

---

# DOMURLS\_BERT: PRE-TRAINED BERT-BASED MODEL FOR MALICIOUS DOMAINS AND URLS DETECTION AND CLASSIFICATION

---

Abdelkader El Mahdaouy<sup>1</sup>, Salima Lamsiyah<sup>2</sup>, Meryem Janati Idrissi<sup>1</sup>, Hamza Alami<sup>3</sup>, Zakaria Yartaoui<sup>4,5</sup>, and Ismail Berrada<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>College of Computing, Mohammed VI Polytechnic University, Ben Guerir, Morocco

<sup>2</sup>Department of Computer Science, Faculty of Science, Technology and Medicine, University of Luxembourg, Luxembourg

<sup>3</sup>LISAC Laboratory, Faculty of Sciences Dhar El Mehraz, USMBA, Fez, Morocco

<sup>4</sup>Vanguard Center, Mohammed VI Polytechnic University, Ben Guerir, Morocco

<sup>5</sup>National Moroccan Computer Emergency and Response Team (maCert), Morocco,

firstname.lastname@{um6p.ma<sup>1,4</sup>|uni.lu<sup>2</sup>|usmba.ac.ma<sup>3</sup>}

September 17, 2024

## ABSTRACT

Detecting and classifying suspicious or malicious domain names and URLs is fundamental task in cybersecurity. To leverage such indicators of compromise, cybersecurity vendors and practitioners often maintain and update blacklists of known malicious domains and URLs. However, blacklists frequently fail to identify emerging and obfuscated threats. Over the past few decades, there has been significant interest in developing machine learning models that automatically detect malicious domains and URLs, addressing the limitations of blacklists maintenance and updates. In this paper, we introduce DomURLs\_BERT, a pre-trained BERT-based encoder adapted for detecting and classifying suspicious/malicious domains and URLs. DomURLs\_BERT is pre-trained using the Masked Language Modeling (MLM) objective on a large multilingual corpus of URLs, domain names, and Domain Generation Algorithms (DGA) dataset. In order to assess the performance of DomURLs\_BERT, we have conducted experiments on several binary and multi-class classification tasks involving domain names and URLs, covering phishing, malware, DGA, and DNS tunneling. The evaluations results show that the proposed encoder outperforms state-of-the-art character-based deep learning models and cybersecurity-focused BERT models across multiple tasks and datasets. The pre-training dataset<sup>1</sup>, the pre-trained DomURLs\_BERT<sup>2</sup> encoder, and the experiments source code<sup>3</sup> are publicly available.

## 1 Introduction

Domain names and Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) are fundamental components in navigating and identifying resources on the Internet. Nevertheless, they are frequently exploited for various malicious activities in cyberspace, such as phishing campaigns, malware distribution, spam dissemination, and Command and Control (C&C) server operations, among others [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. Thus, detecting and flagging malicious domains and URLs is crucial for network security. Traditionally, cybersecurity vendors and practitioners rely on blacklists and heuristic methods to identify malicious domain names and URLs [6, 7, 8, 9]. While blacklists are essential for blocking known threats, they are reactive by

---

<sup>1</sup>[https://hf.co/datasets/amahdaouy/Web\\_DomURLs](https://hf.co/datasets/amahdaouy/Web_DomURLs)

<sup>2</sup>[https://hf.co/amahdaouy/DomURLs\\_BERT](https://hf.co/amahdaouy/DomURLs_BERT)

<sup>3</sup>[https://github.com/AbdelkaderMH/DomURLs\\_BERT](https://github.com/AbdelkaderMH/DomURLs_BERT)

nature, posing challenges in maintenance and being vulnerable to evasion techniques. On the other hand, heuristic methods, which use patterns and behavioral analysis to identify potential threats, offer a more proactive approach to detection [7, 10, 11]. However, they are prone to false positives and require continuous updates to remain effective against evolving obfuscation tactics [4, 5, 10, 12, 13].

To overcome the limitations of blacklisting and heuristic-based methods, a growing body of research has focused on developing Machine Learning (ML) techniques for detecting malicious URLs and domain names [2, 8, 12]. The goal of these approaches is to automatically train models that can distinguish between legitimate and malicious threats based on data. Traditional ML-based techniques rely heavily on hand-engineered features, where the learning process involves identifying patterns in the data to guide the model’s decision-making. Consequently, numerous studies have proposed various feature sets for ML-based classification of malicious domains and URLs [2, 4, 9, 11]. Although ML-based methods have demonstrated promising results across different domain name and URL classification tasks, the manual feature engineering process is both costly and time-consuming [6, 7].

Recently, a considerable amount of literature has been published on the use of Deep Learning (DL) for detecting and classifying malicious domain names and URLs [5, 6, 7, 13]. These studies leverage the representation learning capabilities of deep neural networks, which can automatically learn hierarchical features at different levels of abstraction from raw input data [14]. As a result, various neural network architectures have been explored. Typically, these architectures either use hand-engineered features or learn representations of characters, n-grams, and sub-words for classifying malicious domain names and URLs [6, 13, 15, 16, 17].

The introduction of the transformer architecture [18] has resulted in significant breakthroughs and advancements in Artificial Intelligence. Beyond natural language processing, transformers have been employed in various fields such as computer vision, data science, robotics, and cybersecurity [19, 20, 21, 22]. Particularly, self-supervised pre-training of stacked transformer blocks—whether in encoder, decoder, or encoder-decoder configurations—has demonstrated state-of-the-art performance when fine-tuned for downstream tasks [23, 24]. In line with the pretrain-finetune paradigm, researchers have proposed fine-tuning or adapting pre-trained Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT) [25] for cybersecurity tasks [5, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32]. Following the domain-adaptive pre-training approach, several BERT-based encoders have been pre-trained using the Masked Language Modeling (MLM) objective on domain-specific corpora for the classification of malicious and phishing URLs [22, 29, 33, 31]. However, these models have not been explicitly pre-trained on both domain names and URLs, and much of the existing research has focused primarily on phishing URLs.

