

# GraphWeaver: Billion-Scale Cybersecurity Incident Correlation

Scott Freitas  
scottfreitas@microsoft.com  
Microsoft Security Research  
Redmond, Washington, USA

Amir Gharib  
agharib@microsoft.com  
Microsoft Security Research  
Redmond, Washington, USA

## ABSTRACT

In the dynamic landscape of large enterprise cybersecurity, accurately and efficiently correlating billions of security alerts into comprehensive incidents is a substantial challenge. Traditional correlation techniques often struggle with maintenance, scaling, and adapting to emerging threats and novel sources of telemetry. We introduce GRAPHWEAVER, an industry-scale framework that shifts the traditional incident correlation process to a data-optimized, geo-distributed graph based approach. GRAPHWEAVER introduces a suite of innovations tailored to handle the complexities of correlating billions of shared evidence alerts across hundreds of thousands of enterprises. Key among these innovations are a geo-distributed database and PySpark analytics engine for large-scale data processing, a minimum spanning tree algorithm to optimize correlation storage, integration of security domain knowledge and threat intelligence, and a human-in-the-loop feedback system to continuously refine key correlation processes and parameters. GRAPHWEAVER is integrated into the Microsoft Defender XDR product and deployed worldwide, handling billions of correlations with a 99% accuracy rate, as confirmed by customer feedback and extensive investigations by security experts. This integration has not only maintained high correlation accuracy but reduces traditional correlation storage requirements by 7.4x. We provide an in-depth overview of the key design and operational features of GRAPHWEAVER, setting a precedent as the first cybersecurity company to openly discuss these critical capabilities at this level of depth.

## CCS CONCEPTS

• **Theory of computation** → *Graph algorithms analysis*; • **Computer systems organization** → *Cloud computing*; • **Security and privacy** → *Malware and its mitigation*.

## KEYWORDS

Graph mining, cybersecurity, distributed processing, minimum spanning tree, incident correlation, human-in-the-loop

### ACM Reference Format:

Scott Freitas and Amir Gharib. 2024. GraphWeaver: Billion-Scale Cybersecurity Incident Correlation. In . ACM, New York, NY, USA, 8 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).  
*Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA*

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.  
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06  
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The exponential growth of threat actors, coupled with the proliferation of cybersecurity solutions aimed at thwarting them, has inundated security operation centers (SOCs) with a flood of alerts [9]. Amidst this deluge, discerning genuine threats from the noise presents a formidable challenge. In response, alert correlation (Figure 1) has become an indispensable tool in the defender's arsenal, allowing SOCs to consolidate disparate alerts into cohesive incidents, dramatically reducing the number of analyst investigations [2].

Intuitively, correlation can be likened to the process of "weaving" together security alerts into cohesive incident narratives, grounded in shared indicators of compromise such as malicious files or IP addresses. To facilitate this process, Extended Detection and Response (XDR) platforms, such as Microsoft Defender XDR, take on the pivotal role of centralized telemetry hub for the myriad of security products used by organizations. One of the primary goals of these XDR platforms is to enhance SOC efficiency and effectiveness by synthesizing disparate alerts across endpoint, identity, email, collaboration tools, cloud services, and data repositories, into cohesive incident graphs that serve as a representation of threat activity occurring in the enterprise.


**Incident correlation at scale.** Scalable and efficient incident correlation presents multiple unique and exciting challenges:

- (1) **Mitigating false correlations.** False correlations pose a significant risk, potentially leading to unwarranted actions on benign devices or users, disrupting vital company operations. Additionally, over-correlation can result in "black hole" incidents, where all alerts within an enterprise begin to correlate indiscriminately.
- (2) **Minimizing missed correlations.** Avoiding false negatives is equally important, as a missed correlation could be the difference between the key context required to disrupt a cyberattack, preventing the loss of valuable data and intellectual property.
- (3) **Scalability across vast telemetry.** Correlating billions of alerts across a multitude of security products presents a monumental scaling challenge, requiring a robust infrastructure and an efficient methodology. Furthermore, these correlations need to happen in near real-time to keep SOCs up to date.
- (4) **TI & domain knowledge.** Correlation across diverse entity types such as IP addresses and files often requires specialized threat intelligence (TI) and domain knowledge to mitigate false positive and false negative correlations.

The emergence of XDR as a relatively new industry field underscores the timeliness of these challenges, and positions the realm of alert correlation as a pivotal frontier in the field of cybersecurity.

# GraphWeaver Architecture

## Billion-scale cybersecurity alert correlation



**Figure 1: Overview of the GRAPHWEAVER architecture from the perspective of a single geographic region. Alert telemetry is retrieved from an ADLS system and processed into two PySpark dataframes: one containing the latest 35 minutes of data, and the other the last 2 days. These dataframes are then correlated based on shared entities between pairs of alerts. Subsequently, threat intelligence and security domain knowledge are applied to filter out invalid correlations. The refined correlations are then centralized to the main node and converted into a graph, enabling a minimum spanning tree algorithm to remove redundant incident correlations. Finally, a human-in-the-loop feedback system is employed, where threat researchers review correlation reports to optimize parameters, review assumptions, and pinpoint potential correlation gaps.**

Going forward, innovative solutions will be imperative to successfully navigate this intricate terrain and safeguard organizations against ever-evolving threats.

