

Unsupervised Incremental Learning with Dual Concept Drift Detection for Identifying Anomalous Sequences

Jin Li, Kleantlis Malialis, Christos G. Panayiotou, Marios M. Polycarpou

KIOS Research and Innovation Center of Excellence

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

{li.jin, malialis.kleantlis, christosp, mpolycar}@ucy.ac.cy

ORCID: {0000-0002-3534-524X, 0000-0003-3432-7434, 0000-0002-6476-9025, 0000-0001-6495-9171}

Abstract—In the contemporary digital landscape, the continuous generation of extensive streaming data across diverse domains has become pervasive. Yet, a significant portion of this data remains unlabeled, posing a challenge in identifying infrequent events such as anomalies. This challenge is further amplified in non-stationary environments, where the performance of models can degrade over time due to concept drift. To address these challenges, this paper introduces a new method referred to as VAE4AS (Variational Autoencoder for Anomalous Sequences). VAE4AS integrates incremental learning with dual drift detection mechanisms, employing both a statistical test and a distance-based test. The anomaly detection is facilitated by a Variational Autoencoder. To gauge the effectiveness of VAE4AS, a comprehensive experimental study is conducted using real-world and synthetic datasets characterized by anomalous rates below 10% and recurrent drift. The results show that the proposed method surpasses both robust baselines and state-of-the-art techniques, providing compelling evidence for their efficacy in effectively addressing some of the challenges associated with anomalous sequence detection in non-stationary streaming data.

Index Terms—anomaly detection, concept drift, incremental learning, autoencoders, data streams, stream learning, non-stationary environments.

I. INTRODUCTION

IN recent years, there has been a notable surge in the abundance of streaming data across diverse application areas.

In numerous real-world scenarios, the generating process displays an intrinsic non-stationary phenomenon, referred to as concept drift. This phenomenon can be induced by diverse factors, such as seasonality or periodicity effects (e.g., water consumption in a drinking distribution network), and shifts in user interests/preferences or behavior (e.g., in recommendation systems).

Anomaly detection is a vital tool across domains, crucial for pinpointing in real time deviations from normal data behavior. Yet, a key challenge lies in the dynamic nature of real-world systems. For instance, in drinking water networks, evolving water demand complicates the detection of hardware (sensor or actuator) faults or the detection of cyber-attacks, highlighting an ongoing challenge in adapting to shifting norms.

The majority of anomaly detection systems commonly employ either signature-based methods or data mining-based methods, relying on labeled training data [1]. However, acquiring labeled data in real-time applications can be expensive or, in some cases, impossible.

An anomalous sequence refers to a continuous anomalous pattern in data points within a continuous period of time [2]. For example, in water distribution networks, water leakage can last for days or even weeks, which can cause significant water and financial loss [3]. Therefore, anomaly detection may be of critical importance in real-world applications. However, anomalous sequences might be wrongly classified as drift, resulting in deterioration of model performance.

To tackle these challenges, we design and evaluate a new method, referred to as VAE4AS. Specifically, the key contributions of this work are the following:

- 1) We develop VAE4AS (Variational AutoEncoder for identifying Anomaly Sequences), a VAE-based incremental learning algorithm with a dual concept drift detection mechanism. VAE4AS can detect both abrupt and recurrent concept drifts in the presence of anomalous sequences, and does not rely on supervision. One of its novel characteristics is its dual explicit concept drift detection module, which works in a synergistic manner with incremental learning for effective adaption to nonstationary environments. The operation of drift detection tests is in the latent space.
- 2) We perform an empirical investigation employing both real-world and synthetic datasets to analyze VAE4AS. Additionally, through a comparative study, we illustrate that the proposed method consistently surpasses existing baseline and state-of-the-art techniques, underscoring its efficacy in overcoming some of the challenges outlined above.

The paper is structured as follows: In Section II, we present essential background material that is integral to comprehending the contributions of this paper. Section III delves into the related work, offering a contextual overview. Our proposed

method is discussed in Section IV, providing a detailed exploration of the approach. The experimental setup is described in Section V. Section VI provides an empirical analysis of the proposed approach, accompanied by comparative studies of various methods. Finally, Section VII summarizes our findings and provides some concluding remarks.

II. BACKGROUND

Online learning involves a continual data generation process, producing a set of examples at each time step t , denoted as $S = \{B^t\}_{t=1}^T$. Here, each batch is defined as $B^t = \{(x_i^t, y_i^t)\}_{i=1}^M$. The overall number of steps is denoted by $T \in [1, \infty)$, and the data is typically drawn from a long, potentially infinite sequence. The quantity of examples in each step is represented by M . In the case where $M = 1$, this scenario is known as **one-by-one online learning**, while for $M > 1$, it is referred to as **batch-by-batch online learning** [4]. This study concentrates on one-by-one learning, denoted as $B^t = (x^t, y^t)$, which is especially pertinent for real-time monitoring. The examples are sampled from an unknown time-varying probability distribution $p^t(x, y)$, where $x^t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ represents a d -dimensional vector in the input space $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $y^t \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ denotes the class label, and $K \geq 2$ is the number of classes. In the context of this study, focusing on anomaly detection, the number of classes is set to $K = 2$ ("normal" and "anomalous").

