

Proactive Detection of Physical Inter-rule Vulnerabilities in IoT Services Using a Deep Learning Approach

Bing Huang¹, Chen Chen¹✉, Kwok-Yan Lam¹, Fuqun Huang²

¹ School of Computer Science and Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

² Department of Computer Science, Western Washington University, WA, United States

{bing.huang, chen.chen, kwokyan.lam}@ntu.edu.sg, huangf2@wwu.edu

Abstract—Emerging Internet of Things (IoT) platforms provide sophisticated capabilities to automate IoT services by enabling occupants to create trigger-action rules. Multiple trigger-action rules can physically interact with each other via shared environment channels, such as temperature, humidity, and illumination. We refer to inter-rule interactions via shared environment channels as a *physical inter-rule vulnerability*. Such vulnerability can be exploited by attackers to launch attacks against IoT systems. We propose a new framework to proactively discover possible physical inter-rule interactions from user requirement specifications (i.e., descriptions) using a deep learning approach. Specifically, we utilize the Transformer model to generate trigger-action rules from their associated descriptions. We discover two types of physical inter-rule vulnerabilities and determine associated environment channels using natural language processing (NLP) tools. Given the extracted trigger-action rules and associated environment channels, an approach is proposed to identify hidden physical inter-rule vulnerabilities among them. Our experiment on 27983 IFTTT style rules shows that the Transformer can successfully extract trigger-action rules from descriptions with 95.22% accuracy. We also validate the effectiveness of our approach on 60 SmartThings official IoT apps and discover 99 possible physical inter-rule vulnerabilities.

Index Terms—IoT Service, Deep Learning, smart home, Transformer, Physical Inter-rule Vulnerabilities

I. INTRODUCTION

The Internet of Things (IoT) is growing rapidly and reshaping our lifestyles. The number of IoT devices in use has grown 16%, reaching more than 16.7 billion in 2023 [1]. These IoT devices are heterogeneous in terms of communication protocols (e.g., Bluetooth, ZigBee, Z-Wave, and Wi-Fi) and programming language. Service-oriented Computing (SOC) is a promising paradigm for abstracting IoT devices as *IoT services* by hiding the low-level implementation details of the protocols for communicating to the devices [2]. An IoT service includes both functional properties, which define its capabilities such as turning on and off, and non-functional properties, such as pricing information.

An important application domain of IoT is the smart home which is equipped with a myriad of IoT devices and services. The ultimate goal of smart homes is to improve people’s life quality by making their daily life more convenient, efficient, secure, and comfortable [3]. Customizing the smart home environment and automating IoT services by the Trigger-Action Programming (TAP) paradigm is one of the promising ways to achieve such goals. Occupants can compose multiple IoT services into an *IoT rule* (a.k.a *trigger-action rule*) in the form of “IF triggers happen, THEN perform an action” [4]. In this paper, a composite IoT service is defined as a trigger-action rule.

An example of a trigger-action rule is “IF I am not at home, THEN turn on the camera”. A trigger can be a cyber or physical event reported to the smart home system by the IoT service, such as a motion-sensing event. An action is a physical change like turning on a light. A variety of TAP platforms, such as IFTTT¹, Zapier², SmartThings³, and openHAB⁴, empower non-technical occupants to compose IoT services and Web services (e.g., social media and message apps [5]).

With an increasing number of IoT rules created by occupants, inter-rule vulnerabilities can be introduced accidentally. An inter-rule vulnerability refers to a situation resulting from the interaction between IoT services. We identify two broad categories of inter-rule vulnerabilities: *explicit inter-rule vulnerability* and *implicit/physical inter-rule vulnerability*. An explicit inter-rule vulnerability is manifested when two IoT rules compete to act on the shared IoT services, e.g., turning on and turning off the same light are requested by two IoT rules simultaneously. An implicit inter-rule vulnerability (a.k.a *physical inter-rule vulnerability*) refers to the situation that two IoT rules interact with each other through a shared environment channel/property, such as temperature, humidity, and illumination. One feature of IoT services is their capability of interacting with physical environments such as temperature, humidity, and illumination. For instance, a heater service can increase the room temperature. As a result, the physical interaction capabilities enable multiple IoT rules to interact with each other through a shared environment. The physical inter-rule vulnerability may cause a series of unexpected consequences ranging from a less comfortable home environment to security issues. For example, an IoT rule requests to turn on the air-conditioner to cool the room while another rule requests to open the window in hot summer [6]. Opening the window perhaps lets hot air come in and reduces the air-conditioner’s cooling effect. Furthermore, the physical inter-rule vulnerability may be exploited by attackers to achieve malicious purposes. An IoT rule that changes physical environments may trigger the execution of another IoT rule accidentally via their shared environment channels. For example, a *Heating* service turns on the heater when the room temperature is less than 20°C, while the *Cooling* service opens the window when the temperature is more than 25°C (i.e., temperature < 20°C → turn on the heater, temperature > 25°C → open the window). Suppose that an attacker has obtained

¹<https://ifttt.com/>

²<https://zapier.com/>

³<https://smarthings.com/>

⁴<https://openhab.org/>

access to the heater service, he/she can maliciously turn on the heater to gradually increase room temperature thereby executing the *Cooling* service to open the window.