### 1.1 Contributions

We introduce GRAPHWEAVER (Fig. 1), a novel framework designed to tackle the challenging task of correlating security incidents at scale, marking the first in-depth academic-industry discourse on this vital endeavor. Our framework makes significant contributions to the following areas:

- GRAPHWEAVER.** The GRAPHWEAVER architecture reshapes cybersecurity incident correlation by introducing a scalable framework capable of correlating alerts at the billion-scale. Integrating domain knowledge and threat intelligence, GRAPHWEAVER ensures entity contextualized correlations to minimize both false and missing correlations. Its efficiency is enhanced by a minimum spanning tree algorithm that compresses the number of correlations required to complete an incident by 7.4x compared to traditional rule-based approaches. Additionally, GRAPHWEAVER constantly adapts by mining filtered incident patterns, refining results through a human-in-the-loop feedback system. Most importantly, we reveal key architectural design elements and operational processes, setting a precedent as the first cybersecurity company to openly discuss correlation at this level of depth.
- Impact to Microsoft Customers and Beyond.** GRAPHWEAVER is integrated into the Microsoft Defender XDR product, a leader

in the market [26], which is deployed to hundreds of thousands of organizations worldwide. In the realm of XDR, accurately and efficiently correlating alerts into comprehensive incidents stands as one of the most formidable challenges. This research has led to major impact, reshaping the products approach to correlation at scale.

- Open Research Challenges for the Community.** We discuss a spectrum of open research directions that have the potential to substantially impact the cybersecurity correlation landscape. Among these lies the automatic integration of novel sources of threat intelligence and domain knowledge, leveraging large language models (LLMs) and knowledge graphs to enhance correlation efficacy. Additionally, bridging correlation gaps by discerning how indirectly related alerts and incidents, devoid of shared evidence, can correlate through alternative processes like representation learning presents is a key challenge. Moreover, the pursuit of verifying correlation accuracy at scale, whether through LLMs or alternative methodologies, holds the promise of unlocking new insights and mitigating the impact of false correlations. Together, these multifaceted challenges not only push the boundaries of innovative research but contribute to a more secure future.

To enhance readability, Table 1 details the correlation terminology used in this paper. The reader may want to refer to this table for meanings and synonyms of technical terms.

Technical term	Synonyms	Meaning
Alert	Node, vertex	Potential security threat that was detected on key related entities
Correlation	Edge, link, connection	Connection between two alerts based on a shared entity
Enterprise	Organization, company	Organizations containing an XDR product
Detector	Rule	A security rule, algorithm, or ML model that generates alerts. Detectors can be created by SOCs (custom) or provided by default (built-in)
Incident	Graph, subgraph	Correlated alerts from email, endpoint, cloud, and network layers that reveal comprehensive threat actor activities
Entity	Evidence	An entity is file, IP address, etc. associated with an alert
Time window	Time span	The time span between two alerts
Max time window	Entity time window	Maximum allowed time between two alerts sharing a particular entity
Entity Priority	Priority score	Priority score assigned to each edge based on associated entity type
True positive correlation	TP link	Correlation between two alerts is correct
False positive correlation	FP link	Correlation between two alerts is incorrect
True negative correlation	TN link	Correlation between two alerts is correctly ignored (non-existent)
False negative correlation	FN link	Correlation between two alerts is incorrectly ignored (non-existent)

**Table 1: Incident correlation terminology containing meanings and synonyms of technical terms.**

## 2 RELATED WORK

Our work is informed by advancements in key related fields: Network Intrusion Detection Systems (NIDS), Security Information and Event Management (SIEM), and Extended Detection and Response (XDR). Together, these domains form a symbiotic relationship, each building upon the other to enhance the efficacy and scope of incident correlation. We select a number of academic and industry works relevant to each domain. However, before the introduction of GRAPHWEAVER, industry-based solutions were not publicly discussed in depth, hindering an open discussion of research in the correlation field.

### 2.1 Network Intrusion Detection Systems

NIDS specialize in monitoring and analyzing network traffic for indications of malicious activity [13, 22, 30]. These systems operate by inspecting network packets in real-time, employing signature and anomaly detection techniques to discern threats from suspicious behavior. Signature-based detection entails matching network traffic against a database of known attack signatures, identifying threats like malware payloads and network exploits [25]. Conversely, anomaly-based detection identifies statistical deviations from normal network behavior, such as unusual traffic patterns or protocol violations, signaling potential security breaches [7, 14]. Following the identification of network alerts and events, NIDS systems correlate relevant telemetry into incidents using a variety of approaches encompassing heuristic [3, 11, 12, 36], rule-based [1, 10, 20], and machine learning techniques [6, 18, 29, 33, 37]. In addition, a variety of surveys can be found on NIDS-based correlation methodologies [27, 31, 32, 38]. This correlation task is relatively straightforward, focusing on a reduced subset of network-centric alerts rather than across the entire enterprise threat landscape.

