

SE#PCFG: Semantically Enhanced PCFG for Password Analysis and Cracking

Yangde Wang¹, Weidong Qiu¹, Weicheng Zhang¹, Hao Tian¹, and Shujun Li²

¹ School of CSE, Shanghai Jiaotong University, Shanghai 200240, China
 {softds,qiuwd,vincent-zhang,aatth1971}@sjtu.edu.cn

² iCSS & School of Computing, University of Kent, Canterbury CT2 7NP, UK
 S.J.Li@kent.ac.uk

Abstract. Much research has been done on user-generated textual passwords. Surprisingly, semantic information in such passwords remain under-investigated, with passwords created by English- and/or Chinese-speaking users being more studied with limited semantics. This paper fills this gap by proposing a *general framework* based on *semantically enhanced* PCFG (probabilistic context-free grammars) named SE#PCFG. It allowed us to consider 43 types of semantic information, the richest set considered so far, for semantic password analysis. Applying SE#PCFG to 17 large leaked password databases of user speaking four languages (English, Chinese, German and French), we demonstrate its usefulness and report a wide range of new insights about password semantics at different levels such as cross-website password correlations. Furthermore, based on SE#PCFG and a new systematic smoothing method, we proposed the Semantically Enhanced Password Cracking Architecture (SEPCA). To compare the performance of SEPCA against three state-of-the-art (SOTA) benchmarks in terms of the password coverage rate: two other PCFG variants and FLA. Our experimental results showed that SEPCA outperformed all the three benchmarks consistently and significantly across 52 test cases, by up to 21.53%, 52.55% and 7.86%, respectively, at the user level (with duplicate passwords). At the level of unique passwords, SEPCA also beats the three benchmarks by up to 33.32%, 86.19% and 10.46%, respectively. The results demonstrated the power of SEPCA as a new password cracking framework.

1 Introduction

Textual passwords have dominated user authentication on computer systems and the Internet for decades [21,14]. Although many new user authentication methods have been proposed over the years, e.g., fingerprint and face recognition based methods have been used widely on smartphones [7], textual passwords remain the most widely used method because none of the new methods can provide a better balance between security and usability. Many people believe that the situation will not change in the foreseeable future [10].

Trade-offs between security and usability have been well known in the cyber security field [17]. For textual passwords, it has been well recognized that users

often define easy-to-remember passwords that are not strong enough against password cracking [12,13,11] and prefer relying on themselves than using auxiliary tools [19].

The continuous dominance of textual passwords in user authentication applications means that it remains important to further our understanding of user-generated passwords to improve password security. There has been quite some research looking into semantic patterns of user-generated passwords, but most of which focused on English-speaking users [27,1,10,33,26] or more recently Chinese-speaking users [16,4,35]. However, research covering users speaking more than English and Chinese is still very limited. In addition, past work studied semantic information using stand-alone methods, which means a gap on more reconfigurable frameworks that allow easy incorporation of a rich set of semantic elements. Yet another gap we noticed is that little work has quantitatively analyzed cross-site semantic correlations. Last but not the least, as mentioned in [9], little work has considered applying smoothing techniques to consider unobserved but still plausible passwords to make password cracking methods more generalizable.

This paper fills these gaps via the following main contributions. First, we propose SE#PCFG, semantically enhanced PCFG, a general framework for analyzing semantics of user-generated passwords. We implemented a prototype of SE#PCFG covering 43 types of password semantic information, the richest set considered so far for password analysis (to the best of our knowledge), including semantic information in four different languages (English, Chinese, German and French), entries in Wikipedia, Wiktionary and Urban Dictionary. Second, by applying our implementation of SE#PCFG to 17 large leaked password databases, we demonstrate its usefulness and report a range of new insights about password semantics and the underlying user behaviors such as cross-website password correlations. Third, we propose Semantically Enhanced Password Cracking Architecture (SEPCA), which can leverage training set more effectively, enhanced by a general and systematic smoothing algorithm. Using 52 test cases based on the same 17 password databases (each of four selected databases as the training set and each of the other 13 as the target set), we conducted cracking attacks by comparing the performance of SEPCA against three state-of-the-art (SOTA) password cracking methods in terms of the password coverage rate: two other variants of the PCFG family – Weir et al.’s latest implementation [36] of the original PCFG-based method [37] and Veras et al.’s method based on their “Semantic PCFG” [26] – and FLA (Fast, Lean, and Accurate) that is n-gram-based and not semantically aware [23]. Our experimental results showed that SEPCA outperformed the two other PCFG variants consistently and significantly at both user and password levels. With 5×10^9 guessed passwords, SEPCA performed the best and the average performance across the 52 test cases was improved by up to 21.53% (user level), 33.32% (password level) for one and 52.55% (user level), 86.19% (password level) for the other. SEPCA also outperformed FLA by up to 7.86% (user level) and 10.46% (password level) averagely.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The next section introduces SE#PCFG and how our implementation was applied to the 17 leaked password databases for password semantic analysis. Section 3 describes SEPCHA in detail and reports experimental results, and the last section concludes our work.

2 SE#PCFG and Password Semantic Analysis

In this section, we first describe the conceptual model behind SE#PCFG, then introduce a streamlined computational process which can tackle different languages and richer semantics, and finally report some selected experimental results by applying our work to analyze 17 large leaked password databases as detailed in Table 1. All these databases are publicly available and selected according to the following two principles: 1) they should represent a significantly large user population (over 1 million passwords for each) and 2) they should have information about password frequencies to allow richer analysis.

Table 1: The 17 breached databases used in our work.

No.	Database	Dominative Users	Service	Size	Breached Year
1	CSDN	Chinese	Profession	6,387,785	2011
2	Tianya	Chinese	Social Networks	30,274,001	2011
3	7K7K	Chinese	Entertainment	8,460,641	2011
4	17173	Chinese	Entertainment	17,942,621	2011
5	178	Chinese	Entertainment	9,072,688	2011
6	Dodonev	Chinese	Profession	14,122,756	2011
7	Twitter	English	Social Networks	67,095,263	2016
8	Webhost	English	Profession	14,436,531	2015
9	RockYou	English	Social Networks	28,705,927	2009
10	MyHeritage	English	Life	84,825,745	2017
11	Gmail	English	Life	4,663,677	2014
12	8Fit	Germany	Life	1,121,536	2018
13	Eyeem	Germany	Profession	4,043,116	2018
14	Ge_Mix1	Germany	Mix	6,761,255	2018
15	Fr_Mix1	French	Mix	1,302,365	2018
16	Fr_Mix2	French	Mix	1,098,418	2018
17	Fr_Mix3	French	Mix	10,284,538	2018

2.1 Conceptual Model of SE#PCFG

Four Structural Levels First, we define four password structural levels to better guide analysis of password semantics.

1) Characters: At this level, each character bears the lowest-level information about a password.

2) Semantic Factors (word-level semantics): This level is about a number of consecutive characters (i.e., a word) that together form a semantically meaningful unit, which we call a semantic factor. To indicate what semantic information a semantic factor carries, we call it a **semantic factor type**. For the sake of brevity, in the following, we use “SF” and “SFT” to refer to “semantic factor” and “semantic factor type” respectively. Furthermore, we denote a tuple (SF, SFT) to make it clear what SFT one SF belongs to.

3) Semantic Patterns (password-level semantics): This level looks at how the whole password is semantically composed by one or more semantic factor types. In the rest of this paper, we use an ordered list of SFTs to denote a

Table 2: 43 SFTs used in our implementation of SE#PCFG.