In the paradigm of one-by-one online classification, the model receives an individual instance x^t at time t and generates a prediction \hat{y}^t based on a concept $h : X \rightarrow Y$. In the realm of **online supervised learning**, the model is provided with the true label y^t . Its performance is evaluated using a loss function, and subsequently, it undergoes training based on the incurred loss. This iterative process repeats at each time step. The continuous adaptation of the model without complete re-training, denoted as $h^t = h^{t-1}.train(\cdot)$, is referred to as **incremental learning** [5].

In real-time data streaming applications, promptly acquiring class labels is often impractical. To overcome this challenge, the research community has explored alternative learning paradigms such as **online semi-supervised** [6] and **online active** [7] learning, as well as methods such as few-shot learning [8] and data augmentation [9]. While these have been demonstrated to be effective, they still rely on the availability of labeled data. In this study, our emphasis is on one-by-one **online unsupervised learning**, which operates without the need for any class labels, i.e., $B^t = (x^t)$.

Data nonstationarity is a prominent challenge observed in certain streaming applications, often attributed to concept drift, which refers to a change in the underlying joint probability distribution [4]. **Concept drift** can lead to shifts in the data characteristics over time. Specifically, the drift between two time steps t_i and t_j , where $i \neq j$, is defined as follows:

$$p^{t_i}(x, y) \neq p^{t_j}(x, y) \quad (1)$$

Anomalous sequence refers to a set of continuously anomalous points. As illustrated in Fig. 1, where x -axis represents

time steps and y -axis represents the value of instances, a clear distinction can be observed between Fig. 1a and Fig. 1b. This study specifically centers on anomalous sequences. t_{start} and t_{end} represent the time steps when anomalous expression commences and concludes. Eq. (2) provides the definition of an anomalous sequence. The anomalous sequence defined here can encompass both i.i.d. data and time-series data.

$$f(t) = \begin{cases} \text{Normal Expression} & 0 \leq t < t_{start} \\ \text{Anomalous Expression} & t_{start} \leq t < t_{end} \\ \text{Normal Expression} & t_{end} \leq t \end{cases} \quad (2)$$




Fig. 1: Illustration of anomalous points and sequences

Distinguishing between concept drift and anomalous sequences, even in supervised settings, remains a key research challenge. This work is concerned with developing an approach in unsupervised settings.

III. RELATED WORK

A. Concept drift adaptation

Approaches addressing concept drift are commonly categorized as either passive or active [4].

1) *Passive methods*: Passive strategies implicitly address drift using incremental learning. Within this classification, techniques can be further categorized into memory-based and ensemble methods. A memory-based algorithm typically employs a sliding window to retain a set of recent examples on which the model is trained. Representative methods include CVFDT [10] and OS-ELM [11]. Ensembling involves utilizing a collection of models that can be dynamically added or removed based on their performance. Representative methods in this category include DDD [12] and SEA [13]. Several research studies have been introduced to address imbalanced data in non-stationary environments, including AREBA [14] and ROSE [15].

2) *Active methods*: These strategies rely on explicitly identifying changes in the data distribution to initiate an adaptation mechanism [4]. Two primary categories of detection mechanisms have been investigated: statistical tests and threshold-based mechanisms. Statistical tests monitor the statistical characteristics of the generated data, while threshold-based mechanisms observe prediction errors and compare them against a predefined threshold.

Autoencoders have also been employed as drift detectors. An autoencoder-based approach is presented by [16], which

focuses on detecting concept drift by monitoring two distinct cost functions: cross-entropy and reconstruction error. The variation in these cost functions serves as an indicator for concept drift detection.

3) *Other methods*: Hybrid approaches, such as HAREBA [17], have been proposed to combine the strengths of both active and passive methods. An alternative approach is called drift unlearning [18], which attempts to revert the data distribution to the original one, prior to the concept drift.

B. Online anomaly detection

1) *Detection of anomalous points*: In anomaly detection, a typical approach involves training a classifier on normal data to establish a baseline of "normality", flagging any behavior that deviates from this baseline as anomalous. In contrast, the Isolation Forest (iForest) algorithm [19] employs a fundamentally different strategy. It explicitly isolates anomalies instead of constructing normal profiles by building an ensemble of trees and identifying anomalies as instances with shorter average path lengths within the trees.

Recent advancements in anomaly detection have incorporated deep learning techniques, notably AEs. As outlined in [20], these methods offer substantial advantages due to their ability to learn hierarchical discriminative features from data, making them particularly effective in complex problem domains compared to traditional anomaly detection approaches. Several autoencoder-based methods have been proposed, including CPD [21] and strAEm++DD [22]. CPD employs a deep abstract feature space stored in a sliding window, detecting change points through a *log-likelihood ratio random walk* analysis on each point, triggering the training of a new model with examples from the sliding window. The anomaly detection mechanism of strAEm++DD involves computing the reconstruction loss for each instance within a moving window, ranking the losses, and setting a threshold at a certain percentile. Instances with reconstruction losses beyond this threshold are classified as anomalous.