In this paper, we introduce DomURLs\_BERT, a BERT-based encoder pre-trained on a large-scale corpus using the MLM objective. The pre-training corpus includes multilingual URLs, domain names, and Domain Generation Algorithms (DGA) datasets. Additionally, we propose a lightweight preprocessing method for the input data and train our model’s tokenizer from scratch using SentencePiece tokenization. To evaluate the performance of DomURLs\_BERT in detecting malicious URLs and domain names, we conducted a comprehensive evaluation on a diverse set of datasets covering DGA, DNS tunneling techniques, malware classification, and phishing/malicious URL classification. The overall results show that our model outperforms six character-based deep learning models and four BERT-based models on multiple classification tasks. To summarize, the main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We introduce DomURLs\_BERT, a specialized BERT-based encoder pre-trained on a large-scale multilingual corpus of URLs, domain names, and DGA datasets.
- We propose a light preprocessing tailored to the characteristics of URLs and domain names, and train domain-specific tokenizer.
- We evaluate DomURLs\_BERT on various malicious URLs and domain names classification tasks, including DGA, DNS tunneling, malware classification, and phishing.
- We conduct our experiments on both binary and multi-class classification tasks.
- We compare our model with several state-of-the-art deep learning models, including character-based models and pre-trained cybersecurity BERT models.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 reviews related work in the field of malicious domain and URL detection. In Section 3, we describe the proposed method for DomURLs\_BERT pre-training. Sections 4 presents the experimental results. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper and outlines potential directions for future research.

## 2 Related Work

The field of natural language processing is currently undergoing a revolutionary transformation, driven by the advent of large pre-trained language models (PLMs) based on the groundbreaking Transformer architecture [18]. However,

applying these models to domain-specific tasks poses challenges, as general models often fail to represent domain-specific terms and contexts not covered in their training data. To address this issue, domain-specific PLMs have been developed, such as BioBERT [34] for biomedical text and SciBERT [35] for scientific literature. Similarly, in the cybersecurity domain, several models based on the BERT architecture [25] have been created to capture domain-specific language and improve performance on cybersecurity-related tasks [22].

For instance, CyBERT [36] is a domain-specific variant of BERT pre-trained on a large cybersecurity corpus using MLM. It focuses on generating contextualized embeddings specifically designed for cybersecurity tasks like cyber threat intelligence and malware detection. In the same context, CySecBERT [21] is a domain-adapted version of BERT pre-trained on large cybersecurity corpora. It is designed to improve performance across multiple cybersecurity tasks, including classification and named entity recognition while addressing challenges like catastrophic forgetting during domain adaptation. CySecBERT has demonstrated superior performance compared to both BERT and CyBERT in several cybersecurity tasks. Additionally, SecureBERT [20], based on the RoBERTa architecture, incorporates continual pre-training with a specialized tokenizer and fine-tuned pre-trained weights to capture both general and cybersecurity-specific language. Evaluated on MLM and NER tasks, SecureBERT has shown promising results in comprehending cybersecurity text. On the other hand, SecBERT [19], developed from scratch, is trained on various cybersecurity corpora, such as "APTnotes" and "CASIE," and targets a broad range of cybersecurity data.

More recently, several models have focused on specific tasks within the cybersecurity domain. For example, MalBERT [37], a BERT-based model, is specialized in detecting malicious software. Similarly, Li et al. [29] introduced URLBERT, the first pre-trained model specifically designed for URL classification and detection tasks. URLBERT incorporates novel pre-training techniques, such as self-supervised contrastive learning and virtual adversarial training, to enhance its understanding of URL structures and robustness, achieving state-of-the-art results in phishing detection and web page classification. Motivated by the success of PLMs in cybersecurity tasks, we propose DomURLs\_BERT, a specialized BERT-based encoder pre-trained on a large multilingual corpus of URLs, domain names, and DGA datasets. This paper contextualizes DomURLs\_BERT by reviewing recent studies on the classification of malicious domain names and URLs. For a detailed review of existing large language models in cybersecurity, readers can refer to the recent study by Xu et al. [22].

## 2.1 Malicious domain names classification

Detecting malicious domains, especially those generated by domain generation algorithms, is a crucial task in cybersecurity. Early work by Yadav et al. [1] laid the foundation by focusing on detecting algorithmically generated malicious domain names through linguistic analysis. Building on this, Cucchiarelli et al. [9] proposed using n-gram features, enhancing the ability to capture linguistic patterns in DGA-generated domains. Liew and Law [17] further advanced the field by introducing subword tokenization techniques for DGA classification, a method that allows more granular token analysis, improving model robustness against unseen domain variations. Shi et al. [8] explored machine learning techniques, particularly extreme machine learning, for detecting malicious domain names. This approach demonstrates the effectiveness of using machine learning models to identify domains that exhibit abnormal patterns. Tian et al. [32] introduced Dom-bert, a pre-trained model designed to detect malicious domains, leveraging contextual information embedded in domain names to enhance detection performance. In the broader context, Kang [3] reviewed various malicious domain detection techniques, while Hamroun et al. [11] focused specifically on lexical-based methods, emphasizing the importance of features derived from the domain names themselves. Together, these works underscore the importance of both lexical features and advanced machine-learning techniques in detecting DGA-generated and malicious domains.

## 2.2 Malicious URLs classification

In the field of malicious URLs detection, machine learning and deep learning approaches have been extensively studied and developed, with significant advancements in recent years. These approaches can be broadly categorized into traditional machine learning methods, neural network-based methods, and transformer-based models. Traditional machine learning methods, which rely on manually engineered features, were initially prominent in malicious URL detection. Sahoo et al. [2] provided a comprehensive survey of these early efforts, highlighting how machine learning techniques such as support vector machines, decision trees, naive Bayes, and random forests were applied to extract statistical and lexical features from URLs. Similarly, Aljabri et al. [4] reviewed more recent methods and highlighted the shift toward deep learning techniques due to their ability to automate feature extraction and improve detection performance.

The shift towards deep learning led to the development of several promising models. In this context, Le et al. [6] proposed URLNet, a deep learning-based method that captures both character- and word-level representations of URLs

to improve classification accuracy. Vazhayil et al. [15] performed a comparative study between shallow and deep networks, concluding that deep networks outperform traditional machine learning models by capturing more complex patterns in URLs. Afzal et al. [16] took this further by introducing `Urldeedetect`, a deep learning model that integrates semantic vector models to enhance URL representation.

