectively, for RndOSamp.

We randomly drew 300 samples from KDDTest+ and perform t-SNE projection on the selected data samples for qualitative analysis. Figure 4 shows the t-SNE visualization for all three experiments alongside ground truth for the classifier CNN. Figure 4(a) shows the actual classes, followed by ORG’s classification in 4(b), then RndOSamp’s classification in 4(c), and then CTGANSamp’s classification in 4(d). In Figure 4, we mark five circles (i.e., classes or clusters) shown in blue (I), green (II), black (III), purple (IV), and red (V) colors. We can see that the classification based on CTGANSamp is much closer to the actual truth. The blue circle in the ground truth indicates that the majority of the samples are of the DoS class type. In the same circle, ORG performs very well and is in line with the truth. The RndOSamp, on the other hand, predicts the opposite of the truth. CTGAN has incorrectly predicted some DoS samples as normal in the same circle, but overall it is able to detect most of the DoS samples. The majority of the samples in the green circle of ground truth are normal, and only a few are U2R, R2L, and probe samples. ORG is not able to detect any of the U2R and R2L samples, and some of the normal samples are also labeled as probes. Among all the experiments on this circle, RndOSamp performs the worst. It label many normal samples as probes. CTGANSamp, on the other hand, detects all the normal samples along with the minority classes U2R and R2L. In the black circle of the ground truth, the majority of the samples are probes, where ORG and RndOSamp predict all the samples to be normal. CTGAN’s prediction, on the other hand, is similar to the ground truth. It is also the case with the purple and red circles, where CTGANSamp’s prediction results are the same as the actual results. In contrast, both ORG and RndOSamp fail to capture the actual truth for the same circles.

Finally, we also perform statistical significant test on KDDTest+, Student’s T-test, on these three experiments to check if there is any significant difference and P-values are presented in table 5. We notice that the P-values are consistently very small when we compare the performance of CTGANSamp with ORG and RndOSamp. On the other hand, P-values for ORG and RndOSamp are not always small (for example, the P-value of RF is 0.91). This result also signifies that ML classifiers show improvement when they were trained using dataset augmented with CTGAN.

4. Related Works

In this section, we first discuss some intrusion detection techniques based on Machine Learning, presented in the literature. Then, we discuss data augmentation techniques used in various applications.

Table 5: T-Test on performance of various classifiers trained with ORG, RndOSamp, and CTGANSamp

Classifiers	DT	SVM	RF	NB	FNN	LSTM	CNN
Comparing approaches	<i>P-value</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>P-values</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>P-value</i>
ORG, CTGANSamp	$3.10e^{-10}$	$3.34e^{-78}$	$2.52e^{-16}$	$3.01e^{-253}$	0.05	0.001	$1.64e^{-37}$
ORG, RndOSamp	$2.64e^{-17}$	$1.73e^{-301}$	0.91	0.0	$1.79e^{-16}$	$6.65e^{-13}$	$2.05e^{-18}$
RndOSamp, CTGANSamp	$2.69e^{-12}$	$5.70e^{-128}$	$9.99e^{-17}$	$7.94e^{-151}$	$3.46e^{-26}$	$8.01e^{-05}$	0.00028

4.1. Machine Learning based Intrusion Detection

Machine Learning has been used extensively in designing and implementing IDSes. Ever *et al.* [61] used three machine learning models, ANN, SVM, and DT in their study. The primary goal of this study was to determine the optimal machine learning technique. As part of their experiments, they used 60% and 70% of the dataset NSL-KDD for training, and the rest of the dataset for testing. Based on their experiments, they showed that DT achieved better accuracy compared to the other two.

A new approach to detect intrusion in computer networks was introduced by *et al.* [62]. In order to address the data imbalance problem in NSL-KDD dataset, they proposed a MultiTree algorithm using DT of four levels, with the proportions of the types of classes adjusted accordingly. The authors introduced a model in which they ensemble DT, RF, K-NN, and DNN and used their adaptive voting algorithm to decide on classification.