SFT Description ^a	SFT Description
EMAIL [4] Email addresses	DN [4] Domain names
PY [16] Pinyin strings of all Chinese character	consonants Two or more consecutive consonants can cover many acronyms
SR4, SR5, ... [34] Kinds of Combination of small strings	YEAR [4] 4-digit years between 1990 and 2100
PRE1, SUF1, ... [34] prefixes and suffixes	YYMMDD, ... [42] 6- and 8-digit dates in different formats
KB4, KB5, ... [16] Keyboard patterns with 4, 5, ... characters	CN_MOBILE [42] 11-digit mobile numbers (used in China)
EN_ [26] 11 POS tags of English: NOUN, VERB, PRON, ADJ, ADV, ADP, CONJ, DET, PRT, X, NUM	ge_ , fr_ 5 most common POS tags in German (GE_) and French (FR_): NOUN, ADJ, ADV, PRON, VERB
NUMBER1, ... [37] Numbers with 1, 2, ... digits	SPECL, ... [37] Consecutive special characters
LOCATION [35] English names of places ^b	wkne Wiki name entity [40]
MONTH [26] English words for 12 months	ube Urban Dictionary entity [29]
NAME [35] Male and female names ^c	LEET [34] Leet rules described in 2.2
cn_name_abbr Acronyms of Chinese names ^d	NN Unknown semantics

^a 14 newly added SFTs are highlighted in bold, while others were introduced in previous work.

^b Extracted from the world (non-Chinese) location databases in the Chinese instant messaging software Tencent QQ and the Geonames [6] list of cities.

^c Extracted from a database released by the US Social Security Administration (SSA) [30], based on a 100% sample of records of Social Security card applications as of March 2019. The database contains information on gender.

^d 3- and 4-letter only; derived from Chinese names in [28].

password’s semantic pattern, e.g., [EN_NOUN, NUMBER3] is the semantic pattern of the password “king123”, and “SP” to refer to “semantic pattern”.

4) Semantic Structure (population- or database-level semantics): This level is about the overall observable semantic structure of passwords generated by a group of users, reflecting their collective behaviors that could map to one or more shared semantic attributes (e.g., language spoken, age, gender, and website type). For our work, we considered language and website type because they are more available with leaked password databases than other attributes.

Based on the four-leveled password structure, we can more clearly see how our work differs from others. For instance, some work [26,16,35] takes advantage of extra but limited semantic information to cover more SFs and SFTs on one specific language, some [34,18] considers a special SFT – transformation in passwords, and the n -gram based methods [24,23] work more at the first level to build character-to-character transition probabilities without considering any real semantic information. In contrast, our work provides a more general way to cover a wide range of semantic information, which can also be tailored for specific password databases. One important contribution of our work is the significant expansion of SFTs covered at the second level to enable much more semantically aware password analysis, as explained in greater detail below.

SFTs and SFs At the core of our implementation of SE#PCFG are 43 pre-defined SFTs representing different types of semantic information. While some SFTs have been used in past studies, many are newly introduced. Note that

Table 3: Five typical passwords to show details of each step in the computational process of SE#PCFG. “—” means the output of the former step will stay the same after this step.

Password	Step 1	Step 2a	Step 2b	Step 3	Result
qwertypassword	[[qwerty, KB5], (password, L)]	[[qwerty, KB5], (password, EN_NOUN)]	—	—	[[qwerty, KB5], (password, EN_NOUN)]
qazqazqaz	[[qazqazqaz, SR9]]	—	—	—	[[qazqazqaz, SR9]]
zhangfei1990	[[zhangfei, L], (1990, D)]	[[zhang, PY](fei, PY), (1990, D)]	[[zhang, PY](fei, PY), (1990, Year)]	—	[[zhang, PY](fei, PY), (1990, Year)]
Pa\$word	[(Pa, L), (\$\$, SPEC2), (word, L)]	—	—	[(Pa\$word, LEET)]	[(Pa\$word, LEET)]
ahnung	[[ahnung, L]]	[[ahnung, GE_NOUN]]	—	—	[[ahnung, GE_NOUN]]

more SFTs can be easily added by password analysts and researchers thanks to the general structure of SE#PCFG.

Newly added SFTs: We introduce 14 new SFTs according to some observed gaps (e.g., what were acknowledged in [26]): 1) 5 SFTs for German words and 5 for French words; 2) Chinese acronyms; 3) WKNE and UBE to cover proper nouns and slangs; 4) CONSONANT to cover consecutive consonants.

In addition, we also label any other unknown SFTs as NN. To the best of our knowledge, the 43 SFTs form the richest set of password semantic information considered so far, and serve as a good base line for our implementation and experiments. The whole corpus is published as a public resource at [ANONYMIZED]. Table 2 gives more details about the definitions of these SFTs and information sources we used.

2.2 A Streamlined Computational Process

Based on the conceptual model, we propose a following streamlined computational process of SE#PCFG to automate password semantic analysis in a more general way which consists of three steps: pre-processing, identifying SFTs in segments and post-processing.

We explain each step with greater details below. Table 3 gives five typical examples of how each step works.

Step 1 – Pre-processing Almost all NLP tools consider the change of character type (letter, digit, symbol) as a “split position” of consecutive words in a given text. This means that they cannot identify SFs with mixed character types such as “1qaz” (a keyboard pattern) and “google.com” (a domain name). Therefore, such SFs have to be identified before NLP tools are applied in next step. Three SFTs we consider here are borrowed from Weir et al.’s implementation and several previous work [36,4,16]: keyboard patterns with n characters (KB n , where $n \geq 4$), domain names (DN) and email addresses (EMAIL). In addition, we also considered three other SFTs with mixed character types: prefixes (PRE), suffixes (SUF) and repeated strings (SR). We defined the above SFTs in relatively simple ways, but more complicated versions can be easily defined.

For a given password, the pre-processing step tries to search for all possible SFs falling into the six SFTs following a pre-defined precedence order (KB n >

EMAIL > DN > SR*n* > PRE = SUF). This order is designed following the implementation of original PCFG [36], and adding the three new SFTs in the end for those will not make any ambiguities. After all SFs are labeled, any remaining parts of the password are split into L (Letter), D (Digit) and S (Symbol) segments following the mechanism proposed by Weir et al.’s work [37] for further processing. The first row of Table 3 shows how the pre-processing step works for a given password: `qwertypassword` \rightarrow [(`qwerty`, KB5), (`password`, L)], where the KB5 indicates the identified SFT of `qwerty`. The second row illustrates the identification result of the password “`qazqazqaz`”. The remaining parts containing L, D, S segments are for further processing.

Step 2a – Identifying SFs in L-Segments After pre-processing, the remaining L-segments can be seen as a combination of multiple SFs (e.g., “`wonderbread`”), which are highly language-dependent, therefore NLP tools are needed. In this step, we discuss how SE#PCFG leverage a corpus to obtain richer semantics from L-Segments.

In our implementation of SE#PCFG, we followed Veras et al.’s work [26] to choose the widely used NLP library NLTK (<https://www.nltk.org/>) to identify linguistic SFs and implement a scoring system based on source and reference corpora and *n*-gram frequencies to disambiguate the results of segmentation. The whole process can be split into three sub-steps: i) further segmenting each input L-segment into smaller linguistic elements (e.g., “`sunnyboy`” into “`sunny boy`”); ii) identifying English SFs with a recognized POS (part-of-speech) tag; and iii) identifying SFs more than English words.