### 2.2 Security Information & Event Management

SIEM systems play a pivotal role as centralized platforms for gathering, analyzing, and correlating security telemetry sourced from various platforms within an organization’s IT infrastructure [15, 34]. These solutions collect logs, events, and alerts generated by a myriad of sources including network devices, servers, applications, and security control systems such as firewalls, antivirus software, and intrusion detection [16]. However, SIEMs are best understood as platforms designed for customization and flexibility, allowing each organization to tailor the environment to suit their unique preferences and requirements. While there is limited research into SIEM based alert correlation [17, 21], these environments heavily rely on the expertise and domain knowledge of the organization’s security team to craft correlation rules, rather than out-of-the-box support provided by the system itself.

### 2.3 Extended Detection and Response

XDR solutions represent a significant leap forward in the realm of alert correlation, particularly when compared to other cybersecurity fields. They offer easy integration with various security products such as network, email, endpoint, and cloud security, enabling visibility and correlation capabilities across an organization’s entire digital footprint. However, cross-domain correlation is a formidable challenge, as XDR systems must efficiently and accurately correlate across diverse enterprise landscapes.

There are several prominent XDR products that provide alert correlation by applying static rules based on shared entities like User, IP address, and URL [8, 28]. However, the transparency regarding the methodologies and data used by these companies is limited, with only minimal information made publicly available. This lack of detailed public disclosure poses a significant challenge for academic research and development in the field. We believe

that our research will not only advance these technological capabilities but foster greater openness and collaboration within the cybersecurity research community.

### 3 PROBLEM FORMULATION

A core business challenge presented by XDR is the need to efficiently and accurately correlate alerts across a vast digital infrastructure, spanning hundreds of thousands, or even millions of enterprises. This challenge demands a solution that can handle complex data interactions while adhering to stringent operational and regulatory requirements, including:

- **Geo-distributed computation and storage.** To comply with international data privacy regulations, the system must support geo-distributed computation and storage to ensure data residency and sovereignty requirements.
- **High-frequency batch processing.** The system must continuously operate in streaming or batch mode, processing alerts every few minutes. This ensures that alerts are promptly correlated, enabling quick response to security incidents.
- **Scalability for high-volume data.** The architecture must be capable of scaling to accommodate tens of millions of alerts per region in each run without degradation in performance.
- **Low tolerance for incorrect correlations.** The system needs to incorporate security domain knowledge and threat intelligence to minimize false positive and false negative correlations.
- **System redundancy and robustness.** To ensure continuous operation and mitigate customer outages, robust redundancy mechanisms are needed to handle potential job failures without dropping alert correlations.
- **Parameter optimization and pattern mining.** Optimal parameter settings for correlation time windows must be determined for each entity type to maximize the effectiveness of alert correlations. Additionally, the system should employ pattern mining techniques on the correlations to identify and raise potential incident gaps for resolution.

By viewing these requirements through the lens of efficient graph correlation, we formulate two research tasks: (1) scalable incident graph mining from a dataframe of raw alert telemetry; and (2) parameter optimization and correlation gap discovery by mining potentially missed correlations. We formally define each problem below and present our solutions in Section 4.

#### PROBLEM 1. *Scalable Incident Graph Mining*

**Given.** A dataframe  $T$  containing alert telemetry.

**Find.** A correlation dataframe  $C$  satisfying six constraints:

- (1) Each correlation is valid based on the time difference between two alerts and the shared entity's maximum time period.
- (2) Each correlation is valid based on the latest threat intelligence.
- (3) Cross-detector correlation pass key safety checks.
- (4) Multiple correlations between alerts are resolved such that only the highest prioritized one is retained.
- (5) Only the minimum set of correlations needed to create an incident are retained.

#### PROBLEM 2. *Parameter Optimization & Gap Discovery*

**Given.** A dataframe  $T$  containing alert telemetry.

**Find.** Optimized correlation time windows for each entity type, and potential incident correlation gaps.

**Assumptions.** We establish the following assumptions during our analysis. (1) *Alert classification independence*, where individual alert grades (e.g., TP, FP) are not considered in the correlation process. We observe that a well-constructed correlation architecture inherently associates TP and FP alerts. (2) *Homogeneous graph model* consisting exclusively of alert nodes. Entities are included as edge metadata rather than as separate nodes. Although entities can be modeled as nodes to facilitate indirect alert correlations, our findings suggest that direct alert correlation is more efficient. (3) *Non-directional edges* independent of alert generation time, as the focus is only on establishing the existence of relationships between alerts.

### 4 GRAPHWEAVER ARCHITECTURE

GRAPHWEAVER's architecture and critical design choices are detailed in eleven steps (S1-S11) across three main sections. In Section 4.1, we present our methodology for alert correlation at-scale using Azure Data Lake Storage Gen2 (ADLS) and an Azure Synapse PySpark engine. Section 4.2 introduces the process of creating incident graphs from alert correlations. Finally, Section 4.3 discusses our strategy for mining correlation patterns, allowing us to optimize key GRAPHWEAVER parameters and close potential correlation gaps. While our analysis concentrates on the architecture from the perspective of a single region, it is important to note that the architecture and methodology presented can be uniformly deployed to any number of regions. See Algorithm 1 for an overview of the entire correlation process.

#### 4.1 Scalable Alert Correlation

We establish the foundation for addressing the first four constraints of Problem 1 by processing the raw alert telemetry through a six-step process: (S1) collect alert telemetry from the ADLS system, (S2) correlate alerts, (S3) filter invalid correlations, (S4) remove low fidelity correlations by leveraging threat intelligence, (S5) exclude correlations that could potentially cause massive incidents ("black holes"), and (S6) remove redundant correlations, keeping ones with higher entity prioritization. All correlation parameters presented in this section were established through extensive collaboration with threat researchers at Microsoft, aimed at minimizing the risk of false correlations.