To build effective IDSes, in depth analysis of network data is mandatory, as the volume of network data increases. Due to the different types of protocols used on the Internet, we have diverse network data. Therefore, it is difficult to distinguish between normal network traffic and attack traffic. Shone *et al.* [63] studied the feasibility and sustainability of current approaches in network intrusion detection. Deep and shallow learning were combined in their model. For unsupervised feature learning, the authors applied two layers of non-symmetric deep auto-encoders (NDAE). Unlike conventional auto encoders, the NDAE contains no decoder. In order to perform the final classification of the network traffic into normal and attack, RF was used. Based on NSL-KDD and KDD99 datasets, the authors evaluated their model using five and thirteen layers of classification. To overcome the problem of over-fitting and under-fitting, they performed a 10-fold cross validation. Due to the imbalanced nature of the datasets, the false alarm rate was high in some attack classes.

Yin *et al.* [64] presented a two-step approach for intrusion detection based on deep learning. One hot encoding was used to transform categorical data to numerical values during the preprocessing stage. In the following step, min-max method was used to normalize the dataset due to large variations in the data distribution. To classify data, recurrent neural networks (RNNs) with forward propagation and backward propagation were used. In the forward propagation method, output values were calculated, and the backward propagation method calculated the error and updated the weights. Cross-entropy was used to compute the difference between the output values produced by forward propagation and the true value. Using this methodology, both binary and multiclass classification were performed.

Javaid *et al.* [65] introduced a deep learning technique based on Auto Encoder (AE) for feature representation and feature learning. They used softmax regression for classification. Additionally, in the preprocessing stage, they transformed categorical features into continuous features and normalized the whole dataset using min-max method. They performed two types of evaluations. In order to do cross validation, they used training data for both training and testing. In the second approach, they used different datasets for testing and training.

In all of the above works, NSL-KDD dataset was used. As we saw, this dataset is imbalanced. However, none of the authors addressed this issue. The purpose of our study is to focus on the data imbalance problem and to investigate how this impacts the overall performance of various machine learning models.

4.2. Augmentation Techniques Applied to Various Applications

Synthetic data generation or data augmentation has been used in a variety of applications such as image classification, natural language processing. Various augmentation techniques have been proposed, primarily

based on deep learning models. In this subsection, we review some recent works on data augmentation and how this technique was applied in different areas of research.

Shorten *et al.* [66] presented a critical survey on image data augmentation using deep learning techniques. They explored the use of data augmentation, a data-space approach to the problem of limited data. Additionally, they state that data augmentation encompasses a suite of techniques to augment the size and quality of training datasets in order to build better deep learning models. This survey discussed image augmentation algorithms including geometric transformations, color space augmentations, kernel filters, mixing images, random erasing, feature space augmentation, adversarial training, generative adversarial networks, neural style transfer, and meta-learning. A significant portion of the survey is devoted to the application of GANs for augmentation.

Li *et al.* [67] proposed a novel deep learning technique for rotating machinery fault diagnosis. Generally, the following five data augmentation techniques were examined: additional Gaussian noise, masking noise, signal translation, amplitude shifting, and time stretching. Sample-based as well as dataset-based augmentation techniques were considered. They used two datasets to conduct their experiments, namely: Bearing Data Center of Case Western Reserve University (CWRU) and Intelligent Maintenance System (IMS). Their approach was able to achieve 99.9% accuracy.

Zhou *et al.* [68] proposed a novel approach combining data augmentation and deep learning methods, which addresses the issue of a lack of training samples in deep learning when used to forecast emerging technologies. In order to construct a sample dataset, Gartner's hype cycle and multiple patent features were utilized. As a second step, a generative adversarial network was used to create many synthetic samples (i.e., data augmentation) in order to expand the sample dataset. Lastly, a deep neural network classifier was trained with the augmented data set to forecast emerging technologies, and it was able to accurately predict up to 77% of the emerging technologies in a given year. Based on patent data from 2000-2016, this approach was used to predict emerging technologies in Gartner's hype cycles for 2017. A total of four out of six emerging technologies were accurately predicted, demonstrating the precision and accuracy of the proposed method. This article showed that deep learning now can be used to forecast emerging technologies with limited training samples.