Current works mainly focus on identifying explicit inter-rule vulnerabilities from IoT app source code [7], [8], [9], [10]. An IoT app can be modeled as a trigger-action rule [8]. These works first translate IoT apps into trigger-action rules by performing static code analysis. Then, explicit inter-rule vulnerabilities are identified by comparing the device’s attributes such as turning on and turning off the lights requested in different rules. There are a few studies that consider physical inter-rule vulnerabilities [11], [12]. They rely on static code analysis to extract trigger-action rule information from app source code and use NLP techniques to extract environment channels from rule descriptions. These works adopt a *posteriori* approach in that physical inter-rule vulnerabilities are detected after the IoT rule is deployed or the IoT system runs. In this paper, we adopt an *apriori* approach that *proactively* detects physical inter-rule vulnerabilities from user requirement specifications (i.e., descriptions) at the IoT rule design stage and prevents them from being introduced into the smart home system. Inspired by defect inspection in software development, the earlier the detection of requirements defects, the easier it will be to correct them at a lower cost [13], [14]. To this end, we propose a deep learning-based approach for automating extracting rules from their descriptions and detecting physical inter-rule vulnerabilities hidden among these extracted rules. In particular, we first extract rules from descriptions specified in natural language. For each extracted rule, we identify environment channels using the latest NLP tools. Finally, given the extracted rules and their associated environment channels, we identify possible physical inter-rule vulnerabilities. In a nutshell, the main contributions of our work are as follows:

- We propose a novel framework that extracts IoT rules from requirement specifications and identifies potential physical inter-rule vulnerabilities, intending to avoid introducing them into smart home systems. Compared to existing works that detect and eliminate vulnerabilities *after* the IoT rule deployment, to the best of our knowledge, our work is the *first* attempt to proactively discover physical inter-rule vulnerabilities from requirements at the IoT system design stage to prevent them from being introduced to the system.
- We propose a novel approach for extracting IoT rules specified in natural languages. It adapts the state-of-the-art Transformer sequence-to-sequence (seq2seq) architecture to translate an input requirement into an IoT rule.
- For each extracted IoT rule, we associated it with environment channels using the latest NLP tools. We formalize two types of physical inter-rule vulnerabilities based on the trigger-action rule model and environment channels.
- We conduct extensive experiments on two real-world datasets including IFTTT rules and SmartThings IoT apps. Our experimental results on IFTTT rules show that the proposed Transformer approach can effectively extract rules with 95.22% accuracy. Our physical inter-rule vulnerability detection approach can detect 99 possible vulnerabilities hidden among 60 IoT apps.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides an overview of the framework. Sections 3, 4, and 5 describe the IoT rule extraction, the environmental channel identification, and

physical inter-rule vulnerability detection modules, respectively. Section 6 presents the experimental results. Related work is presented in Section 7 and finally, we conclude in Section 8.

II. FRAMEWORK OVERVIEW

This section provides an overview of the framework in Fig.1. Our framework constitutes three modules including IoT rule extraction, environment channel identification, and physical inter-rule vulnerability detection. The IoT rule extraction module in Section III uses the Transformer to extract trigger-action rules (i.e., represented by a sequential pair of IoT services) from a set of descriptions. Given an extracted IoT rule and its associated description, the environment channel identification module in Section IV is responsible for finding environment channels from this description. Taking a set of extracted rules and their associated environment channels as inputs, the physical inter-rule vulnerability detection module in Section V focuses on discovering possible vulnerabilities.

III. IOT RULE EXTRACTION

In this section, we first propose a trigger-action rule model and present a deep learning approach for extracting trigger-action rules from natural language descriptions.

A. Trigger-Action Rule Model

We first formalize an IoT service based on functionalities and non-functional properties (e.g., environment channels). Then, we define the trigger-action rule based on the IoT service model.

IoT Service. An IoT service is described by a tuple $s = \langle id, \alpha, eff \rangle$ where:

- id is a unique identifier for the smart object.
- $\alpha = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n\}$ is a set of functionalities or methods offered by the service.
- $eff = \{env_1, env_2, \dots, env_n\}$ is a set of *environment channels/properties* associated with the service. An environment property env_i is impacted if the usage of the service s changes the environment value of env_i .

For example, a fan service offers functionalities including turning on/off, and setting fan speed and has the capability of changing temperature. It can be described as $\langle \{\text{fan.on, fan.off, fan.setFanSpeed}\}, \{\text{temperature}\} \rangle$. We use environment channels and environment properties interchangeably.

Trigger-Action Rule. An IoT rule or trigger-action rule r is represented by $trig \rightarrow f$ where:

- $trig = \langle trigger_title, trigger_channel \rangle$ is the trigger component where $trigger_title$ is the trigger service name, $trigger_channel$ is a service event type which can be an IoT service state (i.e., ON and OFF states of a light service), environment properties (i.e., temperature), time, and the occupant’s presence.
- $f = \langle action_title, action_channel \rangle$ is the action component where $action_title$ is a service name, $action_channel$ is a service functionality.