For the sub-step i), we first use several corpora with richer semantics to help NLTK identify SFs. First, we chose to use two widely used English corpora “Brown” and “Web Text” to cover English words. Then we intersected the German dictionary with word frequencies in WorldLex [15] and Wiktionary of German [38] to get more commonly used German words. The same was done with the French dictionary in WordLex [15] and Fewiktionary [39] to produce a French corpus. To cover slangs and proper nouns/phrases, Wikipedia (WKNE) and Urban Dictionary (UBE) were used to produce two more corpora by concatenating entries they cover. Besides, yet another corpus was produced using a number of ad hoc dictionaries to cover other proposed SFTs such as LOCATION.

After segmentation is done, NLTK’s POS module is used to directly identify SFs belonging to SFTs with a clear linguistic meanings in English displayed in Table 2 started with EN_. To recognize non-English words without relying on a POS tagger, we chose to inject non-English words into the English POS tagging process as dummy NP words, which can be mapped to the following SFTs via simple string matching: German and French SFTs, LOCATION, MONTH, MALE_NAME and FEMALE_NAME, etc. For any unrecognized segments, we labeled them as NN. Rows 1, 3 and 5 of Table 3 show the results after this step.

Step 2b – identifying SFs in D- and S-Segments Step 2a identifies SFs in L-segments, so other SFs are processed in this step using non-NLP methods. For

S-segments (i.e., those with special characters only), we treat them as a single SFT SPEC n ($n = 1, 2, \dots$). For D-segments (i.e., numbers), they are processed in two further sub-steps. First, if the length is 4, 6, 8 or 11, the segment will be checked against one of the four SFTs: i) 4-digit years (YEAR), ii) 6-digit dates in the format of YYMMDD (Chinese style), MMDDYY (American style) and DDMMYY (European style), iii) 8-digit dates in the format of YYYYMMDD, MMDDYYYY, DDMMYYYY, iv) and 11-digit for mobile phone numbers in China (CN_MOBILE). Then, if none of the above SFTs are matched, the number is labeled as NUMBER n ($n = 1, 2, \dots$). Row 3 of Table 3 shows the result after this step.

Step 3 – Post-processing After previous steps, a password should have been split into multiple sequential SFs. However, for passwords that went through leet transformations, we can end up with a larger number of wrong SFs, e.g., “pa\$\$word” will lead to three SFs – “pa”, “\$\$”, “word”. To fix such problems, we introduce a post-processing step to further process NN-SFs and passwords with too many (> 3 for our implementation) SFs. According to [34], the top ten transformations ($0 \leftrightarrow o$, $1 \leftrightarrow i$, $3 \leftrightarrow e$, $4 \leftrightarrow a$, $1 \leftrightarrow !$, $1 \leftrightarrow l$, $5 \leftrightarrow s$, $@ \leftrightarrow a$, $9 \leftrightarrow 6$, $\$ \leftrightarrow s$) can cover 96.6% leet pairs, so we decided to consider these leet transformations only. Once detected, we label the whole leet-transformed SFs as a single SF of type LEET. Note that the main purpose of this step is to refine segmentation results of previous steps, so more optimizations could be applied. Row 4 of Table 3 gives a visual example.

2.3 Experimental Results

Now we report selected results of applying our implementation of SE#PCFG to study password semantics of the 17 leaked password databases listed in Table 1.

Attributes of databases: As mentioned before, the 17 databases were selected to cover two main semantic attributes of online services and their users: language (English, Chinese, German, and French), and service type (Social Networks, Entertainment, Profession, and Life). We noticed that users of each database can be from any country all over the world, but we do not have enough information to determine their nationalities and preferences of speaking language(s). So we categorized databases just based on the dominating users the website served. Note that for English databases of large websites, there are likely many users from non-English-speaking countries, so “English” should be treated as “dominated by English”.

Data cleaning: As with [20,35], we cleaned them by removing passwords containing symbols beyond 95 printable ASCII characters. We believe this strategy is reasonable as all these websites only take the 95 printable ASCII characters as legal components of their users’ passwords.

Segmentation results: NN can be seen as a good indicator of how well the framework worked. The less NN remain, the more meaningful SFTs are identified. Our experimental results in Table 4 showed that our implementation of SE#PCFG can identify 85.11% and 97.14% passwords across all 17 databases.

Table 4: Segmentation results over all the 17 databases aligned by language.

CN	SR (%) ^a	EN	SR (%)	GE	SR (%)	FR	SR (%)
1	95.31	7	90.26	12	94.84	15	89.72
2	95.71	8	89.00	13	95.04	16	89.46
3	94.80	9	93.33	14	88.80	17	89.29
4	96.88	10	85.11				
5	96.64	11	90.99				
6	97.14						

^a “SR” is short for “Success Rate”, which means the percentage of all segmentation results that not contain the SFT of NN.

Based on these learned semantic information, we report some selected observations at three semantic levels (SFs/SFTs, SPs, and semantic structures) below.

Analysis of SFs and SFTs Past studies have shown frequent use of some SFTs in user-generated passwords, such as numbers, names, dates, and different linguistic elements [33,26,4,35,32], but a systematic look at a more diverse set of SFTs (e.g., the 14 new ones in SE#PCFG) and SFs is still lacking. To make it easier to identify useful patterns, we re-grouped all the SFTs into 21 groups with a closer semantic relationship: all special characters-based SFs into one (SPECIAL), all name-related SFs into one (NAME), all date-related SFs into one (DATE), all numeric SFs with at least 9 digits into one (NUMBER9+), all SFs for a specific language into one (EN_SFTs, GE_SFTs, and FR_SFTs), SFs identified during pre-processing and post-processing into PRE_PROCESSING and POST_PROCESSING, respectively.

The results led to a number of interesting observations not reported before. **Preference of languages:** 1) In all databases, Chinese-related SFTs are popular (16.87%, 1st in Chinese databases, 6.03%, 7th in English databases, 5.69%, 6th in German databases and 6.70%, 6th in French databases), which may be explained that non-Chinese databases are all multi-national so they have a significant number of Chinese-speaking users. 2) For all non-Chinese databases, English SFs as a collective SFT group is either the highest or the second highest. This can be explained by the fact that English is the “world” language used widely in all countries. 3) To our surprise, users of German and French databases seemed to prefer English over their native language. Although they have the highest ratio by their own language-related SFTs, but the absolute number is much lower than English-related or even Chinese-related SFTs. This may be explained by non-English-speaking users feeling that using English passwords is more convenient, but more empirical studies involving recruited human participants are needed to understand such a phenomenon more.

Numeric SFs: Past studies [16,35,42] have showed the use of numeric segments in user-generated passwords. The richer SFTs used in SE#PCFG still allowed us to observe an interesting new finding: **Chinese and non-Chinese users had different behaviors** – Chinese users tended to use longer numeric SFs (with 6-8 digits) than non-Chinese users (with just 1-3 digits).

Attributions of databases: No noticeable patterns were observed related to the service type, implying that it may not be a good indicator for analyzing

user-generated passwords. In contrast, we can see language plays a key role in the semantic structures at the population/database level: databases sharing the same language have a similar semantic structure, but those labelled with different languages have very different semantic structures. This is a new piece of evidence about users speaking different languages have different password composition behaviors.