More recently, transformer-based models have emerged as a dominant approach, driven by their capacity to understand the semantic and contextual information of URLs. As previously mentioned, the BERT model and its variants have been particularly influential in this area. Chang et al. [26] and Otieno et al. [27] explored the application of BERT for URL detection, demonstrating that transformer models outperform traditional methods in terms of both accuracy and robustness. Building on these efforts, Su et al. [28] and Yu et al. [5] proposed modified BERT variants that further enhance semantic understanding for malicious URL detection. The introduction of URLBERT by Li et al. [29], a contrastive and adversarial pre-trained model, continues this trend, pushing the boundaries of transformer-based URL classification. Several other transformer-based models have also been proposed, focusing on improving phishing URL detection. For example, URLTran [33] applies transformers specifically to phishing detection, while Bozkir et al. [13] introduced GramBeddings, a neural network that utilizes n-gram embeddings to enhance the identification of phishing URLs. This direction was further extended by Liu et al. [30], who combined a pre-trained language model with multi-level feature attention for improved detection accuracy.

Overall, the progression from traditional machine learning approaches to advanced deep learning and transformer-based models has significantly improved the ability to classify malicious URLs. The integration of semantic understanding, n-gram embeddings, and pre-trained models has pushed the state-of-the-art, enabling more accurate and robust detection of malicious URLs across different attack types.

### 3 Methodology

This section presents our methodology for pre-training the `DomURLs_BERT` encoder, focusing on the collection of pre-training data, preprocessing of domain names and URLs, tokenizer training, and domain-adaptive pre-training.

Table 1: Pre-training Dataset

	Training	Development
<b>domain names</b>	19,941,474	1,049,558
<b>URLs</b>	355,116,387	18,690,330
<b>Total</b>	375,057,861	19,739,888

#### 3.1 Pre-training data

We have collected a large-scale pre-training corpus of domain names and URLs from the following datasets:

- **mC4**: The multilingual colossal Common Crawl Corpus<sup>4</sup>. This is a cleaned version of the Common Crawl’s web corpus, curated by the Allen Institute for Artificial Intelligence [38], containing approximately 170 million URLs.
- **falcon-refinedweb**: An English large-scale dataset curated for large language model pre-training. This dataset is compiled from CommonCrawl, using strict filtering and extensive deduplication [39], and contains around 128 million URLs<sup>5</sup>.
- **CBA Web tracking datasets**: A dataset compiled by the Broadband Communications Systems and Architectures Research Group<sup>6</sup>, containing 76M URLs and 1.5M domain names.
- **Tranco top 1M**: is a dataset of top 1M domain names compiled and ranked by Tranco<sup>7</sup> [40].
- **UTL\_DGA22**: A Domain Generation Algorithm botnet dataset, containing 4.3 million entries from 76 DGA families [12].
- **UMUDGA**: A dataset for profiling DGA-based botnets, consisting of 30 million manually labeled DGA entries [41].

<sup>4</sup><https://hf.co/datasets/legacy-datasets/mc4>

<sup>5</sup><https://hf.co/datasets/tiiuae/falcon-refinedweb>

<sup>6</sup><https://cba.upc.edu/downloads/category/29-web-tracking-datasets#>

<sup>7</sup><https://tranco-list.eu/>

Since the pre-training dataset is curated from multiple sources, the data cleaning process includes deduplication based on exact matching. The final pre-training dataset contains 375,057,861 samples for model training and 19,739,888 samples for development. Table 1 provides details on the collected dataset, which is publicly available on Hugging Face Datasets<sup>8</sup>.

## 3.2 Pre-training Procedure

### 3.2.1 Preprocessing




Figure 1: Overall URL structure

A URL consists of several components, which can be grouped into three main parts: the scheme (protocol), the domain name, and the path. Figure 1 illustrates the overall structure of a URL (source<sup>9</sup>). Our proposed input preprocessing method involves removing the protocol identifier and splitting the URL into two parts: the domain name and the path. These two parts are delimited by special tokens, [DOMAIN] and [PATH], indicating the start of the domain name and the URL path, respectively. Additionally, if the input URL contains an IP address instead of a domain name, we use the [IP] and [IPv6] special tokens in place of [DOMAIN] for IPv4 and IPv6 addresses, respectively. Finally, the [CLS] and [SEP] tokens are appended to the start and end of the input URL or domain, as follows:

```
[CLS] [DOMAIN] bkd23kxivodu.com [SEP]
[CLS] [DOMAIN] sabq.org [SEP]
[CLS] [DOMAIN] vitalstorage.info [PATH] /look/wiring-diagram-trailer-brake-5835 [SEP]
[CLS] [DOMAIN] www.kayak.com [PATH] /Baku-Hotels-Almaz-Hostel.2227964.ksp [SEP]
[CLS] [DOMAIN] www.marianos.com [PATH] /p/bagels-forever-egg-bagels/0007285800041 [SEP]
[CLS] [DOMAIN] agnestirrito.wordpress.com [PATH] /2014/06/ [SEP]
[CLS] [IP] 50.19.154.174 [PATH] /recordings/2/update.php [SEP]
[CLS] [IP] 5.42.66.3 [PATH] /fabric/Vxrfxqrevg.mp4 [SEP]
```

Figure 2: A sample of preprocessed domain names and URLs

### 3.2.2 Tokenizer training

After cleaning and preprocessing the data, we trained our tokenizer from scratch using the SentencePiece tokenization method, which employs the Byte Pair Encoding (BPE) algorithm [42]. SentencePiece is language-agnostic and does not require any pre-tokenization, as it processes input as a sequence of Unicode characters. For tokenizer training, we utilized the HuggingFace tokenizers library<sup>10</sup>. The vocabulary size was set to 32,000.

### 3.2.3 Domain-adaptive pre-training

Domain-adaptive pre-training has been shown to enhance the contextualized word embeddings of existing domain-generic Pre-trained Language Models (PLMs) [43]. This improvement has also been demonstrated in cybersecurity applications, where several domain-adapted models have been proposed [20, 21, 29, 33, 31, 22]. Following this trend, we continued the pre-training of the BERT-base encoder introduced in [25]. The model consists of approximately 110 million parameters, with 12 transformer layers, a hidden dimension size of 768, and 12 attention heads.