In [23], a Streaming Autoencoder (SA) for online anomaly detection is introduced. SA utilizes an AE with incremental learning techniques to adapt to streaming data. Ensembling is employed, where the data stream is divided into threads, further segmented into buffer windows. This allows each ensemble member to be trained on a distinct part of the data stream.

Nevertheless, when confronted with an anomalous sequence, the aforementioned methods may fail to distinguish concept drift from the presence of anomalous sequences. This underscores the contribution of the proposed method.

2) *Detection of anomalous sequences*: Several algorithms are tailored to capture temporal relationships among instances. Among them, LSTM-VAE has emerged as a well-explored method in various studies, including [24], and [25], leveraging LSTM networks to effectively capture both long- and short-term dependencies inherent in sequential time-series data.

While [26] introduces a specific extension to address anomalous sequences, it is limited to one-dimensional time-

series data. Another proposed method, DiFF-RF [27], is designed to handle anomalous sequences but operates in a semi-supervised manner. In contrast to the methods mentioned above, the proposed approach VAE4AS aims to deal with situations of high-dimensional data in an unsupervised way.

IV. THE VAE4AS METHOD

In this section, we begin by providing an overview of the proposed method, VAE4AS. Following that, we delve into the anomaly detection component, including its incorporation into incremental learning for enhanced anomaly detection capabilities. Lastly, we elucidate the dual concept drift mechanism integrated within VAE4AS."

The overview of the proposed VAE4AS design is shown in Fig. 2. The prediction part is displayed in blue. The system first observes the instance $x^t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ at time t , and the VAE-based method outputs a prediction $\hat{y}^t \in \{1, \dots, K\}$. If the instance is classified as normal, it is then appended to the sliding windows mov_{train} for incremental learning and its encoding is appended to mov_{driftx} for statistical test. Otherwise, the encoding of classified anomalous instances is appended to the sliding windows mov_{disx} for distance-based test.




Fig. 2: An overview of the VAE4AS design.

The VAE is incrementally updated, using the data in memory, which is displayed in yellow color. Then we incorporate explicit concept drift detection as displayed in brown color. In the presence of drift, normal instances that have undergone drift may be classified as either normal or anomalous by the current classifier, depending on the nature of the drift. To address this, we introduce a dual drift detection (DD) methods DD1 and DD2, the details will be provided in a later section. Once an alarm flag is raised by any DD, the training window

will be emptied and a new VAE will be created and trained. The corresponding pseudocode is shown in Algorithm 1.

A. Anomaly detection and incremental learning

Model. We consider a VAE [28] which incorporates regularization to guide the encoder in learning a distribution $q(z|x)$ which is assumed to be a multivariate Gaussian. Assuming the encoding z is k -dimensional ($z \in \mathbb{R}^k$), the encoder produces two vectors of size k , representing the means $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and standard deviations $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^k$ for each dimension. The variance σ^2 corresponds to the diagonal elements of the covariance matrix. To generate samples from this distribution, the "reparameterization trick" is employed, where z is generated as $z = \mu + \epsilon \odot \sigma$, with $\epsilon \sim N(0, I_k)$. In terms of regularization, the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence [29] is utilized. It measures the divergence between two probability distributions, specifically the KL divergence between the learned distribution with parameters μ and σ for input x , and the unit Gaussian:

$$\begin{aligned} l_{KL}(x) &= KL(q(z|x) || N(0, I_k)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i^2 + \sigma_i^2 - \log(\sigma_i^2) - 1 \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The total loss is determined by the combination of the reconstruction loss and the regularization loss, represented by Eq. (4), in which $\beta \geq 0$ is a weight parameter that adjusts the importance of the KL divergence loss in the overall loss. $l_{AE}(x, \hat{x})$ denotes the loss of a traditional AE. For real-valued inputs, it is defined as the sum of squared differences, while for binary inputs it is defined as the cross-entropy:

$$l_{VAE}(x, \hat{x}) = l_{AE}(x, \hat{x}) + \beta * l_{KL}(x). \quad (4)$$

Memory. The proposed method incorporates a dynamic mechanism using a sliding window, denoted as mov_{train} with a size parameter W_{train} , to retain the most recent instances classified as normal. At any given time t , a queue $mov_{train}^t = \{x_i\}_{i=t-W_{train}+1}^t$ is maintained. Here, for any pair of instances x_i and x_j in q^t with $j > i$, it holds that x_j has been observed more recently in time than x_i . The sliding window can implicitly address the problem of concept drift, as obsolete examples will eventually drop out of the queue. However, it is acknowledged that due to the inherent imperfections in the classification process, the window may not be exclusively populated by normal instances. This point will be considered when anomaly detection is performed.

Anomaly detection (prediction). The rationale behind employing a VAE lies in the expectation that the loss for an anomalous instance would substantially exceed that of a normal instance. This study adopts an adaptive threshold methodology, drawing inspiration from [30]. At each training time t , we calculate the loss of all the elements in the queue mov_{train} : $L^t = \{l(x^i, \hat{x}^i)\}_{i=t-W_{train}+1}^t$. The anomaly threshold at training time t is set as follows:

$$\theta^t = mean(L^t) + 2 * std(L^t). \quad (5)$$

Establishing a threshold presents a challenge because delineating between normal data and outliers is often ambiguous. In this investigation, we introduce the adaptive threshold method, designed to autonomously grasp the statistical nuances of the data stream. As time advances, the threshold θ^t dynamically adjusts to align with the evolving patterns in the data stream.