New SFTs introduced in SE#PCFG: We had interesting observations about the 14 new SFTs described in Section 2.1. 1) They play an important role in segmentation results. Averagely 10.38%, 13.11%, 12.80% and 13.47% passwords consist of these SFTs in Chinese, English, German and French databases, respectively. Out of all these SFTs, WKNE is in the majority in all databases, which indicates that this SFT works well in enriching our understanding of password semantics. 2) Some past studies [35,32] reported that in Chinese and English databases, SFs like “love” or “ai” (the same meaning in Chinese) or “520x” (a homophonic number of “I love you” in Chinese) appeared very frequently. We observed a similar pattern in German and French databases: “Ich liebe dich” and “Je t’aime” mean “iloveyou” in German and French, respectively, and they appear from 73–1,329, 64–5,416 times in the language-aligned databases, respectively. On the other hand, we also noticed frequent use of dirty words. For instance, the English phrase “fuckyou” appears between 2,110 and 25,357 times in the four English databases. A similar pattern was




Fig. 1: Distribution of combined SFTs in the 17 databases. We can see a clear vision that English, German and French databases have similar distribution at SFT-level except for 10 (MyHeritage). Meanwhile, Chinese databases have similar distribution with each other, but quite different from the other databases. All numbers labeled in each figure are on average.




Fig. 2: Distributions of SPL in the 17 databases

also observed in Chinese, German and French databases. 3) Some special types of proper nouns/phrases including names of celebrities, large companies/brands and popular games seem much more popular among non-Chinese users than among Chinese users, e.g., “samsung” (non-Chinese 0.19% vs Chinese 0.05%) and “pokemon” (non-Chinese 0.17% vs Chinese 0.01%).

Analysis of SPs SP length: For a password, we define the length of SP (SPL) as the number of SFTs included in the SP representing the password. SPL can reflect how complicated a user’s mental model was when they generated a password. Figure 2 shows the results about SPL. In 11 databases (5 Chinese, 4 English and 2 French databases), the majority of SPL of 1, while passwords having SPL of 2 dominate in the other 6 databases. 91.4% of all passwords have just one to three SFs (39.77% for SPL = 1, 39.95% for SPL = 2 and 11.69 for SPL = 3), and almost all (98.3%) passwords have an SPL no more than five. These results suggest that most users had a relatively simple mental model for generating passwords, which matches the well-reported preference of users for usability over security [3]. Another interesting observation is that the average SPL of all six Chinese databases is 1.702, significantly smaller than that of English (2.136), German (2.037) and French (2.117) databases. Such differences reflect different collective behaviors of Chinese and non-Chinese users.

Cross-Database Semantic Correlations Metric to evaluate password semantics at the database level: The semantic structure of one database can be represented by a discrete probability density (DPD) of each unique SF, SFT or SP. One useful metric capturing similarities and differences of user behaviors is cosine similarity because it is one of the mostly widely used metrics for such purposes [8]. For the three levels, the one at the SFT level will be more robust and easier to calculate because the dimensionality of the DPD at the SFT level is much smaller than that at the other two levels.

It is also possible to define a correlation metric across two or more semantic levels to make the indicator more informative. For instance, we can use the similarity metrics at the SF level for each SFT to adjust the similarity metrics at the SFT level so that the new metric covers both:

$$\text{Sim}_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{B}}^{\text{SF-SFT}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (w_{A,B,i} A_i B_i)}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n A_i^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n B_i^2}}, \quad (1)$$

where $w_{A,B,i}$ is a similarity metric of the SF-level DPDs of the two databases for the i -th SFT, with a range of $[0,1]$, and the base-line DPDs are at the SFT level. Similarly, many correlation metrics can be used to calculate $w_{A,B,i}$. In our experiments, we used a simple metric focusing on the average probability of common SFs shared between two databases for a given SFT:

$$w_{A,B,i} = \sum_{\text{SF}_j \in \text{SF}_{s_A} \cap \text{SF}_{s_B}} \text{Prob}(\overline{\text{SF}}_j), \quad (2)$$

where SF_{s_A} and SF_{s_B} are the sets of all SFs belonging to the i -th SFT in Database A and B, respectively, and $\overline{\text{SF}}_j$ is the average occurrence probability of SF_j in the two databases.

Cross-database semantic correlations at the SFT and SF levels:

Following the equations above, we can calculate the overall semantic correlation between any two given databases at different semantic levels. Figure 3 shows the cross-database semantic correlation values between each pair of the 17 databases as a diagonally symmetric heatmap, using [8] and Eqs. (1), respectively. The dashed lines in the heatmaps separate Chinese (1-6), English (7-11), German (12-14) and French (15-17) databases to show the language-dependent patterns more clearly. From the two heatmaps, we can see a number of visual patterns. First, there are two clearly non-overlapping areas – one for Chinese databases, and the other for non-Chinese databases, indicating that Chinese and non-Chinese users have very different collective behaviors. One possible reason of this pattern is that Chinese websites are more dominated by Chinese-speaking users, but Western websites have a more mixed groups of users who speak different languages. Another reason is that Western languages are linguistically more similar to each other than Chinese to any Western languages. Second, users of Myheritage (10) display very different habits from all the other databases. This phenomenon is echoed later by the poorer password cracking performance against Myheritage using other databases as the training database (see Sections 3.3). Finally but equally interestingly, comparing the two heatmaps, the correlation values between Chinese databases drop significantly when SFs are considered to weigh the SFT-level correlations, suggesting that Chinese users share more common behaviors on the selection of SFTs but they behave less similarly on selections of SFs. This phenomenon is much less obvious for non-Chinese databases, suggesting that Western users are more consistent in choosing both SFs and SFTs.

3 Semantically Enhanced Password Cracking

Thanks to the enhanced semantic awareness, SE#PCFG clearly has the potential to be used for designing more powerful PCFG-based password cracking methods. Combining SE#PCFG with a systematic model smoothing method, we developed Semantically Enhanced Password Cracking Architecture (SEPCA), a new password cracking architecture that was shown to be able to outperform mainstream SOTA password cracking methods under the scene of real-attacking. The main idea of model smoothing is to address SFs that are not present in training sets but appear in the targets. This problem was first mentioned in [37].




Fig. 3: Cross-database semantic correlation values at the SFT level and those at the combined SF-SFT level, according to [8] and Eq. (1), respectively. The x- and y-axis show the indices of the 17 databases shown in Table 1.

Surprisingly, very few researchers have studied how to practically and systematically smooth a password model, which so far is mainly done by injecting extra information such as new dictionaries with a fixed but ad hoc coefficient. In the following, we first explain the design and implementation of SEPICA, as one of the technical contributions of our work, which allows us to apply a natural way to assign a set of non-zero probabilities to unobserved SFs, then discuss how we conducted our experiments, and finally present the results comparing with three state-of-the-art methods and new insights learned.

3.1 The Proposed New Architecture SEPICA

A generic probabilistic context-free grammar G can be defined by a quintuple, $G=(M, T, R, S, P)$, where M and T represent the set of non-terminal and terminal symbols respectively. S is the start symbol belonging to M . R is the set of production rules and P contains the probabilities of each rule in R .