**S1—Collect telemetry.** We collect 72 hours of historical alert telemetry into a PySpark dataframe called *target alerts*  $T$ . This collection period is strategically chosen based on the maximum entity correlation time window specified in Table 2. Next, the most recent 35 minutes of telemetry is copied from the target alerts dataframe into a second dataframe called *source alerts*  $S$ . Each row in these dataframes includes columns for unique organizational and alert identifiers, along with the 17 entities listed in Table 2.

**S2—Correlate alerts.** We transform the source and target alert dataframes into correlations by iteratively joining them across all 17 entity types. Three primary constraints guide this process—(i)

Entity	Description	Priority	Time
SessionId	Cloud session id	(high) 1	48h
EmailId	Email message id	2	48h
CampaignId	Email campaign id	3	72h
EmailCluster	Email cluster id	4	72h
UserId	User account id	5	24h
URL	Website URL and domain	6	48h
DeviceId	Identifier for device	7	24h
SHA1	Cryptographic file hash	8	24h
FileName	Name of a file	9	24h
AppId	Identifier for cloud app	10	48h
EmailAddress	Email sender address	11	12h
EmailSubject	Email subject	12	12h
RegistryKey	OS registry key	14	24h
RegistryValue	Data stored in key	13	24h
ResourceId	Cloud resource id	15	24h
IP	IP address	16	8h
IPRange	IP addresses in subnet /24	(low) 17	8h

**Table 2: This table contains a description, priority score, and maximum correlation time window for 17 entity types. The priority scores and correlation time windows for each entity are determined in conjunction with domain experts.**

alerts must share an entity to correlate, (ii) originate from the same organization, and (iii) no self-correlations. This approach enables us to generate correlations for every pair of alerts that share common entities, allowing multiple correlations between alerts with several shared entity types. Next, the 17 individual dataframes generated from these joins are merged into a single dataframe  $C$  containing all potential alert correlations. Each row in this unified dataframe includes a source alert, target alert, organization identifier, and columns for all 17 entities. We then refine the correlations by merging it with another ADLS table containing existing correlations, allowing us to remove redundancies.

**S3—Filter invalid correlations.** We filter the correlation dataframe to remove invalid links based on the elapsed time between alerts and the maximum allowed by entity time windows (see Table 2). Specifically, a correlation between two alerts  $u$  and  $v$  is valid if the time difference  $\Delta t$  between them does not exceed the max correlation time  $t_m$  of the shared entity, which can be denoted as  $|\Delta c_{uv}| \leq t_m$ . This ensures adherence to the first constraint of Problem 1 Maximum time windows for each entity were initially set based on threat researcher domain knowledge, and subsequently optimized using the pattern mining approach described in Section 4.3. The final optimized values are reported in Table 2.

**S4—Integrate threat intelligence.** We enhance our correlation process by integrating threat intelligence (TI) to more accurately identify valid correlations for specific entity types such as SHA1, FileName, and IPRange. Given the lower fidelity nature of IPRange data, due to frequent updates and the complexity in determining whether an IPRange indicates malicious activity, a VPN setup, or simply abnormal behavior, it is crucial to incorporate TI. To prevent low quality correlations on benign entities, we use Microsoft Defender Threat Intelligence to keep only those correlations involving SHA1 hashes and FileNames linked to known malicious signatures.

Likewise, correlations for IPRanges are only kept if they have been confirmed as malicious within the last 48 hours.

**S5—Prevent black hole correlations.** A critical capability is safely correlating alerts generated by built-in XDR detectors, with custom detectors developed by SOC analysts. This is especially important since nearly half of all alerts originate from custom detectors. While this may seem conceptually straightforward, it demands careful analysis to ensure safe correlation across the boundary of built-in and custom alerts. Built-in rules are known for their high fidelity detection requirements, whereas custom detections often lack standardized quality controls. For instance, it is not uncommon for custom detections by an enterprise to yield thousands of daily alerts—overwhelmingly noisy and of low value to SOC analysts tasked with their review.

Allowing correlations between high-volume, low-fidelity custom detectors and high-fidelity built-in detectors can lead to the formation of unmanageable “black hole” incidents that obscure essential alerts from the built-in detectors. Conversely, requiring SOC analysts to examine thousands of individual noisy alerts is not practical. Moreover, completely avoiding correlations between custom and built-in rules could overlook critical information pertinent to an incident. Therefore, it is essential to strategically enable cross detector correlations between high-fidelity custom and built-in detectors, while also allowing for the correlation of noisy alerts originating from the same rule. To manage this delicate balance, we developed three essential safety checks to enable cross-detector correlation:

- (1) **Low volume detector.** We examine the historical alert volume for each detector. Cross-detector correlation is activated only if the detector’s average alert volume ( $l_d$ ) is below 6% of the total alerts, and fewer than 20 alerts per day across the enterprise. A detector generating more than 20 alerts per day across an enterprise is considered low fidelity, or noisy.
- (2) **Low evidence detector.** The average number of distinct values per entity type ( $l_{avg}$ ) in a detector should not exceed predetermined thresholds. For most entity types, this threshold is set at 4. However, for entity types such as SHA1, FileName, Url, EmailId, and AppId, a higher threshold of 10 is allowed. These limits are set based on threat researcher expertise help prevent “black hole” incidents that indiscriminately correlate unrelated alerts.
- (3) **Low evidence alert.** Similarly, the number of distinct entity type values ( $l_a$ ) associated with a single alert must be constrained to the same thresholds set above. Since organizations can attach an arbitrary number and type of entities to detector outputs, alerts may occasionally contain dozens, if not hundreds, of entities.