After establishing a threshold, the process of anomaly prediction can be initiated. Let's consider a new instance $x^{t+\Delta}$, where $\Delta > 0$ signifies a point in time subsequent to the model's training at time t . If the cumulative loss associated with this instance surpasses the existing threshold θ^t , the classification is made as anomalous:

$$\hat{y}^{t+\Delta} = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ (anomaly)} & \text{if } l(x^{t+\Delta}, \hat{x}^{t+\Delta}) > \theta^t \\ 0 \text{ (normal)} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where t is the time of the most recent training, and $t + \Delta$ is the current time.

Incremental learning (training). The cost function J^t at training time t is formulated as the mean loss computed across all instances within the queue:

$$J^t = \frac{1}{W_{train}} \sum_{i=t-W_{train}+1}^t l(x^i, \hat{x}^i). \quad (7)$$

The autoencoder will be updated incrementally based on the cost incurred, that is, $h^t = h^{t-1}.train(J^t)$.

To avoid overfitting and to reduce the computational cost, training occurs when a specified percentage, denoted as $p\%$, of the sliding window is replaced.

B. Dual concept drift detection mechanism

In this proposed method, we adopt a dual drift detection (DD) mechanism, one which is based on a statistical test (DD1) and the other which is distance-based (DD2).

DD1: Statistical test. As a non-parametric test, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test does not rely on distribution assumptions. In this study, the KS test is adopted to compare the latent layer distribution of each dimension i . The KS test determines whether a significant difference exists by using the maximum difference of the cumulative distributions obtained by accumulating the two distributions as the statistical test quantity [31]. The p_{value} is calculated as shown in Eq. (8), where $F(ref_{latent}_i)$ and $F(mov_{latent}_i)$ mean the cumulative distribution function of windows ref_{latent}_i and mov_{latent}_i respectively. $ref_{latent}_i = \{a_j\}_{j=1}^n$ and $mov_{latent}_i = \{b_j\}_{j=1}^n$, where $a_j, b_j \in \mathbb{R}$, correspond to the encoding as shown in Lines 15 and 19 in Algorithm 1. N_{eff} is calculated by the size of ref_{latent}_i and mov_{latent}_i , which is W_{drift} . KS_{dis} represents the greatest distance between $F(ref_{latent}_i)$ and $F(mov_{latent}_i)$. γ is calculated with N_{eff} and KS_{dis} .

Algorithm 1 VAE4AS

Input:
 p : window percentage replaced; D : unlabelled data for pre-training; N/AN : normal/anomalous data for reference drift/distance window; W_{drift} : window size for drift detection; $W_{distance}$: window size for Euclidean distance comparison; W_{train} : window size for re-training; $expiry_time$: of the warning flag; DIS_{thre} : Euclidean distance threshold

Init: \triangleright time $t = 0$

2: **initialization of windows, flags and threshold**

Main:
for each time step $t \in [1, \infty)$ **do**
 4: receive instance $x^t \in \mathbb{R}^d$
 predict $\hat{y}^t = h.predict(x^t) \in \{0, 1\}$
 6: **if** $\hat{y}^t == 0$ **then**
 append instance $mov_{train}.append(x^t)$
 8: append instance $mov_{driftx}.append(x^t)$
if $\hat{y}^t == 1$ **then**
 10: append instance $mov_{AN}.append(x^t)$
if ($mov_{train}.isFull()$ or $p\%$ replaced) and $flag_{warn} == False$ **then** \triangleright **Incremental learning**
 12: $h.train(mov_{train})$
 $\theta = calc_anomaly_threshold(mov_{train})$
 14: **if** $ref_{driftx}.isFull()$ **then** \triangleright **DD mechanism**
 $ref_{latent} = h.predict(ref_{driftx})$
 16: **else**
 append instance $ref_{driftx}.append(x^t)$
 18: **if** $mov_{driftx}.isFull()$ **then**
 $mov_{latent} = h.predict(mov_{driftx})$
 20: **if** $flag_{warn} == False$ **then**
for each dimension of mov_{driftx}
 $i \in [1, Dim(mov_{driftx}))$ **do**
 22: $p_{value} = KS(ref_{latent}_i, mov_{latent}_i)$ \triangleright Eq. (8).
if $p_{value} \leq P_{warn}$ **then**
 24: $flag_{warn} = True$
if $p_{value} \leq P_{alarm}$ **then**
 26: $flag_{alarm} = True$
if $flag_{warn}$ and $\neg flag_{alarm}$ **then** \triangleright **DD1: Warning flag**
 28: append instance $mov_{warn}.append(x^t)$
if flag raised for more than $expiry_time$ **then**
 30: $flag_{warn} = False$
 mov_{warn} empty
 32: **if** $flag_{alarm}$ or $Distance(ref_{disx}, mov_{AN}) > DIS_{thre}$ **then**
 \triangleright **DD1, DD2: Alarm flag**
if $DIS(ref_{disx}, mov_{AN}) > DIS_{thre}$ **then**
 34: $h = train(mov_{AN})$
else
 36: $h = train(mov_{warn})$
 reset windows, flags and threshold