In SEPICA, T is the set of all SFs, M is the union of T and S . The production rules can be categorized into two groups: 1) from S to a certain SP, following $\sum_k P(S \rightarrow SP_k) = 1$. 2) from a SFT to a certain SF, and $\forall i, \sum_j P(\text{SFT}_i \rightarrow \text{SF}_j) = 1$. Under the above grammar, we can calculate the probability of any given password as follows to allow ranking passwords for cracking purposes:

$$P(\text{password}) = P(S \rightarrow \text{SP}_k) \prod_{i,j} P(\text{SFT}_i \rightarrow \text{SF}_j). \quad (3)$$

Researchers have proposed different ways to assign probabilities to T . In [24], probabilities of L-segments are calculated by another Markov model over a natural language, while D- and D-segments share the same probability. In [37], probabilities of D- and D-segments are calculated based on the training set, while L-segments in a given dictionary are assigned the same probability. Different from the above approaches, we design a more general way to deal with SFs not present in the training set. First, we further split SFs into two sub-sets, observed SFs (marked as OSFs, T_{ob}) and unobserved SFs (marked as USFs, T_{uob}). Under these definitions, the probabilities of these two sets are marked as P_{OSFs} and P_{USFs} , respectively. Then we have the following equation:

$$\forall i, P_{\text{OSFs}} + P_{\text{USFs}} = 1, \text{OSFs}, \text{USFs} \in \text{SFT}_i. \quad (4)$$

Our smoothing method tries to assign more meaningful probabilities to USFs. In our experiments, we split the training set into two parts according to the size ratio of the training and target databases, then calculate $w_{A,B,i}$ for every SFT_i following Eq. (2), and set the estimated probabilities of all OSFs and all USFs under SFT_i as $P_{OSFs} = w_{A,B,i}$ and $P_{USFs} = 1 - w_{A,B,i}$. Finally, for each individual SF, we do the following:

- For an individual OSF $\in SFT_i$, its probability is calculated based on its original probability in the training set weighted by $w_{A,B,i}$, i.e., $P(OSF) = w_{A,B,i} \times P(OSF|SFT_i)$.
- For an individual USF $\in SFT_i$, we assume that each USF appears equally, so $P(USF) = \frac{1-w_{A,B,i}}{\#(USFs)}$, where $\#(USFs)$ is the number of all USFs in SFT_i .

The smoothing method can be easily generalized to handle more complicated cases, e.g., USFs of a specific SFT and different USFs of the same SFT are handled differently from others. The smoothing method on USFs can in principle be generalized to unobserved SPs, too. These will be left as our future work.

3.2 Experiment Setups

Performance metrics: To compare the performances of password cracking methods, we need some quantitative metrics. One effective metric widely used in the literature is the “coverage rate” $R(D, n) = N_c(D, n)/N(D) \in [0, 1]$, where $N(D)$ is the total number of passwords in the target (test) database D and $N_c(D, n)$ is the number of successfully cracked passwords in D with n guesses. In fact, this metric can also be split to two different types:

- a) $R_{po}(D, n)$. If D has duplicate passwords or password frequencies, this metric can be seen as working at the user level. The higher $R_{po}(D, n)$ is, the more users’ passwords are cracked.
- b) $R_{pa}(D, n)$. If D has neither duplicate passwords nor password frequencies, this metric works at the password level. As reported in [41,25], this metric is a good indicator to demonstrate a password cracking method’s ability to generating new (or unseen) passwords.

In the literature, there are two main methods for calculating coverage rates: 1) running a real password cracking process to enumerate passwords and calculate the actual coverage rate, i.e., via a simulated “real-attacking”, and 2) using a stochastic process like the Monte-Carlo algorithm proposed in [2] to approximately estimate the coverage rate. The “real-attacking” method can give more accurate results, but can be computationally prohibitive if the number of guessed passwords n becomes too large (e.g., above 10^{12}). Therefore, when this method is used, it is common to use a practically large but computationally achievable value of n , e.g., $n = 10^7$ [35,26] and $n = 10^{10}$ [25]. The Monte-Carlo method can work only with password cracking algorithms based on a clearly defined probability model, but can be used to estimate the coverage rate of a very large n with a much smaller number of randomly sampled passwords (e.g., 10^6 random




Fig. 4: Performance using Monte-Carlo (MC) estimation and real attacks (RA).

passwords to estimate the coverage rate with n as large as 10^{16} [18,23,41]. However, in [2,23], it was mentioned that the exact error rates of the Monte-Carlo estimation method depend heavily on the attack methods, so we conducted a small experiment to see whether we could use it for SEPICA. Our experiments in Figure 4 showed that the coverage rates calculated from real-attacking and Monte-Carlo experiments can have a gap as high as 17.79% for SEPICA, which we considered too high for a fair and reliable comparison with other SOTA methods. Therefore, to better understand how SEPICA performs, we chose to use “real-attacking” for all our experiments.

The SOTA benchmarks: To investigate how SEPICA’s performance compares against other mainstream SOTA password cracking methods, we used the latest implementation of [37], i.e., PCFG ver. 4.3 [36] (denoted by “PCFG_w”), Veras et al.’s Semantic PCFG [26,31] (denoted by “PCFG_{se}”), and Melicher et al.’s neural network [23,22] (denoted by “FLA”), as the benchmarks. We noticed that there are also some other password modeling methods, such as PassGAN [11], OMEN [5], and one based on an n -gram Markov model [20]. However, based on the results of [25,23], we observed that FLA can always outperform OMEN and 6-gram Markov models. Meanwhile, as reported in [25], PassGAN requires up to ten times more guesses to reach the same number of matched passwords as its competitors. For the above two reasons, we finally limited our benchmarks to the three selected ones only.

Training and test sets: For our experiments, we used CSDN, Gmail, Eyeem, Fr_Mix1 as training sets, for they have similar sizes and one for each of the four languages studied. The other 13 databases are treated as testing sets, and it ends up to $4 \times 13 = 52$ test cases. More precisely, we used the output of SE#PCFG dealing with each of the four databases as SEPICA’s input, then enumerated a set of passwords to attack each of the other 13 databases under the “real-attacking” scene. All these 17 databases have duplicate passwords shared by different users, so that we can investigate the attack performance at two levels: user-level (having duplicated passwords) and password-level (having unique passwords). All the three benchmarking methods and SEPICA are training-based, and we used exactly the same training set to ensure the comparison is fair.

Parameter selections: For all the three benchmarks, we used their default configurations recommended by their authors/developers to generate passwords and calculate guess numbers. Note that the FLA implementation [22] does not provide a direct interface to generate a specified number of passwords, but can output passwords with their probabilities higher than a given thresh-




Fig. 5: Performance comparison at the user level between SEPCA and three STOA password cracking methods over all testing sets on average using real-attacking. $\color{blue}\frown$ SEPCA, $\color{green}\frown$ PCFG_w [36], $\color{black}\frown$ PCFG_{Se} [31], $\color{red}\frown$ FLA [22].

old. Therefore, to align with the scale of guessing passwords that previous work used [35,26,25], and to balance time cost and the scale of passwords, we set a threshold of 10^{-12} for FLA, then used this to derive the maximum number of guessing passwords 5×10^9 for each training set. Note that FLA is very slow – it took more than a week to enumerate passwords using FLA just as reported in [25].

3.3 Experimental Results

In this section, we report results of a series of experiments we conducted to show how much our SEPCA benefits from the richer semantic information enabled by SE#PCFG. We ran all experiments on a machine with an Intel Xeon E5-2640 CPU and two Nvidia Tesla M40 GPUs.

Performance Comparison at the User Level Figure 5 shows average results of all testing sets at the user level. There are several clear observations as follows.

In terms of the average performance across 52 test cases, SEPCA performed significantly better than all the benchmarks: it outperformed PCFG_w by 21.53%, PCFG_{Se} by 52.55% and FLA by 7.86%. If we look at all the 52 test cases individually, the results are also overwhelmingly positive: SEPCA outperformed PCFG_w and PCFG_{Se} for all 52 cases, and FLA for all but one case (for the only one the performance drop is negligible at -0.3%). The only slight performance drop when compared with FLA happened when attacking MyHeritage. This exceptional case is not surprising: as mentioned in Section 2.3, users of MyHeritage tended to choose very unique SFTs and SFs, therefore the alignment between the training set and MyHeritage will be poorer. Detailed information are displayed in Table 6 in the Appendix. These results indicate that SEPCA can be seen as the most practical and effective method for attacking a given

Table 5: Average performance aligned to the language attribute.