For example, the rule “ $\langle \text{thermometer, temperature} \rightarrow \text{AC, AC.on} \rangle$ ” means turning on the air-conditioner when the temperature reaches a certain value. It should be noticed that time and the resident’s presence can also be triggers. We do not consider them as they play little role in causing physical inter-rule vulnerabilities.




Fig. 1. Overview of the proposed framework

B. A Deep Learning Approach for IoT Rule Extraction

This section presents a deep learning approach for extracting IoT rules from descriptions. It is challenging to extract four elements $\langle trigger_title, trigger_channel \rangle \rightarrow \langle action_title, action_channel \rangle$ as a whole and ensure their correct positions. Our target is to find environment channel interactions between IoT rules. An alternative method is to identify environment channels for each IoT service from outsourced knowledge or human annotations. For example, the knowledge graph Concept-Net is used to identify environmental channels [15]. Therefore, we address this challenge by simplifying the IoT rule into $\langle trigger_title \rangle \rightarrow \langle action_title \rangle$ and identifying environment channels from outsourced knowledge using NLP tools. In the rest of the paper, an IoT rule is simplified as a sequential pair of IoT services in the form of $\langle trigger_title \rangle \rightarrow \langle action_title \rangle$.

Each IoT rule is associated with a description where an occupant specifies the expected functionality of the rule using natural language. Examples of descriptions are shown in Fig. 2. Several challenges are posed in generating trigger-action rules from descriptions: **1) Vague description.** We identify two categories of descriptions: specific and vague descriptions. A description is considered specific if it is described by *explicitly* referring to IoT services. For example, the requirement “If the air-conditioner is turned on, then close the window” explicitly shows the rule “air-conditioner \rightarrow window”. A description is considered vague if it is described using high-level and general words that *implicitly* refer to particular IoT services. For example, a vague description is “If I am coming home, then turn on the light”. It implies the rule “door \rightarrow light”. Users are prone to express their high-level intention using vague descriptions [5]. Studies show that 80% of the descriptions of IFTTT rules (a.k.a., recipes) are ambiguous because they do not explicitly mention the involved services. We find similar results in a recent IFTTT dataset used in our study that 82.8% of descriptions are vague. **2) Uncertain ordering.** The trigger and the action may appear in different orders in two different descriptions that express the same meaning. For example, “If I am watching TV, then turn on the light” (i.e., TV’s position is before that of the light) and “Turning on the light when I am watching TV” (i.e., TV’s position is after that of the light) has a similar meaning. However, the ordering of the light and TV are opposite in the two similar descriptions. **3) Varied length.** The length of descriptions is varied for different rules.

To address the aforementioned challenges, we use the Transformer sequence-to-sequence model to generate trigger-action rules from descriptions. Formally, given a set of requirement

descriptions for rules

$$Req = \{(req_1, r_1), (req_2, r_2) \cdots (req_n, r_n)\}$$

where (req_i, r_i) denotes a description and its associated trigger-action rule (i.e., (“If the AC is turned on, then close the window.”, “AC \rightarrow window”)), we aim to train a Seq2Seq model that takes a req_i as input and generates the trigger tile and action tile to form the rule r_i .

Transformer models, which are based on the attention mechanism [16], are commonly pre-trained on massive corpus and excel in a range of natural language processing tasks. Our approach fine-tunes a pre-trained Transformer Seq2Seq model to extract the trigger-action rules from plain text-based descriptions.

As shown in Fig. 3, the Transformer has the *encoder* and the *decoder* components, each constituting a stack of L identical attention blocks. The process of generating triggers and actions is illustrated in Algorithm 1. For each input description req_i in Req , it is first tokenized into a sequence of token ids via a pre-trained tokenizer which records mappings between text fragments and token ids:

$$\mathbf{T}_{in} = tokenizer(req_i) \quad (1)$$

Second, an embedding layer converts the tokens \mathbf{T}_{in} into token embedding emb_e with a dimension of d_{model} (i.e., the predefined input dimension to the model):

$$emb_e = Embedding(\mathbf{T}_{in}) \quad (2)$$

Third, we calculate the positional encodings [16] to inject the position information of the tokens in the text,

$$PE_{(pos, 2i)} = \sin(pos/10000^{2i/d_{model}}) \quad (3)$$

$$PE_{(pos, 2i+1)} = \cos(pos/10000^{2i/d_{model}}) \quad (4)$$

where pos is the position and i is the dimension.

Fourth, the *Encoder* maps the summation of emb_e and PE_e to an encoded vector E :

$$E = Encoder(emb_e + PE_e) \quad (5)$$

Fifth, the *Decoder* auto-regressively produces the output tokens with the E and the decoded tokens from the previous decoding step until an $\langle EOS \rangle$ (End of Sequence) token is produced. The prediction of the next token is shown as follows:

$$D = Decoder(E, Embedding(t_{out}^j) + PE_d) \quad (6)$$

$$t_{out}^{j+1} = \operatorname{argmax}(\operatorname{softmax}(D)) \quad (7)$$

Descriptions	IoT rules
R1: Heating the room when temperature is less than 20 degrees	thermometer-->heater
R2: If I am coming home, then turn on the light	door->light
R3: Turning on the light if I am watching TV	TV-->light
R4: If the airconditioner is turned on, then close the window	airconditioner-->window
R5: Keeping me cozy	thermometer->airconditioner
R6: Smoke free in the kitchen	smoke sensor-->window
R7: If I am cooking, turn on the kitchen hood.	stove-->kitchen hood

Fig. 2. Extracting IoT rules from descriptions




Fig. 3. The architecture of the Transformer model.