<sup>8</sup>[https://hf.co/datasets/amahdaouy/Web\\_DomURLs](https://hf.co/datasets/amahdaouy/Web_DomURLs)

<sup>9</sup><https://www.seoforgooglenews.com/p/everything-urls-news-publishers>

<sup>10</sup><https://github.com/huggingface/tokenizers>

Pre-training is performed using the MLM objective on our dataset, following the guidelines of Devlin et al. (2019) [25], where 15% of the input sequence’s subwords are randomly selected for masking. The model is trained to minimize the cross-entropy loss between the predicted sequence and the original sequence. We use the HuggingFace transformers<sup>11</sup> library for training on a server equipped with 4 NVIDIA A100 GPUs, each with 80GB of RAM. The maximum sequence length, per-device batch size, and learning rate are set to 128, 768, and  $1 \times 10^{-4}$ , respectively. The model is trained for 260,000 steps. Our pre-trained model is publicly available on HuggingFace Models<sup>12</sup>.

## 4 Experiments and Results

In this section, we present the evaluation datasets, the deep learning models used for comparison, the experimental settings, and the evaluation metrics. We then discuss and analyze the obtained results.

### 4.1 Evaluation Datasets

To evaluate the effectiveness of our model, we employed several domain name and URL classification datasets. For malicious domain name classification, we used the **DNS Tunneling** dataset [44], **UMUDGA** [41], and **UTL\_DGA22** [12]. Additionally, we collected a malware domain names dataset, **ThreatFox\_MalDom**, from the ThreatFox<sup>13</sup> database in June 2024. For legitimate domain names, we used the Tranco list.

For malicious URL classification, we utilized several datasets, including **Mendeley AK Singh** [45], **Kaggle Malicious URLs** [46], **Gramembedding** [47], **LNU\_Phish** [48], **PhiUSIIL** [49], and **PhishCrawl** [50]. We also curated a malware URL dataset, **ThreatFox\_MalURLs**, from the ThreatFox database in June 2024. For legitimate URLs, we employed the benign URLs from the **Kaggle Malicious URLs** dataset [46].

All the used datasets have been divided into 60%, 20%, and 20% for training, validation, and testing, respectively. Table 2 summarizes the characteristics of the evaluation datasets.

Table 2: Evaluation datasets

Dataset	Type	Year	Task	Num Classes	Size	Training	Validation	Test
DNS Tunneling [44]	domain names	2019	DNS Tunneling	5	96,063	57,637	19,213	19,213
UMUDGA [41]	domain names	2020	DGA botnet	51	3,098,626	1,859,175	619,725	619,726
UTL_DGA22 [12]	domain names	2022	DGA botnet	77	4,297,916	2,578,749	859,583	859,584
ThreatFox_MalDom (ours)	domain names	2024	Malware	65	176,065	105,639	35,213	35,213
Mendely AK Singh [45]	URLs	2020	Malicious	2	1,530,687	812,253	359,217	359,217
Kaggle malicious URLs [46]	URLs	2021	Malicious	4	641,126	384,673	128,225	128,228
Gramembedding [47]	URLs	2023	Phishing	2	800,003	480,008	159,997	159,998
LNU_Phish [48]	URLs	2022	Phishing	2	22,501	13,501	4,500	4,500
PhiUSIIL [49]	URLs	2024	Phishing	2	235,370	141,222	47,074	47,074
PhishCrawl [50]	URLs	2024	Phishing	2	101,827	61,095	20,366	20,366
ThreatFox_MalURLs (ours)	URLs	2024	Malware	58	682,003	409,201	136,401	136,401

### 4.2 Comparison methods

We compared our model with several state-of-the-art deep learning models, including six character-based RNN and CNN models, as described below:

- **CharCNN**: This model employs an embedding layer followed by three one-dimensional convolutional layers with kernel sizes of 3, 4, and 5, respectively. The final convolutional layer is followed by a dropout layer and a classification layer.
- **CharGRU**: This model uses an embedding layer and multiple GRU layers. The last GRU layer is followed by a dropout layer and a classification layer.
- **CharLSTM**: This model utilizes an embedding layer and multiple LSTM layers. The final LSTM layer is followed by a dropout layer and a classification layer.
- **CharBiGRU**: This model uses an embedding layer and multiple bidirectional GRU layers. The last BiGRU layer is followed by a dropout layer and a classification layer.

<sup>11</sup><https://github.com/huggingface/transformers>

<sup>12</sup>[https://hf.co/amahdaouy/DomURLs\\_BERT](https://hf.co/amahdaouy/DomURLs_BERT)

<sup>13</sup><https://threatfox.abuse.ch/>

- **CharBiLSTM**: This model employs an embedding layer and multiple bidirectional LSTM layers. The final BiLSTM layer is followed by a dropout layer and a classification layer.
- **CharCNNBiLSTM**: This model uses CNN layers to extract local features from character embeddings, which are then passed into a BiLSTM layer to capture contextual dependencies.

Moreover, we compared our model with five state-of-the-art domain-generic and domain-specific BERT-based PLMs, including **BERT** [25], **SecBERT** [19], **SecureBERT** [20], **CySecBERT** [21], and **URLBERT** [29].

### 4.3 Experiments settings

We implemented our model and the other state-of-the-art models using Pytorch<sup>14</sup> deep learning framework, Lightning<sup>15</sup>, and HuggingFace transformers<sup>16</sup> library. All our experiments have been conducted on a Dell PowerEdge XE8545 server, having 4 NVIDIA A100-SXM4-80GB GPUs, 1000 GiB RAM, and 2 AMD EPYC 7713 64-Core Processor 1.9GHz.