Training Set	CSDN	Gmail	Eyeem	Fr_Mix1
CN	71.73%	58.31%	63.38%	57.85%
EN	41.36%	52.10%	52.76%	53.10%
GE	43.10%	58.19%	61.39%	61.30%
FR	46.24%	59.32%	59.76%	61.17%

█: the highest coverage rate by the training set attacking grouped test sets by language.




Fig. 6: Performance comparison at the password level.

database, as long as the number of guessed password is not prohibitively large (up to the level of 10^{10}).

Performance at (Unique) Password Level: As shown in Figure 6, SEPCA outperformed the benchmarks significantly on all 52 test sets: PCFG_w by 33.32%, PCFG_{Se} by 86.19%, and FLA by 10.46%. In terms of individual test cases, SEPCA performed the best in 50 out of all 52 cases (96.15%), except for using Gmail, Eyeem and Fr_Mix1 to attack MyHeritage. Again, as mentioned before, the poorer results on MyHeritage is not surprising given the database-correlation results in Section 2.3.

Performance on different language settings: Table 5 shows a number of interesting observations, which also echo some visual patterns in Figure 3 in Section 2.3. 1) For Chinese, German and French targets, SEPCA performed better when being trained using language-aligned settings. 2) For English targets, training using an English database does not always produce the best results (52.10% in Gmail attacking English databases, lower than 53.10% in Fr_Mix1), which indicates that English databases likely include users with more diverse backgrounds. Actually this phenomenon is not surprising since Fr_Mix1 has a higher correlation with English databases than Gmail (Fr_Mix1, 93.29% vs. Gmail, 91.53% on SFT-level, while 74.93% vs. 72.18% on SF-level). 3) The performances of SEPCA is more robust compared to other benchmarks: no matter which database was used for training, SEPCA always have a similar performance to attack all test sets (CSDN: 54.06%, Gmail: 56.54%, Eyeem: 59.25%, Fr_Mix1: 57.43%), while PCFG_w fluctuates in the range from 35.42% to 52.46%, FLA moves between 45.56% and 56.04%, and PCFG_{Se} from 30.81% to 40.10%.

4 Conclusion

This paper presents SE#PCFG, a new framework and an associated computational process for analyzing password semantics in four different levels. By applying it to 17 leaked databases, we demonstrated how the framework can be used to produce useful new insights about password semantics and the underlying user behaviors. Then, we further proposed SEPCA, a semantic-aware password cracking architecture equipped by a general smoothing method. Our experiments with the 17 leaked databases showed that SEPCA could outperform other SOTA

password cracking methods and it also performed very robustly across 52 test cases with different pairs of training and testing databases.

References

1. Brown, A.S., Bracken, E., Zoccoli, S., Douglas, K.: Generating and remembering passwords. *Applied Cognitive Psychology* **18**(6), 641–651 (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.1014>
2. Dell’Amico, M., Filippone, M.: Monte Carlo strength evaluation: Fast and reliable password checking. In: *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. pp. 158–169. ACM (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2810103.2813631>
3. Dell’Amico, M., Michiardi, P., Roudier, Y.: Password strength: An empirical analysis. In: *Proceedings of the 2010 29th IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*. IEEE (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFCOM.2010.5461951>
4. Ding, W., Zijian, Z., Ping, W., Jeff, Y., Xinyi, H.: Targeted online password guessing: An underestimated threat. In: *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. pp. 1242–1254. ACM (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2976749.2978339>
5. Durmuth, M., Angelstorf, F., Castelluccia, C., Perito, D., Chaabane, A.: OMEN: Faster password guessing using an ordered Markov enumerator. In: *Engineering Secure Software and Systems: 7th International Symposium, ESSoS 2015, Milan, Italy, March 4-6, 2015. Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 8978, pp. 119–132. Springer (2015). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-15618-7_10
6. GeoNames: GeoNames data. Web page, <http://download.geonames.org/export/dump/>
7. Guo, G., Wechsler, H.: Mobile Biometrics. *IET* (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1049/PBSE003E>
8. Han, J., Kamber, M., Pei, J.: *Data Mining: Concepts and Techniques*. Morgan Kaufmann, 3rd edn. (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1016/C2009-0-61819-5>
9. Han, W., Xu, M., Zhang, J., Wang, C., Zhang, K., Wang, X.S.: TransPCFG: Transferring the grammars from short passwords to guess long passwords effectively. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* **16**, 451–465 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIFS.2020.3003696>
10. Herley, C., van Oorschot, P.C.: A research agenda acknowledging the persistence of passwords. *IEEE Security and Privacy* **10**(1), 28–36 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2011.150>
11. Hitaj, B., Gasti, P., Ateniese, G., Perez-Cruz, F.: PassGAN: A deep learning approach for password guessing. In: *Applied Cryptography and Network Security: 17th International Conference, ACNS 2019, Bogota, Colombia, June 5–7, 2019, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 11464, pp. 217–237. Springer (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-21568-2_11
12. Hunt, T.: The science of password selection. Web page (2011), <https://www.troyhunt.com/science-of-password-selection/>
13. Joseph, B.: The science of guessing: Analyzing an anonymized corpus of 70 million passwords. In: *Proceedings of the 2012 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*. pp. 538–552. IEEE (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2012.49>
14. Joseph, B., Cormac, H., Van Oorschot, P.C., Frank, S.: The quest to replace passwords: A framework for comparative evaluation of web authentication schemes. pp. 553–567. IEEE (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2012.44>

15. Lexique: WorldLex: Blog, twitter and newspapers word frequencies for 66 languages. Website (2011), <http://www.lexique.org/>
16. Li, Z., Han, W., Xu, W.: A large-scale empirical analysis of Chinese web passwords. In: Proceedings of the 23rd USENIX Security Symposium. pp. 559–574. USENIX Association (2014), https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity14/technical-sessions/presentation/li_zhigong
17. Lipford, H.R., Garfinkel, S.: Usable Security. Morgan & Claypool Publishers (2014), <https://www.oreilly.com/library/view/usable-security/9781627055291/>
18. Liu, E., Nakanishi, A., Golla, M., Cash, D., Ur, B.: Reasoning analytically about password-cracking software. In: Proceedings of the 2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy. pp. 380–397. IEEE (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2019.00070>
19. Lyastani, S.G., Schilling, M., Fahl, S., Bugiel, S.: Better managed than memorized? studying the impact of managers on password strength and reuse. In: Proceedings of the 27th USENIX Security Symposium. pp. 203–220. USENIX Association (2018), <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity18/presentation/lyastani>
20. Ma, J., Yang, W., Luo, M., Li, N.: A study of probabilistic password models. In: Proceedings of the 2014 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy. pp. 689–704. IEEE (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2014.50>
21. McMillan, R.: The world’s first computer password? it was useless too. Web page (2012), <https://www.wired.com/2012/01/computer-password/>
22. Melicher, W.: Neural network cracking. Online repository, https://github.com/cups1ab/neural_network_cracking
23. Melicher, W., Ur, B., Segreti, S.M., Komanduri, S., Bauer, L., Christin, N., Cranor, L.F.: Fast, lean, and accurate: Modeling password guessability using neural networks. In: Proceedings of the 25th USENIX Security Symposium. pp. 175–191. USENIX Association (2016), <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity16/technical-sessions/presentation/melicher>
24. Narayanan, A., Shmatikov, V.: Fast dictionary attacks on passwords using time-space tradeoff. In: Proceedings of the 2005 ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security. pp. 364–372. ACM (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1102120.1102168>
25. Pasquini, D., Gangwal, A., Ateniese, G., Bernaschi, M., Conti, M.: Improving password guessing via representation learning. In: Proceedings of the 2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy. pp. 265–282. IEEE (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP40001.2021.00016>
26. Rafael, V., Christopher, C., Julie, T.: On the semantic patterns of passwords and their security impact. In: Proceedings of the 2014 Network and Distributed System Security Symposium. Internet Society (2014). <https://doi.org/10.14722/ndss.2014.23103>
27. Riddle, B.L., Miron, M.S., Semo, J.A.: Passwords in use in a university timesharing environment. *Computers & Security* **8**(7), 569–579 (1989). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-4048\(89\)90049-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-4048(89)90049-7)
28. SunnyFresh: Common name dictionary collection TOP1000 (Pinyin). Web page, <https://download.csdn.net/download/u011827798/9999625>
29. Urban Dictionary: Urban Dictionary. Website, <https://www.urbandictionary.com/>
30. U.S. Social Security Administration: Popular baby names. Web page, <https://www.ssa.gov/oact/babynames/limits.html>