ML-classifiers trained with imbalanced datasets affect their performance. We utilized synthetic data generated with CTGAN, to augment and balance a well known training dataset to study its effect on the performance of various well-known ML-classifiers.

5. Conclusion

Over the past several years, many researchers used Machine Learning in designing and implementing IDSes. They used different datasets for training ML classifiers. Some of the datasets used in such works are: NSL-KDD [52], UNSW-NB15 [69, 70], CICIDS 2017 [71], In many of the datasets used for designing IDSes, data are imbalanced (i.e., not all classes have equal amount of data). With unbalanced data, the predictive models developed using ML algorithms may produce unsatisfactory classifiers which would affect accuracy in predicting intrusions. Traditionally, researchers used over-sampling and under-sampling techniques to balance data in datasets. In this work, we use over-sampling, and also use a synthetic data generation method, called Conditional Generative Adversarial Network (CTGAN) to balance data and study their effect on various ML classifiers. To the best of our knowledge, no one else has used CTGAN to generate synthetic samples to balance datasets designed for intrusion detection in computer networks. Based on extensive experiments with the widely used dataset NSL-KDD, we found that training ML models on data balanced with synthetic samples generated by CTGAN increased prediction accuracy by as much as 8%, compared to training the same ML models over unbalanced data. Our experiments also show that the accuracy of some ML models trained over data balanced with random over-sampling declined compared to the same ML models trained over unbalanced data.

References

- [1] A. S. Dina, D. Manivannan, Intrusion detection based on machine learning techniques in computer networks, *Internet of Things* 16 (2021) 100462. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iot.2021.100462>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2542660521001037>