All models are trained using AdamW optimizer [51]. We used a batch size of 128 and the maximum sequence length is fixed to 128 and 64 for URLs and domain names, respectively. For character-based deep learning models, the number of epochs, the learning rate, the weight decay, the number of RNN layers, the hidden dimensions size are fixed to 20,  $1^{-3}$ ,  $1^{-3}$ , 3, 128, respectively. For BERT-based models, the number of epochs, the learning rate, and the weight decay are fixed to 10,  $1^{-5}$ ,  $1^{-3}$ , respectively. For all models, weight decay is applied to all the layers weights except biases and Layer Normalization. For all models and dataset, we utilized the following performance measures:

- **Accuracy**:  $\text{Accuracy} = \frac{TP+TN}{TP+FP+TN+FN}$  is The proportion of all correct predictions (both true positives and true negatives) out of all predictions.
- **True Positive Rate (TPR) / Recall / Sensitivity/ Detection Rate**:  $\text{TPR} = \frac{TP}{TP+FN}$  is the proportion of actual positives that are correctly identified by the model.
- **Specificity (SPC) / True Negative Rate**:  $\text{SPC} = \frac{TN}{FP+TN}$  is the proportion of actual negatives that are correctly identified by the model.
- **Positive Predictive Value (PPV) / Precision**:  $\text{PPV} = \frac{TP}{TP+FP}$  is the proportion of predicted positives that are actually positive.
- **Negative Predictive Value (NPV)**:  $\text{NPV} = \frac{TN}{TN+FN}$  is the proportion of predicted negatives that are actually negative.
- **F1 score**:  $F1 = \frac{2 \cdot (\text{PPV} \times \text{TPR})}{\text{PPV} + \text{TPR}}$  is the harmonic mean of precision and recall.
- **Weighted F1 Score (F1\_wted)**:  $F1_{\text{weighted}} = \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i \cdot F1_i)$  where  $w_i$  is the proportion of the total number of samples belonging to class  $i$ , and  $F1_i$  is the F1 score for class  $i$ . This score considers each class’s importance by weighting their respective F1 scores according to their frequency.
- **Micro F1 Score (F1\_mic)**:  $F1_{\text{micro}} = \frac{2 \cdot TP_{\text{micro}}}{2 \cdot TP_{\text{micro}} + FP_{\text{micro}} + FN_{\text{micro}}}$  aggregates the contributions of all classes to compute precision and recall, treating all instances equally, regardless of the class.
- **Diagnostic Efficiency (DE)**:  $\text{DE} = \text{TPR} \times \text{SPC}$  is the product of sensitivity (TPR) and specificity (SPC). Indicates the overall diagnostic ability of the test. Higher values indicate better performance.
- **False Positive Rate (FPR)**:  $\text{FPR} = \frac{FP}{FP+TN}$  is the proportion of actual negatives that are incorrectly identified as positive by the model. Lower values indicate better performance.
- **False Discovery Rate (FDR)**:  $\text{FDR} = \frac{FP}{FP+TP}$  is the proportion of predicted positives that are actually negative. Lower values indicate better performance.
- **False Negative Rate (FNR)**:  $\text{FNR} = \frac{FN}{FN+TP}$  is the proportion of actual positives that are incorrectly identified as negative by the model. Lower values indicate better performance.

For all evaluation measures, we report the macro-average performances (except F1\_wted, F1\_mic, and Accuracy).

<sup>14</sup><https://pytorch.org/>

<sup>15</sup><https://lightning.ai/>

<sup>16</sup><https://github.com/huggingface/transformers>

Table 3: Malicious domain names detection. For each dataset, the best performances are highlighted in bold font. All performance measures are presented as percentages.