$$p_{value} = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{i-1} e^{-2i^2 \gamma^2}$$

$$\text{where, } \gamma = \left(\sqrt{N_{eff}} + 0.12 + \frac{0.11}{\sqrt{N_{eff}}} \right) KS_{dis}, \quad (8)$$

$$KS_{dis} = \max |F(ref_{latent}_i) - F(mov_{latent}_i)|$$

$$\text{and } N_{eff} = \frac{W_{drift}^2}{2 * W_{drift}}$$

We will utilize this test to set two flags, $flag_{warn}$ and

$flag_{alarm}$, as illustrated below. The warning flag signifies a cautionary signal for a potential concept drift, whereas the alarm flag is activated in the presence of an actual concept drift. The P-value for $flag_{warn}$ should be larger than the p-value for $flag_{alarm}$, i.e., $P_{warn} > P_{alarm}$. Once there is a flag alarm, then H_0 (null hypothesis) is rejected and H_1 (alternative hypothesis) is satisfied. The above description is shown in Lines 23-26 in Algorithm 1.

$$flag = \begin{cases} warn & \text{if } P_{value} < P_{warn} \\ alarm & \text{if } P_{value} < P_{alarm} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

DD2: Distance-based. By calculating the Euclidean distance between the reference anomalous instances and the classified anomalous instances, we can identify the presence of drift as presented in Eq. (10) and Eq. (11). The corresponding instances are stored in the windows ref_{disx} and mov_{AN} . ref_{disx}_{ij} and mov_{AN}_{ij} represent the elements at the i -th row and j -th column of matrices ref_{disx} and mov_{AN} respectively. The elements of the row are the coordinates of a point along different dimensions and each column represents the values of a particular variable or feature across all observations. The threshold DIS_{thre} is calculated offline.

$$DIS(ref_{disx}, mov_{AN}) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m (ref_{disx}_{ij} - mov_{AN}_{ij})^2} \quad (10)$$

$$flag = alarm \text{ if } DIS(ref_{disx}, mov_{AN}) > DIS_{thre} \quad (11)$$

Warning flag raised. The warning mechanism is only adopted for DD1. As shown in Line 27 of Algorithm 1, once a $flag_{warn}$ is raised and $flag_{alarm}$ is not raised, we start to store examples into mov_{warn} . In order to avoid false alarms, we set a parameter $expiry_time$, if $flag_{warn}$ is raised for more than $expiry_time$ and there is still no $flag_{alarm}$, we regard this as false warnings, and then reset the status of $flag_{warn}$ and empty mov_{warn} .

Alarm flag raised. When an alarm flag is triggered no matter by which detection mechanism, i.e., equal or more than one alarm is raised, a new autoencoder is instantiated to supersede the existing one. This new model undergoes training with the instances stored in mov_{warn} or mov_{AN} . Simultaneously, the threshold is updated based on the contents of mov_{warn} . Following these updates, the windows, mov_{train} , mov_{driftx} , mov_{warn} , and mov_{AN} are cleared, and the associated flags are reset. Subsequently, the new reference window post-drift ref_{driftx} is replenished with arriving instances, with a size of W_{drift} , after the occurrence of drift.

V. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

A. Datasets

Our experimental study considers both synthetic and real-world datasets. For the sythetic datasets, we use the popular benchmark datasets Sine [32], Sea [13] and Circle [32].

TABLE I: Description of synthetic and real-world dataset

Dataset	#Features	#Arriving	Drift Time	Anomalous Sequences	Before Drift	After Drift
Sea [13]	2	15000	5000, 10000	(2000, 2100) (7000, 7100) (12000, 12100)	Class 0: $x_1+x_2 \geq 10$ Class 1: $x_1+x_2 \leq 3$ x_1, x_2 in range [0,1]	Class 0: $x_1+x_2 \geq 15$ Class 1: $x_1+x_2 \leq 4$ x_1, x_2 in range [0,1]
Circle [32]	2	15000	5000, 10000	(3000, 3200) (8000, 8200) (13000, 13200)	Class 0: center=(0.6, 0.6), radius=0.2 Class 1: center=(0.2, 0.2), radius=0.2 x_1, x_2 in range [0,1]	Class 0: center=(0.6, 0.6), radius=0.1 Class 1: center=(0.2, 0.2), radius=0.15 x_1, x_2 in range [0,1]
Sine [32]	2	30000	10000, 20000	(5000, 5050) (15000, 15050) (25000, 25050)	Class 0: $x_2 > \sin(x_1)+0.5$ Class 1: $x_2 < \sin(x_1)-1$ x_1 in [0, pi], x_2 in [-1,1]	Class 0: $x_2 > \sin(x_1)$ Class 1: $x_2 < \sin(x_1)-1.1$ x_1 in [0, pi], x_2 in [-1, 1]
Vib	10	22500	7500, 15000	(3000, 3200) (9000, 9200) (17000, 17200)	Class 0: mean=0, std=1 Class 1: mean=5, std=1	Class 0: mean=3, std=1 Class 1: mean=0, std=0.5
Fraud [33]	29	6100	3050	(2000, 2200) (5050, 5250)	[33]	Class 0: values of all features* 0.1 Class 1: values of all features*0.95
Wafer [34]	152	5000	2500	(1500, 1550) (4000, 4050)	[34]	Class 0: values of all features*0.5 Class 1: values of all features*0.95