In practice, we develop a secondary PySpark job that profiles all custom and built-in detectors on an hourly basis, storing the resulting telemetry in an ADLS table to confirm their suitability for cross-detector correlation. This setup enables the GRAPHWEAVER job to dynamically access these detector profiles and make correlation decisions in real time.

**S6—Prioritize duplicate correlations.** At this stage of the process, numerous duplicate correlations still exist between alerts with multiple shared entities. The final correlation step involves selecting the most critical link between alerts based on their entity prioritization score (see Table 2), and filtering out the remaining ones. The criteria for correlation link prioritization is established through partnership with threat researchers at Microsoft.

## 4.2 Incident Graph Mining

We transform the correlations from the previous section into incident graphs, allowing us to address the final constraint of Problem 1 through a three-step process: (S7) transform the correlation dataframe into millions of incident graphs, (S8) remove redundant correlation links through a minimum spanning tree (MST) algorithm, and (S9) mine incident graph statistics to monitor the efficacy and efficiency of the correlation process.

**S7—Graph construction.** After completing the computationally demanding distributed PySpark calculations, we transfer the resulting alert correlations dataframe into a Pandas dataframe for additional processing on the central PySpark node. This step of data conversion and centralization facilitates the construction of a simple<sup>1</sup> graph in NetworkX. Each node in the graph represents an alert, containing metadata such as the time of occurrence and an organization identifier, with edges characterized by the correlation entity type.

**S8—Compress graph links.** Our incident graph, now containing millions of subgraphs, is optimized to retain only the essential edges necessary to connect the alerts within each incident. For example, in an incident involving alerts  $A$ ,  $B$ , and  $C$  with the correlations  $A \rightarrow B$ ,  $B \rightarrow C$ , and  $A \rightarrow C$ , we can eliminate redundant correlations like  $A \rightarrow C$  or  $B \rightarrow C$  to streamline the graph. To accomplish this compression, we run a minimum spanning tree (MST) algorithm across the entire incident graph. This approach ensures that we retain only the theoretical minimum number of edges required to connect each incident subgraph. Resolving this task addresses the final constraint of Problem 1, enhancing our ability to efficiently store correlations, and reduce the computational costs of downstream processes utilizing the telemetry.

**S9—Mine graph statistics.** With our incident graphs now complete, we can extract detailed statistics that provide insights into various aspects of the correlation process. These statistics can include the number of correlations per entity type, correlations segmented by region, correlations categorized by product and detector type, the distribution of incident sizes, the average runtime of correlation processes per region, and the success and failure rates of correlation jobs. Collecting and analyzing these and other statistics serves multiple purposes. First, they offer a comprehensive view of the operational health of our correlation jobs by highlighting potential bottlenecks. Additionally, these metrics enable targeted monitoring, allowing us to identify trends, anomalies, and potential areas requiring intervention or optimization.

<sup>1</sup>defined as having only one edge between any two alerts and no self-correlating edges

---

### Algorithm 1: GRAPHWEAVER

---

**Input:** Alert dataframe  $T$ , TI entity list  $N$ ; functions: TI lookup  $L$ , entity prioritization  $S$ , alert volume  $V$ , avg entity volume  $A$ , number of entities  $E$ , detector volume  $V$ ; and threshold limits:  $t_m$ ,  $l_d$ ,  $l_{avg}$ , and  $l_a$

**Output:** A refined correlation dataframe  $C$

```

let  $R = \emptyset$ ; // initialize temp dataframe
let  $S = \{s \in T \mid \text{now}() - s_{time} \leq 35 \text{ minutes}\}$ ; // S1

for entity  $e \in E$  do
  |  $R = R \cup S.\text{join}(T, \text{on} = e, \text{how} = \text{inner})$ ; // S2
 $C = \{c \in R \mid |c_{time_1} - c_{time_2}| \leq t_m\}$ ; // S3
 $C = \{c \in C \mid c_e \in N \wedge L(c) = \text{malicious}\}$ ; // S4
 $C = \{c \in C \mid V(c) \leq l_d \wedge A(c) \leq l_{avg} \wedge E(c) \leq l_a\}$ ; // S5
 $C = C[C.\text{GroupBy}(C_{src}, C_{tar})[C_{score}].\text{argmin}()]$ ; // S6
 $C = \text{DataFrame}(\text{MST}(\text{Graph}(C)))$ ; // S7, S8

 $F = R \setminus C$ ; // filtered correlations
 $t_m \leftarrow \text{Optimize}(\text{Feedback}(\text{Stats}(C, F)))$ ; // S9, S10
Assumptions  $\leftarrow \text{Feedback}(\text{Analyze}(C, F))$ ; // S11

```

---

## 4.3 Parameter Optimization & Gap Discovery

We address Problem 2 through two steps: (S10) optimizes correlation time windows by analyzing both valid and rejected correlations, and (S11) pinpoints potential correlation gaps through analysis of filtered correlations and engaging in continuous feedback with our threat research team. This human-in-the-loop feedback system ensures that GRAPHWEAVER's correlation strategies are not only precise, but robust against evolving security challenges.