Algorithm 1 Transformer for Generating Trigger-action Rules

Input: Req (a set of descriptions);
Output: R (a set of extracted IoT rules)

- 1: **for all** req_i in Req **do**
- 2: Tokenize and extract embedding req_i as emb_e
- 3: Get the positional encoding PE_e by formula (3) and (4)
- 4: Extract the encoding vector via the Encoder as E by formula (2)
- 5: $t^0 \leftarrow [\text{BOS}]$
- 6: $j \leftarrow 1$
- 7: **while** t^{j-1} is not $[\text{EOS}]$ **do**
- 8: Tokenize t^{j-1} and extract the embedding as emb_d^j
- 9: Get the positional encoding PE_d^j by formula (3) and (4)
- 10: Decode and predict the next token t^j by formula (6) and (7)
- 11: $j \leftarrow j + 1$
- 12: $T_{out}.append(t^j)$
- 13: **end while**
- 14: Convert all tokens in T_{out} to texts via the tokenizer and add them to R
- 15: **end for**
- 16: **return** R

where t_{out}^0 equals to $\langle \text{BOS} \rangle$ (Begin of Sequence). Finally, the tokenizer converts the decoded tokens back into words as the final output.

IV. ENVIRONMENT CHANNEL IDENTIFICATION

Environment channel identification (i.e., physical channel identification) aims at extracting environment properties from descriptions. An environment channel is an environment entity through which IoT services interact with each other indirectly. We consider six common environment entities including *temperature*, *illumination*, *smoke*, *sound*, *humidity* and *air quality*. We

employ the latest ChatGPT-4 to identify environment channels from descriptions. ChatGPT-4 has shown great potential in processing text data in the task of entity recognition [17][18]. The key task of asking ChatGPT-4 is to design the proper prompts. We directly input descriptions into ChatGPT-4 and instruct it to extract environment channels.

Prompt Instruction: “Please compute the similarity between a sample in the sentence list with every element in the keyword list. The output should be the most similar keyword with a similarity score for each sample. If no keyword is matched, print “None”. The output is in the format of: “keyword, score” or “None”. The keyword list is [“temperature”, “illumination”, “humidity”, “smoke”, “sound”, “air quality”]. The sentence list is $[des_1, des_2, \dots, des_n]$.”

Ground Truth and Performance: We collect descriptions of 60 IoT apps and manually annotate each involved IoT service with environment channels as ground truth. For example, light is associated with “illumination”. Some devices, such as doors and windows, may have multiple environment channels in different smart home layouts. The context of doors and windows greatly influences their environment channels. We conduct two groups of physical channel identification. In the first group, all IoT services, except for doors and windows, are appropriately assigned environment channels. In the second group, all devices are assigned proper environment channels in which doors and windows are assigned with *temperature*, *humidity*, and *illumination*.

The outputs are collected from the online ChatGPT-4 interface and compared with the ground truth. We calculate the accuracy of correctly identified environment channels. In the first group, the accuracy of physical channel identification is 93.3%, whereas it is 83.3% in the second group. The results show that ChatGPT-4 performs well in identifying the main effects of an IoT service on the environment, whereas performs poorly in inferring an IoT service’s side effects on the environment, e.g., the primary environmental effect of the air-conditioner is reducing the temperature, while its secondary environmental effects include generating noise and reducing humidity.

V. PHYSICAL INTER-RULE VULNERABILITY DETECTION

This section first formally defines two types of physical inter-rule vulnerabilities (i.e., Environment Channel Rule Chain and Environment Channel Interference) based on the trigger-action rule model and environment channels. Then it describes the process of the physical inter-rule vulnerability detection module.

Environment Channel Rule Chain: An Environment Channel Rule Chain exists if the environmental impact of executing

an IoT rule triggers or disables the execution of another rule accidentally. For example, a rule turns on the humidifier to make the air more humid in the living room. The air humidity increases after turning on the humidifier for a while. As a result, the increasing air humidity may activate the dehumidifier automatically to dehumidify the air. Formally, given two IoT rules r_i and r_j , the action title service s_i in the former rule has a set of environment channels $eff_i = \{env_1, env_2, \dots, env_n\}$. These environmental channels may be the triggering channel of the latter rule. The following condition is satisfied:

$$eff_i \cap trigger_channel^j \neq \phi \quad (8)$$

Environment Channel Interference: An Environment Channel Interference refers to the situation that two rules update the shared environment properties. For example, a rule requests to use the air-conditioning to cool the living room in hot summer while another rule opens the window to let outside fresh air come in. An environment channel interference may occur because opening the window would let hot air come in and impact the air-conditioning’s cooling effect. Formally, given two IoT rules $trig^i \rightarrow f^i$ and $trig^j \rightarrow f^j$, their action titles are the service s_i and s_j , respectively. The environment channels associated with s_i and s_j are $eff_i = \{env_1, env_2, \dots, env_n\}$ and $eff_j = \{env_1, env_2, \dots, env_m\}$, respectively. The following conditions should hold:

$$(s_i \neq s_j) \wedge (eff_i \cap eff_j \neq \phi) \quad (9)$$

The physical inter-rule vulnerability detection module takes all extracted trigger-action rules and identified environment channels as inputs. The outputs are all possible vulnerabilities (i.e., Environment Channel Rule Chains or Environment Channel Interference), which are generated by connecting inter-rule interactions through proper environment channels.

Specifically, this module detects physical inter-rule vulnerabilities from a set of extracted rules in a *particular* smart home setting. In a particular smart home setting, we assume the *location* information of each IoT service is available because IoT services in different locations are less likely to be physically interacting. In this regard, physical inter-rule vulnerability detection is conducted for IoT services that are located at the same location. In this work, we collect and assign a semantic location such as a bathroom and bedroom to each IoT service. We use a dictionary to store rules. Given two rules $r_i : trig^i \rightarrow f^i$ and $r_j : trig^j \rightarrow f^j$, we check whether there are vulnerabilities between them based on the physical inter-rule vulnerability model defined in Equation (8) and (9).

VI. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

We conduct a set of experiments to evaluate our proposed framework. The first set examines the performance of extracting trigger-actions rules from descriptions. The second set evaluates the effectiveness of detecting physical inter-rule vulnerabilities. The experiments are implemented in Python and use open-source packages Pytorch⁵ and HuggingFace [19]. The experiments are performed on an Ubuntu 20.04 server with AMD EPYC 7763 CPU@2.45GHz, NVIDIA RTX A6000 (49GB).

Experiment I: Performance of the Transformer in extracting trigger-action rules from descriptions. This experiment aims to evaluate the performance of the Transformer in generating

trigger-action rules from descriptions. It is conducted on the latest IFTTT rules⁶ (a.k.a., recipes) collected from the popular trigger-action programming platform IFTTT in May 2017. It contains 27983 rules. We preprocess the raw dataset by removing noise data that are not written in English. We join the *Title* and *Description* columns as the description and use the (*triggerTitle*, *actionTitle*) columns as the ground truth value i.e., the sequential IoT service pairs. An example of the dataset is (“Turn off lights when motion is no longer detected by Wyze Motion Sensor”), (Wyze, Philips Hue). We use *accuracy* as the metric of the performance, which is defined as follows:

$$accuracy = \frac{|correct|}{|samples|} \quad (10)$$

where $|samples|$ is the total number of samples and $|correct|$ is the number of correctly predicted trigger tile and action title that are aligned sequentially. It should be noted that a sample counted as *correct* must meet two constraints at the same time: 1) both the predicted trigger title and action title must exist in the ground truth sample, and 2) the sequential relation between the predicted trigger title and action title must be the same as the one in the corresponding ground truth sample.

TABLE I
HYPERPARAMETER SETTINGS FOR THE TRANSFORMER

Hyperparameters	Values
batch size(\mathcal{B})	32
learning rate (η)	5e-4
number of beams (n)	5
epoch (ep)	50
optimizer	AdamW
search algorithm	Beam search

We utilize T5 [20] as our backbone model due to its effectiveness on diverse NLP tasks. Specifically, we initialize our model with T5-large and follow the default settings of T5 to fine-tune our Transformer model as shown in Table I. We set batch size \mathcal{B} , learning rate η , number of beams n and epoch ep to be 32, 5e-4, 5, and 50, respectively. We choose the AdamW optimizer for the Gradient descent algorithm and use the standard beam search decoding algorithm [21] to find the best prediction results. We use 80% and 20% of the dataset for training and testing, respectively. Table II shows the accuracy of the Transformer in generating trigger-action rules. The Transformer achieves an overall accuracy score of approximately 95.22% on the test samples.

TABLE II
RESULTS OF THE TRANSFORMER IN GENERATING TRIGGER-ACTION RULES.

Groups	# Samples	<i>accuracy_T</i>
Specific descriptions	4799	99.29%
Vague descriptions	23184	94.37%
All	27983	95.22%

A key feature of the dataset is that it contains both *specific* and *vague* descriptions. A description is considered specific if it is described by *explicitly* referring to IoT services. For example, the description “If the air-conditioner is turned on, then close the window” explicitly shows the rule “air-conditioner \rightarrow window”. A description is considered vague if it is described using high-level and general words that *implicitly* refer to particular IoT

⁵<https://pytorch.org/>

⁶https://www-users.cse.umn.edu/~fengqian/ifttt_measurement/

services. For example, a vague description is “If I am coming home, then turn on the light”. It implies the rule “door \rightarrow light”. Therefore, the Transformer model should be capable of learning specific IoT services from vague descriptions. To study such generalization capability of the Transformer, we split the dataset into two groups: specific description group containing 4,799 samples, and vague descriptions containing 23,184 samples. We test the Transformer on these two groups. As expected, the Transformer achieves much higher accuracy (99.29%) in the specific description group than that in the vague description group. The experiment result demonstrates that the Transformer performs well in extracting trigger-action rules from descriptions and generalizing well on vague descriptions that express a high level of user intention.