dataset	Name	Accuracy	F1_macro	F1_wted	F1_micro	TPR	PPV	NPV	SPC	DE	FDR	FPR	FNR
ThreatFox_MailDomains	CharBiGRU	85.26	84.58	85.02	85.26	83.96	86.24	86.24	83.96	69.58	13.764	16.040	16.040
	CharBiLSTM	85.70	85.24	85.60	85.70	84.86	85.94	85.94	84.86	71.63	14.061	15.139	15.139
	CharCNN	85.03	84.46	84.87	85.03	83.99	85.48	85.48	83.99	69.97	14.516	16.006	16.006
	CharCNNBiLSTM	84.94	84.33	84.75	84.94	83.82	85.53	85.53	83.82	69.58	14.466	16.181	16.181
	CharGRU	85.09	84.61	84.98	85.09	84.25	85.26	85.26	84.25	70.60	14.736	15.750	15.750
	CharLSTM	85.03	84.50	84.89	85.03	84.06	85.39	85.39	84.06	70.15	14.608	15.938	15.938
	CySecBERT	87.04	86.57	86.91	87.04	86.08	87.57	87.57	86.08	73.60	12.426	13.917	13.917
	SecBERT	84.97	84.63	84.94	84.97	84.50	84.79	84.79	84.50	71.29	15.213	15.497	15.497
	SecureBERT	86.55	86.04	86.41	86.55	85.54	87.11	87.11	85.54	72.62	12.886	14.458	14.458
	BERT	86.90	86.46	86.79	86.90	86.03	87.25	87.25	86.03	73.62	12.746	13.966	13.966
	URLBERT	85.10	84.59	84.97	85.10	84.17	85.42	85.42	84.17	70.37	14.584	15.831	15.831
	DomURLs_BERT	<b>88.73</b>	<b>88.33</b>	<b>88.62</b>	<b>88.73</b>	<b>87.83</b>	<b>89.30</b>	<b>89.30</b>	<b>87.83</b>	<b>76.72</b>	<b>10.705</b>	<b>12.165</b>	<b>12.165</b>
UMUDGA	CharBiGRU	97.52	97.16	97.52	97.52	97.23	97.10	97.10	97.23	94.52	2.901	2.775	2.775
	CharBiLSTM	98.54	98.33	98.54	98.54	98.27	98.40	98.40	98.27	96.56	1.600	1.734	1.734
	CharCNN	96.86	96.41	96.86	96.86	96.35	96.46	96.46	96.35	92.82	3.539	3.646	3.646
	CharCNNBiLSTM	97.76	97.44	97.76	97.76	97.46	97.42	97.42	97.46	94.97	2.581	2.544	2.544
	CharGRU	97.52	97.16	97.52	97.52	97.15	97.17	97.17	97.15	94.36	2.831	2.853	2.853
	CharLSTM	98.35	98.11	98.34	98.35	98.05	98.16	98.16	98.05	96.13	1.836	1.951	1.951
	CySecBERT	98.74	98.55	98.74	98.74	98.49	98.61	98.61	98.49	97.00	1.386	1.507	1.507
	SecBERT	97.95	97.65	97.95	97.95	97.47	97.83	97.83	97.47	94.98	2.167	2.535	2.535
	SecureBERT	98.81	98.64	98.81	98.81	98.59	98.69	98.69	98.59	97.19	1.306	1.414	1.414
	BERT	98.76	98.58	98.76	98.76	98.59	98.58	98.58	98.59	97.20	1.424	1.407	1.407
	URLBERT	97.58	97.24	97.58	97.58	97.35	97.13	97.13	97.35	94.76	2.866	2.652	2.652
	DomURLs_BERT	<b>99.11</b>	<b>98.98</b>	<b>99.11</b>	<b>99.11</b>	<b>98.98</b>	<b>98.99</b>	<b>98.99</b>	<b>98.98</b>	<b>97.96</b>	<b>1.012</b>	<b>1.024</b>	<b>1.024</b>
UTL_DGA22	CharBiGRU	97.15	96.03	97.16	97.15	96.27	95.79	95.79	96.27	92.66	4.206	3.726	3.726
	CharBiLSTM	98.26	97.55	98.25	98.26	97.50	97.61	97.61	97.50	95.03	2.386	2.504	2.504
	CharCNN	96.58	95.18	96.57	96.58	94.90	95.46	95.46	94.90	89.97	4.537	5.098	5.098
	CharCNNBiLSTM	97.45	96.44	97.45	97.45	96.48	96.39	96.39	96.48	93.05	3.608	3.521	3.521
	CharGRU	97.20	96.10	97.21	97.20	96.33	95.87	95.87	96.33	92.77	4.127	3.667	3.667
	CharLSTM	98.30	97.61	98.29	98.30	97.54	97.68	97.68	97.54	95.12	2.320	2.459	2.459
	CySecBERT	98.62	98.06	98.62	98.62	97.91	98.22	98.22	97.91	95.84	1.776	2.093	2.093
	SecBERT	97.88	97.03	97.88	97.88	96.97	97.10	97.10	96.97	93.99	2.903	3.034	3.034
	SecureBERT	98.64	98.09	98.64	98.64	98.02	98.17	98.17	98.02	96.07	1.834	1.978	1.978
	BERT	98.58	98.00	98.58	98.58	97.84	98.17	98.17	97.84	95.71	1.831	2.160	2.160
	URLBERT	97.55	96.56	97.55	97.55	96.55	96.58	96.58	96.55	93.18	3.420	3.451	3.451
	DomURLs_BERT	<b>98.80</b>	<b>98.32</b>	<b>98.80</b>	<b>98.80</b>	<b>98.34</b>	<b>98.31</b>	<b>98.31</b>	<b>98.34</b>	<b>96.70</b>	<b>1.695</b>	<b>1.661</b>	<b>1.661</b>
DNS Tunneling	CharBiGRU	99.97	99.90	99.97	99.97	99.93	99.88	99.88	99.93	99.86	0.123	0.070	0.070
	CharBiLSTM	99.96	99.89	99.96	99.96	99.93	99.85	99.85	99.93	99.85	0.152	0.073	0.073
	CharCNN	<b>99.98</b>	99.95	99.98	99.98	99.99	99.91	99.91	<b>99.99</b>	<b>99.98</b>	0.088	0.009	0.009
	CharCNNBiLSTM	99.97	99.92	99.97	99.97	99.93	99.91	99.91	99.93	99.87	0.093	0.067	0.067
	CharGRU	99.97	99.90	99.97	99.97	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.81	0.096	0.096	0.096
	CharLSTM	99.97	99.90	99.97	99.97	99.93	99.88	99.88	99.93	99.86	0.123	0.070	0.070
	CySecBERT	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.94</b>	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.94</b>	<b>99.94</b>	<b>99.94</b>	99.94	99.87	<b>0.064</b>	<b>0.064</b>	<b>0.064</b>
	SecBERT	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.94</b>	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.94</b>	<b>99.94</b>	<b>99.94</b>	99.94	99.87	<b>0.064</b>	<b>0.064</b>	<b>0.064</b>
	SecureBERT	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.94</b>	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.94</b>	<b>99.94</b>	<b>99.94</b>	99.94	99.87	<b>0.064</b>	<b>0.064</b>	<b>0.064</b>
	BERT	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.94</b>	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.94</b>	<b>99.94</b>	<b>99.94</b>	99.94	99.87	<b>0.064</b>	<b>0.064</b>	<b>0.064</b>
	URLBERT	99.97	99.92	99.97	99.97	99.91	99.93	99.93	99.91	99.81	0.067	0.093	0.093
	DomURLs_BERT	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.94</b>	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.94</b>	<b>99.94</b>	<b>99.94</b>	99.94	99.87	<b>0.064</b>	<b>0.064</b>	<b>0.064</b>

## 4.4 Results

In this section, we present the results of our model alongside state-of-the-art character-based and BERT-based models. All evaluated models are compared on both binary and multi-class classification tasks for domain names and URLs.

### 4.4.1 Domains names classification Tasks

Table 3 summarizes the obtained results for binary classification of domain names. The aim of this task is to detect malicious domain names and DNS tunneling. The overall results show that DomURLs\_BERT achieves the best performance across all datasets for most evaluation metrics. However, on the DNS tunneling dataset, the CharCNN model outperforms in Specificity (SPC) and diagnostic efficiency (DE). Additionally, the results indicate that fine-tuning BERT and cybersecurity-specific BERT-based models (BERT, SecureBERT, and CySecBERT) outperforms character-based deep learning models in most datasets and metrics.