**S10—Time window optimization.** We optimize the correlation time window for each entity in Table 2 by identifying potential correlation gaps. This process begins by analyzing both valid and filtered correlations from the output of S2 in Section 4.1. We calculate key statistical measures such as the average, median, and percentiles for the correlation times of valid and invalid correlations, as well as their combined correlations, on a per-entity basis. These statistics are then forwarded to our threat research team for a detailed investigation. This enables them to assess whether an extension of the correlation time window for specific entities could reduce false negatives, or conversely, if a reduction is necessary to decrease false positives. By continuously refining these time windows based on empirical data and expert insights, we are able to optimize GRAPHWEAVER's correlation process.

**S11—Correlation gap discovery.** Unoptimized time windows are not the only contributor to correlation gaps. Gaps can also arise from missing threat intelligence, or shifting telemetry as new products and detectors challenge existing assumptions. To address this, we analyze rejected correlations from the processes outlined in Section 4.1 (S3-S5) to identify the most prevalent potential correlation gaps across different detectors and entity types. The findings are then forwarded to our threat research team, allowing them to assess the need for new TI feeds, revising our correlation assumptions, or adjusting various correlation parameters to maintain and enhance the accuracy and relevance of the system.

## 4.4 Computational Complexity

LEMMA 1. *The time and space complexity of GRAPHWEAVER is  $O(s + t + c \log c)$  and  $O(sm + tm + cm)$ , respectively.*

PROOF. The time complexity of GRAPHWEAVER is dominated by two key operations: the iterative joins in step S2 and the minimum spanning tree (MST) algorithm in step S8. Each PySpark join operation has a time complexity of  $O(s + t)$ , where  $s$  and  $t$  represent the number of rows in the source  $S$  and target  $T$  dataframes, respectively. Despite the join being executed for each of the 17 entities, the aggregate time complexity for the joins remains  $O(s + t)$ . The MST algorithm can be implemented with a time complexity of  $O(c \log c)$ , where  $c$  is the number of edges in the graph—which corresponds to the number of rows in the correlation dataframe  $C$ . When combining these complexities, the total time complexity of the method is  $O(s + t + c \log c)$ .

The space complexity of GRAPHWEAVER is determined by the memory requirements of the three primary PySpark dataframes,  $S$ ,  $T$ , and  $C$ . These dataframes are stored in dense format, and occupy space proportional to  $O(sm)$ ,  $O(tm)$ , and  $O(cm)$  respectively, where  $s$ ,  $t$ , and  $c$  indicate the number of rows and  $m$  represents the number of columns in each dataframe. As a result, the overall space complexity is  $O(sm + tm + cm)$ .  $\square$

## 5 DEPLOYMENT AND IMPACT

**Deployment.** GRAPHWEAVER has been deployed worldwide, serving hundreds of thousands of Microsoft Defender XDR customers over the last few months. The deployment infrastructure utilizes a Synapse-based PySpark cluster tailored to each geographical region (e.g., Europe, Asia). This setup includes: (a) an ADLS database that guarantees both accessibility and secure management of alert telemetry; (b) an Azure Synapse backend that provides a robust framework for deployment and monitoring; and (c) an XXL PySpark pool with 60 executors, each equipped with 64 CPU cores and 400GB of RAM. To ensure system efficiency, Synapse is configured to autoscale the number of executors based on fluctuating job demand. Additionally, GRAPHWEAVER runs every few minutes in each region to maintain optimal correlation coverage. To enhance system reliability and prevent potential data, Synapse automatically reruns any failed jobs.

**Impact.** Microsoft Defender XDR processes billions of correlations each month, with GRAPHWEAVER accounting for a significant portion of them. A key metric in the XDR domain is the singleton incident ratio—the percentage of incidents containing only a single alert. GRAPHWEAVER has successfully reduced the product’s overall singleton incident rate by 7%, translating into millions of investigation hours saved annually by security operation centers. Customer feedback and detailed review of thousands of security incident correlations by our threat research team demonstrate that GRAPHWEAVER achieves a 99% true correlation rate. Furthermore, the MST algorithm attains a 7.4x compression ratio on the number of correlations generated by our traditional correlation techniques, yielding substantial savings in terms of storage and downstream computational tasks.

## 6 OPEN RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

The task of correlating vast quantities of security alerts presents several compelling research directions for future exploration. Each of these directions offers a significant opportunity to advance our understanding and capabilities in security alert management:

**Correlation verification at scale.** With billions of correlations generated each month, it becomes infeasible to manually review more than a tiny fraction of them. Developing robust systems capable of verifying the accuracy of these correlations at scale is a key challenge. The integration of advanced techniques, such as large language models, could play a crucial role in achieving scalable verification. This will not only enhance the reliability of correlation processes but streamline security operations by reducing manual investigations. The challenge here lies in creating a system that can efficiently process vast data sets while maintaining high precision.