Experiment II: Effectiveness of physical inter-rule vulnerability detection. This experiment aims to evaluate the effectiveness of our physical inter-rule vulnerability detection approach. We study 185 official IoT apps provided by the SmartThings platform⁷. Some IoT apps are too complex that are implementations of multiple trigger-action rules, which would generate excessive physical inter-rule vulnerabilities. Some IoT apps only use Web services that don’t interact with physical environments. We exclude these two types of IoT apps using the SmartVisual tool [22] and finally use 60 representative IoT apps for our evaluation.

Each IoT app is associated with a description. For example, the app *brighten-my-path* has the description “Turn your lights on when motion is detected”. Given a description of an IoT app, we manually extract its trigger-action rules. Next, we identify environment channels for each trigger-action rule. We use the latest ChatGPT-4 to identify environment channels as described in Section IV. It successfully identifies three environment channels in total including *temperature*, *humidity*, and *illumination*. Our environment channel identification analysis successfully connects 93.3% (56 out of 60 IoT apps) of the IoT rules with the correct environment channels. The failures mainly come from the case that a description contains no environment channel-related information. For example, the description “Turn on one or more switches at a specified time and turn them off at a later time” is not assigned with any environment channels even if the switch capability is subscribed by lights.

We compare each pair of IoT rules and check possible physical inter-rule vulnerabilities using Equations (8) and (9), and discover 99 physical inter-rule vulnerabilities. 60.6% (60 out of 99) of them are Environment Channel Rule Chain vulnerabilities that one rule execution may trigger or disable the execution of another rule via the identified environment channel (i.e., temperature, humidity, and illumination). The rest are Environment Channel Interference vulnerabilities that two rules may update the shared environment channel simultaneously.

Discussion: We propose a deep learning-based approach (Transformer) to extract trigger-action rules from descriptions and discover hidden physical inter-rule vulnerabilities via shared environment channels. The noticeable novelty of our approach is that it proactively identifies physical inter-rule vulnerabilities at the IoT rule specification stage, thereby preventing introducing them into the smart home system. However, several limitations deserve attention: (1). The accuracy of environment channel

identification highly relies on the context of a given smart home. For example, the window in one smart home impacts temperature while it may not have such a feature in another home. External information, such as the layout of a home, or occupants’ feedback can help in improving the accuracy of environment channel identification. (2). Some physical inter-rule vulnerabilities are severe and risky and need to be resolved immediately, while others are less serious and can be ignored. An assessment mechanism is needed to evaluate the risk levels of the vulnerabilities.

VII. RELATED WORK

Our work lies at the intersection of research in three related areas: trigger-action programming, rule extraction from natural language descriptions, and inter-rule vulnerability detection.

A. Trigger-action programming

The proliferation of IoT services brings many opportunities to smart homes, making residents’ home lives more convenient, efficient, secure, and entertaining by automating IoT services [3]. End-User Development (EUD) focuses on providing technologies and tools and putting the IoT-based applications/services development in the hands of residents who are most familiar with the actual needs but have limited programming skills [23]. EUD is a promising approach to automate and remotely control IoT services, which empowers residents who have little programming knowledge to customize smart homes by trigger-action programming. A trigger-action program can be expressed by IF-THEN rules in the form of “IF triggers happen, THEN perform an action” [4]. Triggers and actions are connected by conditions that are logical predicates defined by the current state of the triggering events. If the triggering event makes the condition true, the corresponding action is exerted. Several EUD platforms, e.g., IFTTT, Zapier, SmartThings, and OpenHAB, offer the tools so that non-technical residents can compose IoT services.

B. Inter-Rule Vulnerability Detection

Inter-rule vulnerability is becoming a critical issue in trigger-action programming platforms. It is estimated that around 15% of rules on the IFTTT platform have inter-rule vulnerabilities [24]. The majority of studies perform *static code analysis* on IoT app sources to extract TAP rules and then inspect inter-rule vulnerabilities [7], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12], [25], [26]. Some of these works consider physical inter-rule vulnerabilities [11], [12], [25], [26].

The proposed framework, *IoTMon*, aims to discover physical interactions between IoT apps [11]. These interactions occur when IoT devices communicate through shared environment channels like temperature, humidity, and air. The framework extracts information from the app’s source code to create intra-app interactions and employs NLP techniques to identify physical channels from the app’s descriptions. By chaining together these interactions through the identified physical channels, the framework generates interaction chains. The risk level of these interaction chains is evaluated based on the similarity score between intra-app interactions of trustworthy applications. In [12], the proposed system, *IoTSAFE*, focuses on detecting physical interactions between IoT devices in smart homes. It utilizes a run-time physical interaction discovery approach that involves static code analysis to construct an interaction graph

⁷<https://github.com/SmartThingsCommunity/SmartThingsPublic>

and dynamic testing techniques to discover real-time physical interactions among IoT devices. The system also leverages contextual features to predict future risky situations and disable unsafe device states using the interaction graph and the temporal physical interaction graph.