TABLE II: Hyper-parameter values for VAE4AS

	Sea	Sine	Circle	Vib	Fraud	Wafer
Learning rate	0.001					0.0001
Mini-batch size	64					
weight initializer	He Normal					
Optimizer	Adam					
Hidden activation	Leaky ReLu					
Num. of epochs	10					
beta	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
Output activation	Sigmoid					
Loss function	Binary cross-entropy			Square error		

Furthermore, we have created Vib, a time-series dataset which consists of simulated equipment vibration data in industrial manufacturing. For the real-world datasets, we have used Fraud [33] which contains credit card transactions by European cardholders, and Wafer [34], a time-series dataset which relates to semi-conductor microelectronics fabrication. Additionally, both simple abrupt drift and recurrent drift are considered. Drift is not restricted to a single class, and can occur in either the normal or anomalous class. In all cases with concept drift, we have assumed that after its occurrence, no anomalous sequence follows for a reasonable amount of time (up to 1000 time steps). Lastly, the anomalous class rate varies from 0.5% to 6.5%. An overview of the datasets is provided in Table I, where the normal and anomalous classes are denoted with “0” and “1” respectively.

B. Methods

Baseline: In this approach, we initiate the pre-training process with unlabelled data. The training phase is conducted offline using 1800 normal examples as the training set, and the validation set comprises 200 normal instances and 50 anomalous instances. Pre-training is applied to all methods.

strAE++DD: A state-of-the-art method for detecting anomalous points as described in Section III-B. It uses incremental learning and has a drift detection mechanism. For a fair comparison, we replace its AE with a VAE.

iForest++: An advanced tree-based method for detecting anomalous points as described in Section III-B. For fairness, incremental learning is adopted with the same window size as strAE++DD.

LSTM-VAE++: A state-of-the-art method for detecting anomalous sequences as described in Section III-B. For fairness, incremental learning is adopted with the same window size as strAE++DD.

VAE4AS: The proposed method as described in Section IV and its pseudocode is shown in Algorithm 1. For reproducibility, the hyper-parameters of VAE4AS are provided in Table II.

C. Performance metrics

One suitable and widely accepted metric that is insensitive to class imbalance is the geometric mean [35], defined as:

$$G\text{-mean} = \sqrt{R^+ \times R^-}, \tag{12}$$

where $R^+ = TP/P$ is the recall of the positive class, $R^- = TN/N$ is the recall (or specificity) of the negative class, and TP, P, TN, and N, are the number of true positives, total positives, true negatives, and total negatives, respectively. Not only G-mean is insensitive to class imbalance, it has some important properties as it is high when all recalls are high and when their difference is small.

A widely used method for evaluating sequential learning algorithms is the prequential evaluation with fading factors, known for converging to the Bayes error in stationary data [36]. Its key advantage is dispensing with a holdout set, consistently testing the classifier on unseen data. We use a fading factor as 0.99 in all simulations, plotting the prequential metric (G-mean) in each time step averaged over 10 repetitions with error bars indicating the standard error.

VI. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

A. Empirical analysis of our method

In this study, we set the window size W_{drift} as 200 for real datasets and 1000 for synthetic datasets. The parameter p is set to 100. In other words, the training occurs only after the whole sliding window is replaced. $W_{distance}$ is set to 50, P_{warn} to 0.01, $expiry_time$ to 100 and P_{alarm} to 0.001.




Fig. 3: Performance of VAE4AS in non-stationary environments with different drift detection mechanisms.

1) *Drift Detection mechanism combination*: In this experiment, we demonstrate the importance of the combination of two drift detection mechanisms instead of relying solely on the KS test or distance measurement. The anomalous sequences (AS) are shown in red. As depicted in Fig. 3, when only KS test is employed, it can only detect the first drift, as indicated by the overlap of $alarm_{KS}$ and $alarm_{KS+DIS}$ at the left dashed line and the performance drops to zero after the second drift. In the case that only distance measurement mechanism is employed, no drift is detected and the performance drops to zero after the second drift as well. However, when dual drift detection mechanisms are employed together, two drifts are successfully detected. This is attributed to the fact that normal instances following the second drift are classified as anomalous, and they are not included in the window mov_{driftx} , preventing the KS test fails to being triggered.

2) *Role of the re-training window size*: In this experiment, we compare model performance and false alarm rates across various re-training window sizes W_{train} using the Sea and Sine datasets. We set $expiry_time = 100$, $W_{distance} = 50$, $P_{warn} = 0.01$, and $P_{alarm} = 0.001$. Table III summarizes the number of false alarms and performance metrics. For the Sea dataset, false alarms decrease from 5 to 0 as W_{train} increases from 500 to 2000. Similarly, for the Sine dataset, the false alarm counts are 2, 1, and 1 for the models with $W_{train} = 500, 1000, 2000$ respectively. As illustrated in Fig. 4, the model performance achieves the best or second-best results with a window size of 2000. Considering its impact on false alarms, we determine $W_{train} = 2000$ as the optimal setting, which will be adopted in subsequent experiments.