**Enhanced decision making.** Enhancing the decision-making process in correlations by incorporating security knowledge graphs [24, 35] and sophisticated computational models, such as large language models [23], is another promising research avenue. This research can significantly elevate the precision and relevance of correlations, especially for lower fidelity entity types like IP Ranges. The focus would be on developing systems that not only correlate data more accurately but also contextualize the significance of key correlations in real-world scenarios.

**Advanced gap detection.** There is a critical need for the development of advanced correlation systems that are capable of identifying gaps in the connections between security alerts, where direct evidence is lacking. Techniques such as representation learning could be pivotal in mapping these gaps within a latent space, thereby uncovering hidden patterns and connections between seemingly unrelated alerts and incidents [4, 5, 19, 24].

## 7 CONCLUSION

GRAPHWEAVER represents a groundbreaking shift in the landscape of large enterprise cybersecurity, marking the first time a cybersecurity company has openly discussed an industry-scale correlation framework in depth. Deployed globally to hundreds of thousands of customers as part of Microsoft Defender XDR, we are correlating billions of security alerts into coherent incidents. GRAPHWEAVER introduces multiple novel ideas to the correlation space, including the use of a geo-distributed database and PySpark correlation engine, an MST algorithm for optimizing storage and downstream computational tasks, and a human-in-the-loop feedback system that enables continuous refinement of key correlation processes and parameters. GRAPHWEAVER has decreased the product’s singleton incident rate by 7%, equating to millions of saved SOC investigation hours each year. This workload reduction is supported by a 99% true correlation rate based on customer feedback and an extensive manual evaluation of thousands of correlations by our security team. Our hope is that this research will not only advance correlation capabilities, but foster greater openness and collaboration within the community.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank all of our colleagues who supported this research.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Faez M Alserhani. 2016. Alert correlation and aggregation techniques for reduction of security alerts and detection of multistage attack. *International Journal of Advanced Studies in Computers, Science and Engineering* 5, 2 (2016), 1.
- [2] Tao Ban, Takeshi Takahashi, Samuel Ndichu, and Daisuke Inoue. 2023. Breaking alert fatigue: Ai-assisted siem framework for effective incident response. *Applied Sciences* 13, 11 (2023), 6610.
- [3] Mehdi Bateni, Ahmad Baraani, and Ali A Ghorbani. 2013. Using Artificial Immune System and Fuzzy Logic for Alert Correlation. *Int. J. Netw. Secur.* 15, 3 (2013), 190–204.
- [4] Yujun Chen, Xian Yang, Hang Dong, Xiaoting He, Hongyu Zhang, Qingwei Lin, Junjie Chen, Pu Zhao, Yu Kang, Feng Gao, et al. 2020. Identifying linked incidents in large-scale online service systems. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM joint meeting on European software engineering conference and symposium on the foundations of software engineering*. 304–314.
- [5] Zhuangbin Chen, Jinyang Liu, Yuxin Su, Hongyu Zhang, Xuemin Wen, Xiao Ling, Yongqiang Yang, and Michael R Lyu. 2021. Graph-based incident aggregation for large-scale online service systems. In *2021 36th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, 430–442.
- [6] Qiumei Cheng, Chunming Wu, and Shiyang Zhou. 2021. Discovering attack scenarios via intrusion alert correlation using graph convolutional networks. *IEEE Communications Letters* 25, 5 (2021), 1564–1567.
- [7] Dylan Chou and Meng Jiang. 2021. A survey on data-driven network intrusion detection. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 54, 9 (2021), 1–36.
- [8] Cisco. 2024. Cisco XDR incident. <https://docs.xdr.security.cisco.com/Content/Incidents/incidents.htm>
- [9] Forrester Consulting. 2020. The 2020 State Of Security Operations.
- [10] Frédéric Cuppens. 2001. Managing alerts in a multi-intrusion detection environment. In *Seventeenth Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*. IEEE, 22–31.
- [11] Oliver Dain and Robert K Cunningham. 2002. Fusing a heterogeneous alert stream into scenarios. *Applications of Data Mining in Computer Security* (2002), 103–122.
- [12] Huwaida Tagelsir Elshoush and Izzeldin Mohamed Osman. 2013. Intrusion alert correlation framework: An innovative approach. In *IAENG Transactions on Engineering Technologies: Special Volume of the World Congress on Engineering 2012*. Springer, 405–420.
- [13] Scott Freitas, Andrew Wicker, Duen Horng Chau, and Joshua Neil. 2020. D2M: Dynamic defense and modeling of adversarial movement in networks. In *Proceedings of the 2020 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*. SIAM, 541–549.