31. Veras, R.: Semantic password guesser. Online repository, <https://github.com/vialab/semantic-guesser>
32. Veras, R., Collins, C., Thorpe, J.: A large-scale analysis of the semantic password model and linguistic patterns in passwords. *ACM Transactions on Privacy and Security* **24**(3) (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3448608>
33. Veras, R., Thorpe, J., Collins, C.: Visualizing semantics in passwords: The role of dates. In: *Proceedings of the 9th International Symposium on Visualization for Cyber Security*. pp. 88–95. ACM (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2379690.2379702>
34. Wang, C., Jan, S., Hu, H., Wang, G.: Empirical analysis of password reuse and modification across online service. In: *Proceedings of the 8th ACM Conference on Data and Application Security and Privacy*. pp. 196–203. ACM (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3176258.3176332>
35. Wang, D., Wang, P., He, D., Tian, Y.: Birthday, name and bifacial-security: Understanding passwords of Chinese web users. In: *Proceedings of the 28th USENIX Security Symposium*. pp. 1537–1555. USENIX Association (2019), <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity19/presentation/wang-ding>
36. Weir, C.M.: Probabilistic Context Free Grammar (PCFG) password guess generator. Online source code repository, https://github.com/lakiw/pcfg_cracker
37. Weir, M., Aggarwal, S., de Medeiros, B., Glodek, B.: Password cracking using probabilistic context-free grammars. In: *Proceedings of the 2009 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*. pp. 391–405. IEEE (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2009.8>
38. Wikimedia Foundation: DeWiktionary. Web page, <https://dumps.wikimedia.org/dewiktioary/>
39. Wikimedia Foundation: FrWiktionary. Web page, <https://dumps.wikimedia.org/frwiktionary/>
40. Wikimedia Foundation: WikiNameEntity. Web page, <https://dumps.wikimedia.org/enwiki/latest/>
41. Xu, M., Wang, C., Yu, J., Zhang, J., Zhang, K., Han, W.: Chunk-level password guessing: Towards modeling refined password composition representations. *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security* pp. 5–20 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3460120.3484743>
42. Zhang, H., Wang, C., Ruan, W., Zhang, J., Xu, M., Han, W.: Digit semantics based optimization for practical password cracking tools. In: *Proceedings of the 2021 Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*. pp. 513–527. ACM (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3485832.3488025>

A Detail Performance on User and Password Level and Comparison

Table 6: Performance comparison between SEPCA and three state-of-the-art password cracking methods at user-level.

Metrics ^b	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	12	14	16	17	Average
CR(S_1^a)	74.19%	74.06%	76.36%	74.06%	54.33%	35.37%	17.32%	40.27%	22.74%	31.32%	29.46%	30.06%	32.67%	45.56%
CR(S_2)	57.10%	54.21%	55.42%	58.22%	39.73%	27.68%	16.58%	32.81%	18.33%	28.71%	23.56%	22.32%	25.74%	35.42%
CR(S_3)	42.59%	40.88%	43.10%	47.49%	31.67%	23.79%	17.00%	34.11%	18.70%	30.92%	23.84%	22.52%	24.02%	30.82%
CR(S_4)	74.62%	74.80%	76.78%	76.59%	55.84%	48.90%	23.43%	60.00%	33.08%	43.69%	42.53%	45.14%	47.35%	54.06%
RIR(S_1) ^c	0.58%	1.00%	0.54%	3.42%	2.79%	38.25%	35.28%	48.99%	45.48%	39.48%	44.35%	50.16%	44.92%	27.33%
RIR(S_2)	30.67%	37.97%	38.53%	31.56%	40.56%	76.68%	41.36%	82.87%	80.50%	52.15%	80.50%	102.2%	83.94%	59.96%
RIR(S_3)	75.18%	82.99%	78.15%	61.29%	76.31%	105.5%	37.89%	75.90%	76.97%	41.30%	78.42%	100.4%	97.14%	75.96%
CR(S_1)	65.99%	62.86%	58.53%	58.98%	32.67%	56.72%	31.34%	70.18%	41.36%	54.79%	50.51%	55.55%	57.41%	53.61%
CR(S_2)	63.58%	59.20%	55.31%	56.63%	29.99%	55.70%	30.74%	69.23%	40.93%	52.52%	47.93%	52.56%	55.94%	51.56%
CR(S_3)	27.76%	25.74%	27.53%	32.88%	17.83%	45.91%	28.98%	63.04%	35.67%	58.70%	45.69%	46.95%	47.88%	38.81%
CR(S_4)	67.18%	64.96%	61.69%	61.96%	35.77%	59.91%	33.72%	73.52%	41.23%	61.99%	54.40%	58.22%	60.41%	56.54%
RIR(S_1)	1.82%	3.34%	5.39%	5.04%	9.47%	5.63%	7.60%	4.76%	50.3%	13.14%	7.70%	4.81%	5.22%	5.66%
RIR(S_2)	5.67%	9.72%	11.52%	9.42%	19.26%	7.55%	9.68%	6.20%	0.75%	18.03%	13.49%	10.77%	7.98%	10.00%
RIR(S_3)	141.9%	152.3%	124.1%	88.46%	100.5%	30.48%	16.35%	16.62%	15.59%	5.60%	19.07%	24.01%	26.16%	58.56%
CR(S_1)	67.30%	65.08%	62.78%	63.02%	37.99%	57.37%	33.13%	70.02%	40.13%	64.59%	53.04%	56.73%	57.28%	56.04%
CR(S_2)	60.66%	55.20%	52.73%	54.39%	30.93%	56.24%	33.09%	69.51%	39.81%	65.18%	52.06%	55.33%	56.86%	52.46%
CR(S_3)	30.29%	28.52%	31.18%	35.31%	20.70%	45.31%	29.81%	62.89%	34.52%	60.34%	46.41%	48.13%	47.96%	40.10%
CR(S_4)	69.95%	68.65%	67.96%	67.85%	42.48%	60.92%	34.65%	74.47%	41.00%	66.97%	55.82%	58.84%	60.67%	59.25%
RIR(S_1)	9.94%	5.48%	8.27%	7.66%	11.80%	6.18%	4.58%	6.35%	2.17%	3.69%	5.25%	3.73%	5.92%	5.77%
RIR(S_2)	15.32%	24.36%	28.88%	24.74%	37.32%	8.32%	4.73%	7.13%	3.00%	2.73%	7.23%	6.35%	6.69%	13.60%
RIR(S_3)	130.9%	140.7%	117.9%	92.17%	105.2%	34.45%	16.23%	18.40%	18.77%	10.98%	20.30%	22.26%	26.51%	58.07%
CR(S_1)	65.34%	62.65%	59.46%	60.03%	36.01%	59.79%	33.61%	68.99%	40.86%	63.77%	54.03%	58.55%	58.48%	55.51%
CR(S_2)	49.50%	43.58%	41.95%	45.51%	25.74%	54.58%	32.49%	64.38%	38.61%	61.29%	50.67%	55.00%	55.14%	47.57%
CR(S_3)	27.41%	25.45%	27.57%	33.09%	18.50%	46.86%	29.67%	60.74%	36.76%	58.86%	46.84%	49.50%	48.97%	39.25%
CR(S_4)	66.33%	63.56%	60.76%	61.69%	36.92%	62.32%	35.20%	73.26%	41.65%	65.95%	56.65%	60.52%	61.81%	57.43%
RIR(S_1)	1.51%	1.45%	2.18%	2.77%	2.53%	4.24%	4.76%	6.18%	1.94%	3.42%	4.85%	3.37%	3.45%	3.45%
RIR(S_2)	33.98%	45.85%	44.84%	35.55%	43.47%	14.18%	8.36%	13.78%	7.89%	7.59%	11.81%	10.04%	12.10%	22.26%
RIR(S_3)	141.9%	149.7%	120.4%	86.46%	99.58%	33.00%	18.65%	20.61%	13.29%	12.04%	20.94%	22.28%	26.22%	58.86%