B. Comparative study

In this section, we compare five methods: Baseline, strAEm++DD, iForest++, and VAE4AS. Details and hyperparameter values are in Section V-B and Table II. For synthetic datasets, W_{train} is 2000; for real datasets, it is adjusted to 1000 for data volume.

The results are presented in Fig. 5. Notably, the performance of strAEm++DD significantly degrades upon encountering anomalous sequences, revealing its lack of robustness. iForest’s performance varies considerably across different datasets, demonstrating its sensitivity to the dataset’s nature. The performance of LSTM-VAE++ is quite unstable, especially after




Fig. 4: Performance of VAE4AS in non-stationary environments with different re-training window sizes.

a drift or anomalous sequence, the performance of the model decreases significantly. While the Baseline exhibits impressive performance in certain scenarios (a), (d), and (f), it showcases a decline in performance for dataset Sine immediately after the first drift occurs. Moreover, in (d) and (e), the model’s performance fluctuates substantially with the occurrence of anomalous sequences, and in (e), after the second anomalous sequence, the G-mean value drops to zero, underscoring the Baseline’s sensitivity to anomalous sequences and drift.

TABLE III: Performance of VAE4AS and number of false alarms with different re-training window size

Datasets	Sea			Sine			
	Window size	500	1000	2000	500	1000	2000
#False alarms		5	2	0	2	1	1
G-mean		0.98	0.77	0.93	0.84	0.85	0.93

In contrast, the proposed method, VAE4AS, consistently ranks among the top two algorithms, boasting a G-mean value exceeding 0.7 for all datasets. Moreover, even in the presence of recurrent drift, VAE4AS exhibits a reasonable number of false alarms, validating its robustness and effective detection capabilities. Overall, important remarks are as follows:

- Performance-wise, VAE4AS significantly outperforms the strAEm++DD, iForest++, LSTM-VAE++ and Baseline methods.
- Furthermore, VAE4AS is more robust to different characteristics (i.e., drift type and anomalous rate) of the datasets as it appears to be less sensitive compared to the rest of the methods. The robustness of the proposed method can be attributed to the integration of a dual drift detection mechanism, effectively reducing the occurrence of false alarms and accurately identifying real drifts.

VII. CONCLUSION

Mining patterns from data streams presents formidable challenges, encompassing the unavailability of ground truth, the adaptation to nonstationary environments, and the presence of anomalous sequences. In such cases, distinguishing between concept drift and anomalous sequences constitutes a major challenge. In response to these challenges, we introduce a novel approach termed VAE4AS. This method leverages a




Fig. 5: Comparison between Baseline, strAEm++DD, iForest++ and VAE4AS in nonstationary environments.