- [2] link, Lastline article available online: <https://www.lastline.com/blog/examine-tco-of-a-of-a-network-intrusion-detection-system/>.
- [3] A. Khraisat, I. Gondal, P. Vamplew, J. Kamruzzaman, Survey of intrusion detection systems: techniques, datasets and challenges, *Cybersecurity* 2 (1) (2019) 1–22.
- [4] J. P. Anderson, *Computer security technology planning study*. volume 2. (1972).
- [5] R. Bridges, T. Glass-Vanderlan, M. Iannacone, M. Vincent, Q. Chen, A survey of intrusion detection systems leveraging host data, *ACM computing surveys* 52 (6) (2020) 1–35.
- [6] W. Stallings, L. Brown, *Computer Security Principles and Practice* (4th edition), Pearson, ISBN-13: 978-0-13-479410-5, 2018.
- [7] A. L. Buczak, E. Guven, A survey of data mining and machine learning methods for cyber security intrusion detection, *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* 18 (2) (2016) 1153 – 1176. doi:10.1109/COMST.2015.2494502.
- [8] T. Saranya, S. Sridevi, C. Deisy, T. D. Chung, M. A. Khan, Performance analysis of machine learning algorithms in intrusion detection system: A review, *Procedia Computer Science* 171 (2020) 1251–1260.
- [9] A. L. Buczak, E. Guven, A survey of data mining and machine learning methods for cyber security intrusion detection, *IEEE Communications surveys & tutorials* 18 (2) (2015) 1153–1176.
- [10] S. M. Abd Elrahman, A. Abraham, A review of class imbalance problem, *Journal of Network and Innovative Computing* 1 (2013) (2013) 332–340.
- [11] N. V. Chawla, N. Japkowicz, A. Kotcz, Special issue on learning from imbalanced data sets, *ACM SIGKDD explorations newsletter* 6 (1) (2004) 1–6.
- [12] L. Xu, M. Skoularidou, A. Cuesta-Infante, K. Veeramachaneni, Modeling tabular data using conditional GAN, arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.00503 (2019).
- [13] M. Hasan, M. M. Islam, M. I. I. Zarif, M. Hashem, Attack and anomaly detection in iot sensors in iot sites using machine learning approaches, *Internet of Things* 7 (2019) 100059.
- [14] A. Mottini, R. Acuna-Agost, Relative label encoding for the prediction of airline passenger nationality, in: 2016 IEEE 16th International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW), IEEE, 2016, pp. 671–676.
- [15] X. Wang, L. Wang, Y. Qiao, A comparative study of encoding, pooling and normalization methods for action recognition, in: *Asian Conference on Computer Vision*, Springer, 2012, pp. 572–585.
- [16] M. Svensén, C. M. Bishop, *Pattern recognition and machine learning* (2007).
- [17] S. Aich, K. Younga, K. L. Hui, A. A. Al-Absi, M. Sain, A nonlinear decision tree based classification approach to predict the parkinson’s disease using different feature sets of voice data, in: 2018 20th International Conference on Advanced Communication Technology (ICACT), IEEE, 2018, pp. 638–642.
- [18] M. Syamala, N. J. Nalini, A filter based improved decision tree sentiment classification model for real-time amazon product review data, *International Journal of Intelligent Engineering and Systems* 13 (1) (2020) 191–202.
- [19] O. Reges, A. E. Krefman, S. T. Hardy, Y. Yano, P. Muntner, D. M. Lloyd-Jones, N. B. Allen, Decision tree-based classification for maintaining normal blood pressure throughout early adulthood and middle age: Findings from the coronary artery risk development in young adults (cardia) study, *American journal of hypertension* 34 (10) (2021) 1037–1041.
- [20] S.-H. Kim, I.-J. Moon, S.-H. Won, H.-W. Kang, S. K. Kang, Decision-tree-based classification of lifetime maximum intensity of tropical cyclones in the tropical western north pacific, *Atmosphere* 12 (7) (2021) 802.
- [21] W. Zhao, L. Shang, J. Sun, Power quality disturbance classification based on time-frequency domain multi-feature and decision tree, *Protection and Control of Modern Power Systems* 4 (1) (2019) 1–6.
- [22] link, Decision tree available online: <https://ekamperi.github.io/machine20learning/2021/04/13/gini-index-vs-entropy-decision-trees.html>.
- [23] K. Peng, V. Leung, L. Zheng, S. Wang, C. Huang, T. Lin, Intrusion detection system based on decision tree over big data in fog environment, *Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing* 2018 (2018).
- [24] J. Cervantes, F. Garcia-Lamont, L. Rodríguez-Mazahua, A. Lopez, A comprehensive survey on support vector machine classification: Applications, challenges and trends, *Neurocomputing* 408 (2020) 189–215.
- [25] R. Vijayarajeswari, P. Parthasarathy, S. Vivekanandan, A. A. Basha, Classification of mammogram for early detection of breast cancer using svm classifier and hough transform, *Measurement* 146 (2019) 800–805.
- [26] D. C. Toledo-Pérez, J. Rodríguez-Reséndiz, R. A. Gómez-Loenzo, J. Jauregui-Correa, Support vector machine-based emg signal classification techniques: A review, *Applied Sciences* 9 (20) (2019) 4402.
- [27] M. A. Chandra, S. Bedi, Survey on svm and their application in image classification, *International Journal of Information Technology* 13 (5) (2021) 1–11.
- [28] M. Pal, G. M. Foody, Feature selection for classification of hyperspectral data by svm, *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 48 (5) (2010) 2297–2307.
- [29] Y. Bazi, F. Melgani, Toward an optimal svm classification system for hyperspectral remote sensing images, *IEEE Transactions on geoscience and remote sensing* 44 (11) (2006) 3374–3385.
- [30] J. Hartmann, J. Huppertz, C. Schamp, M. Heitmann, Comparing automated text classification methods, *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 36 (1) (2019) 20–38.
- [31] X. Deng, Y. Li, J. Weng, J. Zhang, Feature selection for text classification: A review, *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 78 (3) (2019) 3797–3816.
- [32] A. Churher, R. Ullah, J. Ahmad, S. Ur Rehman, F. Masood, M. Gogate, F. Alqahtani, B. Nour, W. J. Buchanan, An experimental analysis of attack classification using machine learning in iot networks, *Sensors* 21 (2) (2021) 446.
- [33] S. Mukherjee, N. Sharma, Intrusion detection using naive bayes classifier with feature reduction, *Procedia Technology* 4 (2012) 119–128.
- [34] H. Komkov, L. Pocher, A. Restelli, B. Hunt, D. Lathrop, Rf signal classification using boolean reservoir computing on an fpga, in: 2021 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN), IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–9.
- [35] L. Peng, A. Hu, J. Zhang, Y. Jiang, J. Yu, Y. Yan, Design of a hybrid rf fingerprint extraction and device classification