Table 4 presents the obtained results for domain names multi-class classification tasks. The aim of these tasks is to classify domain names into a set of predefined class labels. The overall results show that DomURLs\_BERT model outperform the other state-of-the-art models domain generation algorithm classification datasets on most evaluation



measures. Nevertheless, the CharBiLSTM achieves better F1\_macro and precision (PPV) on the UTL\_DGA22 dataset. For malware domain names classification (ThreatFox\_MalDomains dataset), DomURLs\_BERT model yields better Accuracy, F1\_wted, F1\_mic, NPV, specificity (SPC), and false positive rate (FPR). However, the best F1\_macro, precision (PPV), diagnostic efficiency (DE), recall (TPR) and false negative rate (FNR) are achieved by CharCNN, CharCNN, BERT, and CharBiGRU, respectively. For DNS tunneling, all models achieve nearly similar performances. However, the best results are obtained using CharBiGRU, CharGRU, and SecureBERT models.

Table 4: Malicious domain names classification. For each dataset, the best performances are highlighted in bold font. All performance measures are presented as percentages.

dataset	Name	Accuracy	F1_macro	F1_wted	F1_micro	TPR	PPV	NPV	SPC	DE	FDR	FPR	FNR
ThreatFox_MalDomains	CharBiGRU	74.87	35.97	72.80	74.87	<b>34.31</b>	46.60	99.50	99.39	<b>33.85</b>	34.941	0.611	<b>65.686</b>
	CharBiLSTM	74.48	32.00	71.90	74.48	29.99	42.87	99.50	99.36	29.49	38.664	0.640	70.012
	CharCNN	73.94	<b>37.43</b>	71.01	73.94	32.66	<b>54.71</b>	99.51	99.32	32.11	32.985	0.681	67.341
	CharCNNBiLSTM	68.67	10.30	64.41	68.67	11.97	9.76	99.39	99.27	11.43	10.243	0.731	88.029
	CharGRU	74.55	35.29	71.95	74.55	33.62	48.85	99.51	99.36	33.12	35.768	0.635	66.384
	CharLSTM	73.53	29.64	71.21	73.53	27.99	37.41	99.47	99.36	27.52	30.281	0.636	72.007
	CySecBERT	75.55	30.02	73.69	75.55	28.67	39.41	99.50	99.43	28.25	23.667	0.565	71.331
	SecBERT	74.44	28.14	72.16	74.44	26.60	41.25	99.49	99.38	26.13	27.979	0.616	73.400
	SecureBERT	75.88	31.97	73.85	75.88	30.88	39.66	99.52	99.43	30.44	23.416	0.573	69.123
	BERT	75.36	25.66	72.83	75.36	25.21	35.01	99.52	99.41	24.74	<b>17.295</b>	0.587	74.794
	URLBERT	72.75	22.91	69.00	72.75	21.38	30.98	99.50	99.29	20.81	29.021	0.709	78.624
	DomURLs_BERT	<b>76.64</b>	26.45	<b>74.53</b>	<b>76.64</b>	25.19	33.20	<b>99.53</b>	<b>99.47</b>	24.78	17.565	<b>0.534</b>	74.814
	UMUDGA	CharBiGRU	88.95	83.95	88.26	88.95	84.87	85.47	99.77	99.77	84.68	12.569	0.231
CharBiLSTM		90.68	86.25	90.23	90.68	86.62	87.59	<b>99.81</b>	<b>99.81</b>	86.47	10.445	0.192	13.380
CharCNN		85.83	80.68	85.50	85.83	80.64	82.67	99.71	99.70	80.43	15.367	0.296	19.365
CharCNNBiLSTM		87.11	81.38	86.43	87.11	82.05	83.51	99.73	99.73	81.84	14.528	0.270	17.947
CharGRU		89.26	84.42	88.54	89.26	85.25	86.16	99.78	99.78	85.07	11.882	0.224	14.746
CharLSTM		90.48	85.95	89.91	90.48	86.52	87.69	99.80	99.80	86.36	10.354	0.196	13.483
CySecBERT		90.40	86.07	90.19	90.40	86.23	87.36	99.80	99.80	86.09	10.681	0.195	13.767
SecBERT		89.48	85.27	89.29	89.48	85.59	86.33	99.78	99.78	85.44	11.711	0.216	14.407
SecureBERT		90.54	86.22	90.33	90.54	86.60	87.09	<b>99.81</b>	<b>99.81</b>	86.46	10.945	0.192	13.402
BERT		90.40	85.99	90.10	90.40	86.22	87.51	99.80	99.80	86.07	10.533	0.196	13.781
URLBERT		89.32	85.07	88.98	89.32	85.41	86.33	99.78	99.78	85.24	11.705	0.221	14.587
DomURLs_BERT		<b>90.86</b>	<b>86.26</b>	<b>90.46</b>	<b>90.86</b>	<b>86.66</b>	<b>87.78</b>	<b>99.81</b>	<b>99.81</b>	<b>86.52</b>	<b>10.258</b>	<b>0.185</b>	<b>13.337</b>
UTL_DGA22		CharBiGRU	86.16	82.50	85.12	86.16	83.56	85.02	99.81	99.81	83.41	14.978	0.188
	CharBiLSTM	88.36	<b>85.23</b>	87.60	88.36	86.07	<b>87.05</b>	99.84	99.84	85.95	12.952	0.156	13.933
	CharCNN	83.13	79.78	82.69	83.13	80.05	82.29	99.77	99.77	79.90	17.715	0.228	19.955
	CharCNNBiLSTM	84.46	80.96	83.84	84.46	81.43	83.49	99.79	99.79	81.28	16.510	0.210	18.571
	CharGRU	86.48	83.42	85.86	86.48	84.15	84.90	99.82	99.82	84.02	13.805	0.183	15.850
	CharLSTM	87.96	84.32	86.75	87.96	85.52	86.73	99.84	99.84	85.39	13.269	0.162	14.484
	CySecBERT	87.97	84.76	87.35	87.97	85.35	86.90	99.84	99.84	85.23	13.095	0.160	14.653
	SecBERT	86.94	84.16	86.60	86.94	84.72	85.76	99.82	99.83	84.60	14.235	0.174	15.281
	SecureBERT	88.17	84.76	87.33	88.17	85.71	87.49	99.84	99.84	85.60	<b>12.506</b>	0.157	14.290
	BERT	87.88	84.51	87.14	87.88	85.24	87.21	99.84	99.84	85.12	12.792	0.162	14.764
	URLBERT	87.17	84.04	86.46	87.17	84.79	86.24	99.83	99.83	84.67	13.764	0.172	15.214
	DomURLs_BERT	<b>88.50</b>	85.09	<b>87.68</b>	<b>88.50</b>	<b>86.08</b>	86.08	<b>99.85</b>	<b>99.85</b>	<b>85.97</b>	12.624	<b>0.153</b>	<b>13.918</b>
	DNS Tunneling	CharBiGRU	<b>99.98</b>	99.94	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.94</b>	99.93	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>99.94</b>	0.067	0.004
CharBiLSTM		96.92	88.47	96.34	96.92	87.01	96.45	99.37	99.28	86.30	3.550	0.718	12.986
CharCNN		99.97	99.94	99.97	99.97	99.93	99.94	99.99	99.99	99.93	0.060	0.006	0.068
CharCNNBiLSTM		99.97	99.93	99.97	99.97	99.93	99.93	99.99	99.99	99.93	0.069	0.006	0.068
CharGRU		<b>99.98</b>	99.94	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.94</b>	99.94	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	99.94	0.062	0.004	<b>0.056</b>
CharLSTM		96.55	87.65	96.00	96.55	85.84	96.09	99.29	99.19	85.03	3.912	0.805	14.163
CySecBERT		99.97	99.94	99.97	99.97	99.92	99.95	99.99	99.99	99.91	0.047	0.009	0.080
SecBERT		99.96	99.92	99.96	99.96	99.90	99.93	99.99	99.99	99.90	0.069	0.008	0.096
SecureBERT		<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.95</b>	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.98</b>	99.93	<b>99.96</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	99.93	<b>0.042</b>	<b>0.005</b>	0.065
BERT		99.96	99.91	99.96	99.96	99.90	99.92	99.99	99.99	99.89	0.081	0.010	0.096
URLBERT		99.93	99.81	99.93	99.93	99.84	99.78	99.98	99.99	99.83	0.217	0.015	0.158
DomURLs_BERT		99.97	99.93	99.97	99.97	99.93	99.94	99.99	99.99	99.92	0.063	0.006	0.072