variational autoencoder-based incremental learning strategy coupled with a dual drift detection mechanism. Our extensive experimental analysis establishes that the proposed VAE4AS method outperforms strong baseline and state-of-the-art methods. Looking ahead, our future research will explore the realm of multi-classification problems, specifically addressing scenarios involving the presence of multiple normal or anomalous classes. Additionally, we aim to apply our proposed method to more datasets with different concept drift characteristics to further validate the efficacy of our method.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. M. Gomes, J. P. Barddal, F. Enembreck, and A. Bifet, "A survey on ensemble learning for data stream classification," *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 1–36, 2017.
- [2] Z. Chen, Z. Peng, X. Zou, and H. Sun, "Deep learning based anomaly detection for multi-dimensional time series: A survey," in *China Cyber Security Annual Conference*. Springer Nature Singapore Singapore, 2021, pp. 71–92.
- [3] E. Kyriakides and M. Polycarpou, Eds., *Intelligent monitoring, control, and security of critical infrastructure systems*. Springer, 2014, vol. 565.
- [4] G. Ditzler, M. Roveri, C. Alippi, and R. Polikar, "Learning in non-stationary environments: A survey," *IEEE Computational Intelligence Magazine*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 12–25, 2015.
- [5] V. Losing, B. Hammer, and H. Wersing, "Incremental on-line learning: A review and comparison of state of the art algorithms," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 275, pp. 1261–1274, 2018.
- [6] K. B. Dyer, R. Capo, and R. Polikar, "Compose: A semisupervised learning framework for initially labeled nonstationary streaming data," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 12–26, 2013.
- [7] I. Žliobaitė, A. Bifet, B. Pfahringer, and G. Holmes, "Active learning with drifting streaming data," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 27–39, 2013.
- [8] K. Malialis, C. G. Panayiotou, and M. M. Polycarpou, "Nonstationary data stream classification with online active learning and siamese neural networks," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 512, pp. 235–252, 2022.
- [9] K. Malialis, D. Papatheodoulou, S. Filippou, C. G. Panayiotou, and M. M. Polycarpou, "Data augmentation on-the-fly and active learning in data stream classification," in *IEEE Symposium Series on Computational Intelligence (SSCI)*, 2022.
- [10] G. Hulten, L. Spencer, and P. Domingos, "Mining time-changing data streams," in *Proceedings of the Seventh ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2001, pp. 97–106.
- [11] N.-Y. Liang, G.-B. Huang, P. Saratchandran, and N. Sundararajan, "A fast and accurate online sequential learning algorithm for feedforward networks," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 1411–1423, 2006.
- [12] L. L. Minku and X. Yao, "Ddd: A new ensemble approach for dealing with concept drift," *IEEE transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 619–633, 2011.
- [13] W. N. Street and Y. Kim, "A streaming ensemble algorithm (sea) for large-scale classification," in *Proceedings of the seventh ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, 2001, pp. 377–382.
- [14] K. Malialis, C. G. Panayiotou, and M. M. Polycarpou, "Online learning with adaptive rebalancing in nonstationary environments," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2020.
- [15] A. Cano and B. Krawczyk, "Rose: robust online self-adjusting ensemble for continual learning on imbalanced drifting data streams," *Machine Learning*, pp. 1–39, 2022.
- [16] M. Jaworski, L. Rutkowski, and P. Angelov, "Concept drift detection using autoencoders in data streams processing," in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Soft Computing*. Springer, 2020, pp. 124–133.
- [17] K. Malialis, M. Roveri, C. Alippi, C. G. Panayiotou, and M. M. Polycarpou, "A hybrid active-passive approach to imbalanced nonstationary data stream classification," in *IEEE Symposium Series on Computational Intelligence (SSCI)*, 2022.
- [18] A. Artelt, K. Malialis, C. Panayiotou, M. Polycarpou, and B. Hammer, "Unsupervised unlearning of concept drift with autoencoders," in *IEEE Symposium Series on Computational Intelligence (SSCI)*, 2023.
- [19] F. T. Liu, K. M. Ting, and Z. Zhou, "Isolation forest," in *2008 eighth IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 413–422.
- [20] R. Chalapathy and S. Chawla, "Deep learning for anomaly detection: A survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.03407*, 2019.
- [21] A. M. Mustafa, G. Ayoade, K. Al-Naami, L. Khan, K. W. Hamlen, B. Thuraisingham, and F. Araujo, "Unsupervised deep embedding for novel class detection over data stream," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1830–1839.
- [22] J. Li, K. Malialis, and M. M. Polycarpou, "Autoencoder-based anomaly detection in streaming data with incremental learning and concept drift adaptation," in *International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, 2023.
- [23] Y. Dong and N. Japkowicz, "Threaded ensembles of autoencoders for stream learning," *Computational Intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 261–281, 2018.
- [24] Z. Niu, K. Yu, and X. Wu, "Lstm-based vae-gan for time-series anomaly detection," *Sensors*, vol. 20, no. 13, p. 3738, 2020.
- [25] D. Fährmann, N. Damer, F. Kirchbuchner, and A. Kuijper, "Lightweight long short-term memory variational auto-encoder for multivariate time series anomaly detection in industrial control systems," *Sensors*, vol. 22, no. 8, p. 2886, 2022.
- [26] J. Rosenberger, K. Müller, A. Selig, M. Bühren, and D. Schramm, "Extended kernel density estimation for anomaly detection in streaming data," *Procedia CIRP*, vol. 112, pp. 156–161, 2022.

- [27] P.-F. Marteau, "Random partitioning forest for point-wise and collective anomaly detection—application to network intrusion detection," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 16, pp. 2157–2172, 2021.
- [28] D. P. Kingma and M. Welling, "Auto-encoding variational bayes," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.
- [29] S. Kullback and R. A. Leibler, "On information and sufficiency," *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 79–86, 1951.
- [30] J. Clark, Z. Liu, and N. Japkowicz, "Adaptive threshold for outlier detection on data streams," in *2018 IEEE 5th International Conference on Data Science and Advanced Analytics (DSAA)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 41–49.
- [31] T. Nitta, Y. Shi, T. Hirakawa, T. Yamashita, and H. Fujiyoshi, "Detecting data drift with ks test using attention map," in *Asian Conference on Pattern Recognition*. Springer, 2023, pp. 68–80.
- [32] J. Gama, P. Medas, G. Castillo, and P. Rodrigues, "Learning with drift detection," in *Brazilian Symposium on Artificial Intelligence*. Springer, 2004, pp. 286–295.
- [33] A. Dal Pozzolo, O. Caelen, R. A. Johnson, and G. Bontempi, "Calibrating probability with undersampling for unbalanced classification," in *Computational Intelligence, 2015 IEEE Symposium Series on*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 159–166.
- [34] R. T. Olszewski, *Generalized feature extraction for structural pattern recognition in time-series data*. Carnegie Mellon University, 2001.
- [35] Y. Sun, M. S. Kamel, and Y. Wang, "Boosting for learning multiple classes with imbalanced class distribution," in *International Conference on Data Mining*. IEEE, 2006, pp. 592–602.
- [36] J. Gama, R. Sebastião, and P. P. Rodrigues, "On evaluating stream learning algorithms," *Machine Learning*, vol. 90, no. 3, pp. 317–346, 2013.