- scheme, *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 6 (1) (2018) 349–360.
- [36] M. Sheykhmousa, M. Mahdianpari, H. Ghanbari, F. Mohamadimanesh, P. Ghamisi, S. Homayouni, Support vector machine versus random forest for remote sensing image classification: A meta-analysis and systematic review, *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing* 13 (2020) 6308–6325.
- [37] M. Ezuma, F. Erden, C. K. Anjinappa, O. Ozdemir, I. Guvenc, Detection and classification of uavs using rf fingerprints in the presence of wi-fi and bluetooth interference, *IEEE Open Journal of the Communications Society* 1 (2019) 60–76.
- [38] A. Catic, L. Gurbeta, A. Kurtovic-Kozaric, S. Mehmedbasic, A. Badnjevic, Application of neural networks for classification of patau, edwards, down, turner and klinefelter syndrome based on first trimester maternal serum screening data, ultrasonographic findings and patient demographics, *BMC medical genomics* 11 (1) (2018) 1–12.
- [39] R. Arulmurugan, H. Anandakumar, Early detection of lung cancer using wavelet feature descriptor and feed forward back propagation neural networks classifier, in: *Computational vision and bio inspired computing*, Springer, 2018, pp. 103–110.
- [40] J. Yang, J. Ma, Feed-forward neural network training using sparse representation, *Expert Systems with Applications* 116 (2019) 255–264.
- [41] K. Kamali, Deep learning (part 1) - feedforward neural networks (fnn) (galaxy training materials), [Online; accessed Wed Mar 16 2022] (06 2021).
URL `\url{https://training.galaxyproject.org/training-material/topics/statistics/tutorials/FNN/tutorial.html}`
- [42] P. Nagabushanam, S. Thomas George, S. Radha, Eeg signal classification using lstm and improved neural network algorithms, *Soft Computing* 24 (13) (2020) 9981–10003.
- [43] B. Jang, M. Kim, G. Harerimana, S.-u. Kang, J. W. Kim, Bi-lstm model to increase accuracy in text classification: Combining word2vec cnn and attention mechanism, *Applied Sciences* 10 (17) (2020) 5841.
- [44] O. Yildirim, U. B. Baloglu, R.-S. Tan, E. J. Ciaccio, U. R. Acharya, A new approach for arrhythmia classification using deep coded features and lstm networks, *Computer methods and programs in biomedicine* 176 (2019) 121–133.
- [45] S. Saadatnejad, M. Oveisi, M. Hashemi, Lstm-based eeg classification for continuous monitoring on personal wearable devices, *IEEE journal of biomedical and health informatics* 24 (2) (2019) 515–523.
- [46] J. Lu, L. Tan, H. Jiang, Review on convolutional neural network (cnn) applied to plant leaf disease classification, *Agriculture* 11 (8) (2021) 707.
- [47] G. Dai, J. Zhou, J. Huang, N. Wang, Hs-cnn: a cnn with hybrid convolution scale for eeg motor imagery classification, *Journal of neural engineering* 17 (1) (2020) 016025.
- [48] H. Phan, F. Andreotti, N. Cooray, O. Y. Chén, M. De Vos, Joint classification and prediction cnn framework for automatic sleep stage classification, *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering* 66 (5) (2018) 1285–1296.
- [49] C. Yu, R. Han, M. Song, C. Liu, C.-I. Chang, A simplified 2d-3d cnn architecture for hyperspectral image classification based on spatial-spectral fusion, *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing* 13 (2020) 2485–2501.
- [50] Y. Khourdifi, M. Bahaj, Heart disease prediction and classification using machine learning algorithms optimized by particle swarm optimization and ant colony optimization, *International Journal of Intelligent Engineering and Systems* 12 (1) (2019) 242–252.
- [51] T. T. Nguyen, G. Armitage, A survey of techniques for internet traffic classification using machine learning, *IEEE communications surveys & tutorials* 10 (4) (2008) 56–76.
- [52] dataset link, NSL-KDD dataset. available on: <http://nsl.cs.unb.ca/kdd/nsl-kdd.html>, march 2009.