^a Denotations of cracking methods: S_1 – FLA [22], S_2 – $PCFG_w$ [36], S_3 – $PCFG_{Sc}$ [31], S_4 – SEPCA. All experiments are conducted across $4 \times 13 = 52$ different test cases (4 training databases in the first column and 13 target databases in Columns 3 to 15) at user-level.

^b Performance metrics in Column 2: CR = Coverage Rate, RIR = Relative Increase Rate defined as $RIR(x) = (S_4 - x)/x$.

^c To help read data in the table, test cases for which SEPCA outperformed the most powerful cracking method, i.e. FLA, are highlighted in green, and the opposite test cases are highlighted in red.

Table 7: Performance comparison between SEPCA and three state-of-the-art password cracking methods at password-level.

Metrics ^b	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	12	14	16	17
UNCP(S_1^a)	6.64	2.83	3.26	2.05	4.26	3.44	0.83	2.48	3.84	0.22	0.71	0.17	0.87
UNCP(S_2)	3.93	1.60	1.88	1.23	2.57	2.37	0.74	1.71	2.67	0.19	0.51	0.12	0.66
UNCP(S_3)	2.02	0.87	1.15	0.69	1.75	2.30	0.86	1.79	2.44	0.21	0.52	0.11	0.65
UNCP(S_4)	6.64	2.88	3.28	2.14	4.42	5.58	1.28	4.35	5.55	0.32	1.06	0.25	1.44
RIR(S_1)	0.05%	1.57%	0.77%	4.37%	3.72%	62.34%	54.15%	75.40%	44.56%	46.75%	49.28%	49.96%	65.15%
RIR(S_2)	69.22%	79.35%	74.34%	74.21%	71.87%	136.1%	73.18%	154.1%	108.1%	68.09%	109.2%	108.5%	117.1%
RIR(S_3)	229.3%	229.6%	184.7%	208.7%	152.1%	143.2%	49.01%	143.1%	127.1%	50.27%	102.1%	124.5%	122.3%
UNCP(S_1)	4.91	2.13	2.03	1.28	2.03	7.75	2.02	6.22	7.86	0.43	1.52	0.35	2.07
UNCP(S_2)	4.48	1.92	1.82	1.19	1.74	7.34	1.90	5.83	9.76	0.41	1.39	0.32	1.95
UNCP(S_3)	1.03	0.44	0.50	0.27	0.70	6.02	1.82	4.87	6.01	0.47	1.26	0.28	1.65
UNCP(S_4)	5.10	2.25	2.20	1.41	2.30	8.36	2.19	6.57	8.43	0.50	1.61	0.37	2.21
RIR(S_1)	4.02%	5.80%	8.38%	9.97%	13.20%	7.87%	8.51%	5.75%	7.29%	15.54%	5.80%	5.10%	6.44%
RIR(S_2)	13.91%	17.63%	21.11%	18.35%	31.91%	13.81%	15.69%	12.73%	13.6%	20.92%	15.90%	14.35%	13.20%
RIR(S_3)	896.08%	413.3%	337.1%	431.3%	225.6%	38.83%	20.68%	34.94%	40.20%	7.22%	27.76%	33.57%	33.95%
UNCP(S_1)	5.09	2.24	2.25	1.41	2.41	7.86	2.16	6.10	8.22	0.53	1.59	0.36	2.06
UNCP(S_2)	3.76	1.61	1.59	1.05	1.68	7.21	2.07	5.58	8.73	0.53	1.48	0.34	1.95
UNCP(S_3)	1.09	0.48	0.59	0.33	0.83	5.81	1.87	4.76	5.93	0.48	1.27	0.28	1.63
UNCP(S_4)	5.64	2.48	2.60	1.73	2.98	8.55	2.26	6.75	8.67	0.55	1.67	0.37	2.23
RIR(S_1)	10.88%	11.02%	15.49%	22.51%	23.66%	8.81%	4.40%	10.77%	5.45%	3.52%	5.15%	3.66%	7.83%
RIR(S_2)	49.98%	54.56%	62.91%	64.94%	77.66%	18.62%	8.83%	21.06%	20.7%	3.92%	12.79%	10.08%	14.33%
RIR(S_3)	417.2%	414.5%	339.1%	431.9%	257.5%	47.13%	20.51%	41.94%	46.26%	14.48%	31.49%	32.42%	36.22%
UNCP(S_1)	4.81	2.13	2.12	1.30	2.33	8.56	2.24	6.03	8.37	0.53	1.67	0.38	2.17
UNCP(S_2)	2.37	1.00	1.03	0.65	1.23	6.85	2.04	4.72	8.37	0.49	1.42	0.34	1.85
UNCP(S_3)	1.01	0.43	0.52	0.27	0.75	6.02	1.89	4.55	7.99	0.47	1.30	0.29	1.66
UNCP(S_4)	4.93	2.17	2.16	1.36	2.35	8.93	2.33	6.52	8.65	0.54	1.72	0.39	2.30
RIR(S_1)	2.60%	1.94%	1.84%	4.48%	0.62%	4.35%	4.21%	8.08%	3.29%	2.84%	3.30%	2.75%	6.16%
RIR(S_2)	107.9%	116.8%	108.8%	108.1%	90.80%	30.27%	14.19%	38.11%	3.34%	10.35%	21.42%	16.52%	24.76%
RIR(S_3)	889.3%	401.1%	318.4%	396.4%	210.9%	48.20%	23.81%	43.33%	8.29%	15.24%	32.81%	32.52%	38.39%

^a Denotations of cracking methods: S_1 – FLA [22], S_2 – $PCFG_w$ [36], S_3 – $PCFG_{Sc}$ [31], S_4 – SEPCA, across $4 \times 13 = 52$ different test cases (4 training databases in the first column and 13 target databases in Columns 3 to 15) at password-level.

^b Performance metrics in Column 2: UNCP = Unique Number of Cracked Passwords (10^6), RIR = Relative Increase Rate defined as $RIR(x) = (S_4 - x)/y$.

^c To help read data in the table, test cases for which SEPCA outperformed a state-of-the-art method for over 100% are highlighted in green, and test cases for which SEPCA performed just slightly worse are highlighted in red.