- [14] Sunanda Gamage and Jagath Samarabandu. 2020. Deep learning methods in network intrusion detection: A survey and an objective comparison. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications* 169 (2020), 102767.
- [15] Gartner. 2024. Security Information And Event Management (SIEM).
- [16] Gustavo González-Granadillo, Susana González-Zarzosa, and Rodrigo Diaz. 2021. Security information and event management (SIEM): analysis, trends, and usage in critical infrastructures. *Sensors* 21, 14 (2021), 4759.
- [17] Gustavo Gonzalez Granadillo, Mohammed El-Barbori, and Herve Debar. 2016. New types of alert correlation for security information and event management systems. In *2016 8th IFIP international conference on new technologies, mobility and security (NTMS)*. IEEE, 1–7.
- [18] Steffen Haas and Mathias Fischer. 2019. On the alert correlation process for the detection of multi-step attacks and a graph-based realization. *ACM SIGAPP Applied Computing Review* 19, 1 (2019), 5–19.
- [19] Shengmin Jin and Reza Zafarani. 2020. The spectral zoo of networks: Embedding and visualizing networks with spectral moments. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 1426–1434.
- [20] Peyman Kabiri and Ali A Ghorbani. 2007. A Rule-based Temporal Alert Correlation System. *Int. J. Netw. Secur.* 5, 1 (2007), 66–72.
- [21] Igor Kotenko, Diana Gaifulina, and Igor Zelichenok. 2022. Systematic literature review of security event correlation methods. *IEEE Access* 10 (2022), 43387–43420.
- [22] Karthikeyan KR and A Indra. 2010. Intrusion detection tools and techniques—a survey. *International Journal of Computer Theory and Engineering* 2, 6 (2010), 1793–8201.
- [23] Jinxi Kuang, Jinyang Liu, Junjie Huang, Renyi Zhong, Jiazhen Gu, Lan Yu, Rui Tan, Zengyin Yang, and Michael R Lyu. 2024. Knowledge-aware Alert Aggregation in Large-scale Cloud Systems: a Hybrid Approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.06485* (2024).
- [24] Diana Levshun and Igor Kotenko. 2023. A survey on artificial intelligence techniques for security event correlation: models, challenges, and opportunities. *Artificial Intelligence Review* 56, 8 (2023), 8547–8590.
- [25] Mohammad Masdari and Hemn Khezri. 2020. A survey and taxonomy of the fuzzy signature-based intrusion detection systems. *Applied Soft Computing* 92 (2020), 106301.
- [26] Allie Mellen, Joseph Blankenship, Sarah Morana, and Michael Belden. 2024. The Forrester Wave™: Extended Detection And Response Platforms, Q2 2024.
- [27] Seyed Ali Mirheidari, Sajjad Arshad, and Rasool Jalili. 2013. Alert correlation algorithms: A survey and taxonomy. In *Cyberspace Safety and Security: 5th International Symposium, CSS 2013, Zhangjiajie, China, November 13-15, 2013, Proceedings* 5. Springer, 183–197.
- [28] Palo Alto Networks. 2024. Palo Alto XDR incident. <https://docs-cortex.paloaltonetworks.com/r/Cortex-XDR/Cortex-XDR-Pro-Administrator-Guide/Incidents>
- [29] Ali Ahmadian Ramaki, Masoud Khosravi-Farmad, and Abbas Ghaemi Bafghi. 2015. Real time alert correlation and prediction using Bayesian networks. In *2015 12th International Iranian Society of Cryptology Conference on Information Security and Cryptology (ISCISC)*. IEEE, 98–103.
- [30] Martin Roesch et al. 1999. Snort: Lightweight intrusion detection for networks. In *Lisa*, Vol. 99. 229–238.
- [31] Reza Sadoddin and Ali Ghorbani. 2006. Alert correlation survey: framework and techniques. In *Proceedings of the 2006 international conference on privacy, security and trust: bridge the gap between PST technologies and business services*. 1–10.
- [32] Saeed Salah, Gabriel Maciá-Fernández, and Jesús E Díaz-Verdejo. 2013. A model-based survey of alert correlation techniques. *Computer Networks* 57, 5 (2013), 1289–1317.
- [33] Reuben Smith, Nathalie Japkowicz, Maxwell Dondo, and Peter Mason. 2008. Using unsupervised learning for network alert correlation. In *Advances in Artificial Intelligence: 21st Conference of the Canadian Society for Computational Studies of Intelligence, Canadian AI 2008 Windsor, Canada, May 28-30, 2008 Proceedings* 21. Springer, 308–319.
- [34] Manfred Vielberth, Fabian Böhm, Ines Fichtinger, and Günther Pernul. 2020. Security operations center: A systematic study and open challenges. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 227756–227779.
- [35] Wei Wang, Rong Jiang, Yan Jia, Aiping Li, and Yi Chen. 2017. KGBIAC: Knowledge graph based intelligent alert correlation framework. In *Cyberspace Safety and Security: 9th International Symposium, CSS 2017, Xi'an China, October 23–25, 2017, Proceedings*. Springer, 523–530.
- [36] Mingtao Wu and Young Moon. 2019. Alert correlation for cyber-manufacturing intrusion detection. *Procedia Manufacturing* 34 (2019), 820–831.
- [37] Feng Xuewei, Wang Dongxia, Huang Minhuan, and Sun Xiaoxia. 2014. An approach of discovering causal knowledge for alert correlating based on data mining. In *2014 IEEE 12th International Conference on Dependable, Autonomic and Secure Computing*. IEEE, 57–62.
- [38] Leau Yu Beng, Sureswaran Ramadass, Selvakumar Manickam, and Tan Soo Fun. 2014. A survey of intrusion alert correlation and its design considerations. *IETE Technical Review* 31, 3 (2014), 233–240.

Received 20 May 2024