The proposed framework, *IoTSeer*, is designed to identify physical interactions between IoT apps [25]. These interactions involve IoT devices communicating through shared environment channels. The framework extracts information from the app’s source code to create intra-app interactions and utilizes NLP techniques to identify physical channels from the app’s descriptions. By linking these interactions through the identified physical channels, the framework generates interaction chains. The risk level of these chains is evaluated by comparing their similarity to intra-app interactions of trustworthy applications. A system called *iRULER* is developed to identify inter-rule vulnerabilities that exist within trigger-action platforms [26]. It identifies six types of vulnerabilities and formally defines them. It extracts inter-rule information flows by using Natural Language Processing (NLP) to inspect the text descriptions of triggers and actions on the IoT platform website. It performs Satisfiability Modulo Theories (SMT) solving and model checking to discover inter-rule vulnerabilities using extracted information flow.

C. Trigger-Action Rule Generation

The task of trigger-action rule generation is to predict elements including trigger title, trigger channel, action tile, and action channel from descriptions. Prior works treat the problem of trigger-action rule generation as a multi-task classification task. A proposed approach to address this problem involves combining a neural network with logistic regression [27]. It formulates the problem of natural language understanding as a structure prediction problem. The predicted element is conditioned on the whole input and all prior decisions. The existing work proposes a Latent Attention Model (LAM) to generate trigger actions automatically [28]. Taking a natural language description of the intended TAP as the input, LAM identifies the contained channel and function for trigger and action respectively. For example, given the description “Autosave your Instagram photos to Dropbox”, LAM predicts its trigger channel “Instagram” has the trigger channel Instagram, trigger function “Any new photo by you”, action channel “Dropbox”, and action function “Add a file from URL”. LAM utilizes a latent attention mechanism to locate the words in the description that are the most relevant for predicting desired labels.

The current state-of-the-art research frames the TAP generation as a sequence-to-sequence learning problem [29]. A recent study proposes an approach RecipeGen to automatically generate TAP rules given natural language descriptions [30]. RecipeGen treats the TAP generation as a natural language translation problem. It leverages Transformer sequence-to-sequence (seq2seq) architecture to generate a sequence of triggers and actions from natural language descriptions. Compared to LAM which performs poorly when the description is vague, RecipeGen generalizes well and performs better because it learns implicit relations between the channels, functions, and fields of triggers and actions. A Hierarchical Reinforcement Learning (HRL) approach is proposed to parse trigger channels, trigger functions, action channels, and action functions from a

natural language description [31]. It decomposes the task into 4 subtasks (i.e., predicting trigger/action channel/function), and designs hierarchical policies: a high-level policy on deciding the order of the task and a low-level policy on deciding whether to ask users a clarification question. The policies are trained to maximize the parsing accuracy and minimize the number of questions with the rewarding mechanism.

VIII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we propose a novel approach to proactively discover and prevent physical inter-rule vulnerabilities of Internet of Things (IoT) services in smart homes. We particularly rely on a deep learning model (Transformer) to accurately learn trigger-action rules from natural language descriptions that are associated with the rules. We also utilize the latest ChatGPT 4 to identify environment channels for each extracted rule with high accuracy. We propose two types of physical inter-rule vulnerabilities and formalize them based on the formal trigger-action rule model. The experiments on real-world datasets demonstrate the high performance of the Transformer in generating trigger-action rules. We also validate the effectiveness of the approach in detecting physical inter-rule vulnerabilities on existing IoT apps. In the future, we plan to devise a risk-level assessment mechanism to evaluate the severity of physical inter-rule vulnerabilities. We also plan to learn occupants’ preferences towards environmental properties for dynamically resolving physical inter-rule vulnerabilities.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The research for this project is supported by Cyber Security Agency of Singapore (CSA).