- [53] M. Tavallae, E. Bagheri, W. Lu, A. A. Ghorbani, A detailed analysis of the kdd cup 99 data set, in: *2009 IEEE symposium on computational intelligence for security and defense applications*, IEEE, 2009, pp. 1–6.
- [54] B. Ingre, A. Yadav, Performance analysis of nsl-kdd dataset using ann, in: *2015 international conference on signal processing and communication engineering systems*, IEEE, 2015, pp. 92–96.
- [55] L. Van der Maaten, G. Hinton, Visualizing data using t-sne., *Journal of machine learning research* 9 (11) (2008).
- [56] Y. Pang, Z. Chen, L. Peng, K. Ma, C. Zhao, K. Ji, A signature-based assistant random oversampling method for malware detection, in: *2019 18th IEEE International conference on trust, security and privacy in computing and communications/13th IEEE international conference on big data science and engineering (TrustCom/BigDataSE)*, IEEE, 2019, pp. 256–263.
- [57] G. Sharma, Pros and cons of different sampling techniques, *International journal of applied research* 3 (7) (2017) 749–752.
- [58] link, Scikit-learn available online: <https://scikit-learn.org/dev/versions.html>.
- [59] V. M. Patro, M. R. Patra, Augmenting weighted average with confusion matrix to enhance classification accuracy, *Transactions on Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence* 2 (4) (2014) 77–91.
- [60] in: *Proceedings of*.
- [61] Y. K. Ever, B. Sekeroglu, K. Dimililer, Classification analysis of intrusion detection on NSL-KDD using machine learning algorithms, in: *Proceedings of International Conference on Mobile Web and Intelligent Information Systems*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 11673, Springer, Cham, 2019. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-27192-3_9.
- [62] X. Gao, C. Shan, C. Hu, Z. Niu, Z. Liu, An adaptive ensemble machine learning model for intrusion detection, *IEEE Access* 7 (2019) 82512 – 82521. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2923640.
- [63] N. Shone, T. N. Ngoc, V. D. Phai, Q. Shi, A deep learning approach to network intrusion detection, *IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computational Intelligence* 2 (1) (2018) 41–50. doi:10.1109/TETCI.2017.2772792.
- [64] C. Yin, Y. Zhu, J. Fei, X. He, A deep learning approach for intrusion detection using recurrent neural networks, *IEEE Access* 5 (2017) 21954–21961.
- [65] A. Javaid, Q. Niyaz, W. Sun, M. Alam, A deep learning approach for network intrusion detection system, in: *Proceedings of the 9th EAI International Conference on Bio-inspired Information and Communications Technologies (formerly BIONETICS)*, 2016, pp. 21–26.
- [66] C. Shorten, T. M. Khoshgoftaar, A survey on image data augmentation for deep learning, *Journal of big data* 6 (1) (2019) 1–48.

- [67] X. Li, W. Zhang, Q. Ding, J.-Q. Sun, Intelligent rotating machinery fault diagnosis based on deep learning using data augmentation, *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing* 31 (2) (2020) 433–452.
- [68] Y. Zhou, F. Dong, Y. Liu, Z. Li, J. Du, L. Zhang, Forecasting emerging technologies using data augmentation and deep learning, *Scientometrics* 123 (1) (2020) 1–29.
- [69] N. Moustafa, J. Slay, UNSW-NB15: A comprehensive data set for network intrusion detection systems (UNSW-NB15 network data set), in: *Proceedings of 2015 military communications and information systems conference (MilCIS)*, IEEE, 2015, pp. 1–6.
- [70] N. Moustafa, J. Slay, The evaluation of network anomaly detection systems: Statistical analysis of the UNSW-NB15 data set and the comparison with the KDD99 data set, *Information Security Journal: A Global Perspective* 25 (1-3) (2016) 18–31.
- [71] I. Sharafaldin, A. H. Lashkari, A. A. Ghorbani, Toward generating a new intrusion detection dataset and intrusion traffic characterization., *ICISSp* 1 (2018) 108–116.