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Sinha, “State of iot 2023: Number of connected iot devices growing 16% to 16.7 billion globally,” <https://iot-analytics.com/number-connected-iot-devices/>, accessed: 2023-07-24.
- [2] V. Issarny, G. Bouloukakis, N. Georgantas, and B. Billet, “Revisiting service-oriented architecture for the iot: a middleware perspective,” in *Service-Oriented Computing: 14th International Conference, ICSOC 2016, Banff, AB, Canada, October 10-13, 2016, Proceedings 14*. Springer, 2016, pp. 3–17.
- [3] B. Huang, “Enabling convenience in iot-based smart homes,” Ph.D. dissertation, 2021.
- [4] F. Corno, L. De Russis, and A. Monge Roffarello, “Recurles: recommending if-then rules for end-user development,” *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 1–27, 2019.
- [5] —, “Taprec: supporting the composition of trigger-action rules through dynamic recommendations,” in *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*, 2020, pp. 579–588.
- [6] J. Hua, H. Yu, S. Lee, H. M. Adal, C. Milhaupt, G.-C. Roman, and C. Julien, “Copi: Enabling probabilistic conflict prediction in smart space through context-awareness,” in *2022 IEEE/ACM Seventh International Conference on Internet-of-Things Design and Implementation (IoTDI)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 30–42.
- [7] Y. Yu and J. Liu, “Tapinspector: Safety and liveness verification of concurrent trigger-action iot systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 17, pp. 3773–3788, 2022.
- [8] H. Chi, Q. Zeng, X. Du, and J. Yu, “Cross-app interference threats in smart homes: Categorization, detection and handling,” in *2020 50th Annual IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks (DSN)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 411–423.
- [9] M. Alhanahnah, C. Stevens, and H. Bagheri, “Scalable analysis of interaction threats in iot systems,” in *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*, 2020, pp. 272–285.
- [10] Z. Chen, F. Zeng, T. Lu, and W. Shu, “Multi-platform application interaction extraction for iot devices,” in *2019 IEEE 25th International Conference on Parallel and Distributed Systems (ICPADS)*, 2019, pp. 990–995.

- [11] W. Ding and H. Hu, "On the safety of iot device physical interaction control," in *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2018, pp. 832–846.
- [12] W. Ding, H. Hu, and L. Cheng, "Iotsafe: Enforcing safety and security policy with real iot physical interaction discovery," in *the 28th Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS 2021)*, 2021.
- [13] A. A. Alshazly, A. M. Elfatry, and M. S. Abougabal, "Detecting defects in software requirements specification," *Alexandria Engineering Journal*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 513–527, 2014.
- [14] F. Huang and L. Bin, "Software defect prevention based on human error theories," *Chinese Journal of Aeronautics*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 1054–1070, 2017.
- [15] B. Huang, H. Dong, and A. Bouguettaya, "Conflict detection in iot-based smart homes," in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 303–313.
- [16] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, "Attention is all you need," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [17] Y. Hu, I. Ameer, X. Zuo, X. Peng, Y. Zhou, Z. Li, Y. Li, J. Li, X. Jiang, and H. Xu, "Zero-shot clinical entity recognition using chatgpt," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16416*, 2023.
- [18] X. Wei, X. Cui, N. Cheng, X. Wang, X. Zhang, S. Huang, P. Xie, J. Xu, Y. Chen, M. Zhang *et al.*, "Zero-shot information extraction via chatting with chatgpt," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.10205*, 2023.
- [19] T. Wolf, L. Debut, V. Sanh, J. Chaumond, C. Delangue, A. Moi, P. Cistac, T. Rault, R. Louf, M. Funtowicz *et al.*, "Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing," in *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, 2020, pp. 38–45.
- [20] C. Raffel, N. Shazeer, A. Roberts, K. Lee, S. Narang, M. Matena, Y. Zhou, W. Li, P. J. Liu *et al.*, "Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 21, no. 140, pp. 1–67, 2020.
- [21] I. Sutskever, O. Vinyals, and Q. V. Le, "Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 27, 2014.
- [22] N.-Y. Bak, B.-M. Chang, and K. Choi, "Smartvisual: a visualisation tool for smarthings iot apps using static analysis," *IET Software*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 411–422, 2020.
- [23] G. Ghiani, M. Manca, F. Paternò, and C. Santoro, "Personalization of context-dependent applications through trigger-action rules," *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interactions*, vol. 24, no. 2, apr 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3057861>
- [24] Q. Wu, B. Shen, and Y. Chen, "Learning to recommend trigger-action rules for end-user development: A knowledge graph based approach," in *Reuse in Emerging Software Engineering Practices: 19th International Conference on Software and Systems Reuse, ICSR 2020, Hammamet, Tunisia, December 2–4, 2020, Proceedings 19*. Springer, 2020, pp. 190–207.
- [25] M. O. Ozmen, X. Li, A. Chu, Z. B. Celik, and Hoxha, "Discovering iot physical channel vulnerabilities," in *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2022, pp. 2415–2428.
- [26] Q. Wang, P. Datta, W. Yang, S. Liu, A. Bates, and C. A. Gunter, "Charting the attack surface of trigger-action iot platforms," in *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2019, pp. 1439–1453.
- [27] I. Beltagy and C. Quirk, "Improved semantic parsers for if-then statements," in *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2016, pp. 726–736.
- [28] C. Liu, X. Chen, E. C. Shin, M. Chen, and D. Song, "Latent attention for if-then program synthesis," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 29, 2016.
- [29] D. Dalal and B. V. Galbraith, "Evaluating sequence-to-sequence learning models for if-then program synthesis," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.03485*, 2020.
- [30] I. N. B. Yusuf, L. Jiang, and D. Lo, "Accurate generation of trigger-action programs with domain-adapted sequence-to-sequence learning," in *Proceedings of the 30th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Program Comprehension*, 2022, pp. 99–110.
- [31] Z. Yao, X. Li, J. Gao, B. Sadler, and H. Sun, "Interactive semantic parsing for if-then recipes via hierarchical reinforcement learning," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 33, no. 01, 2019, pp. 2547–2554.