#### 4.4.2 URLs classification Tasks

Tables 5 and 6 summarizes the obtained results for URLs binary classification tasks (malicious URLs detection). The overall obtained results show that DomURLs\_BERT outperforms the state-of-the-art character-based models and the evaluated BERT-based models on GramEmbedding, PhishCrawl, and kaggle malicious urls datasets. Besides, it achieves comparable or nearly similar performances on LNU\_Phish, Mendely AK Singh, and PhiUSIIL datasets. For LNU\_Phish, the top performances are achieved by CharGRU, CySecBERT, SecBERT, SecureBERT, BERT, and DomURLsBERT models. For Mendely AK Singh dataset, DomURLs\_BERT yields the best accuracy, F1\_macro, F1\_wted, and F1\_micro. Whereas, SecureBERT obtains better recall (TPR), specificity (SPC), diagnostic efficiency (DE), false positive rate (FPR) and false negative rate (FNR) performances. Additionally, the CharCNN model yields the best precision (PPV),

NPV, and false detection rate (FDR). For PhiUSIIL dataset, CySecBERT achieves the best overall performances, while the other models, including DomURLs\_BERT, obtain comparable results. For ThreatFox\_MalURLs dataset, all models yield nearly perfect performances, while the top results are achieved by CySecBERT, SecureBERT, and BERT models. In accordance with domain names classification tasks, BERT model and the other cybersecurity BERT-based models obtain state-of-the-art performances on all datasets.

Table 5: Malicious URLs detection (part 1). For each dataset, the best performances are highlighted in bold font. All performance measures are presented as percentages.

dataset	Name	Accuracy	F1_macro	F1_wted	F1_micro	TPR	PPV	NPV	SPC	DE	FDR	FPR	FNR	
Gramembedding	CharBiGRU	97.50	97.50	97.50	97.50	97.50	97.51	97.51	97.50	95.06	2.489	2.497	2.497	
	CharBiLSTM	97.53	97.53	97.53	97.53	97.53	97.54	97.54	97.53	95.11	2.455	2.472	2.472	
	CharCNN	97.02	97.02	97.02	97.02	97.02	97.02	97.02	97.02	94.13	2.975	2.977	2.977	
	CharCNNBiLSTM	96.95	96.95	96.95	96.95	96.95	96.96	96.96	96.95	93.99	3.038	3.049	3.049	
	CharGRU	97.52	97.52	97.52	97.52	97.52	97.53	97.53	97.52	95.10	2.475	2.480	2.480	
	CharLSTM	97.45	97.45	97.45	97.45	97.45	97.46	97.46	97.45	94.97	2.542	2.546	2.546	
	CySecBERT	98.40	98.40	98.40	98.40	98.40	98.41	98.41	98.40	96.81	1.593	1.603	1.603	
	SecBERT	97.91	97.91	97.91	97.91	97.91	97.91	97.91	97.91	95.85	2.087	2.094	2.094	
	SecureBERT	98.42	98.42	98.42	98.42	98.42	98.42	98.42	98.42	96.85	1.581	1.584	1.584	
	BERT	98.26	98.26	98.26	98.26	98.26	98.26	98.26	98.26	96.55	1.737	1.739	1.739	
	URLBERT	96.87	96.87	96.87	96.87	96.87	96.88	96.88	96.87	93.84	3.120	3.128	3.128	
	DomURLs_BERT	<b>98.51</b>	<b>98.51</b>	<b>98.51</b>	<b>98.51</b>	<b>98.51</b>	<b>98.51</b>	<b>98.51</b>	<b>98.51</b>	<b>98.51</b>	<b>97.05</b>	<b>1.488</b>	<b>1.488</b>	<b>1.488</b>
	LNU_Phish	CharBiGRU	99.98	99.97	99.98	99.98	99.98	99.96	99.96	99.98	99.97	0.036	0.016	0.016
CharBiLSTM		99.98	99.97	99.98	99.98	99.98	99.96	99.96	99.98	99.97	0.036	0.016	0.016	
CharCNN		99.98	99.97	99.98	99.98	99.98	99.96	99.96	99.98	99.97	0.036	0.016	0.016	
CharCNNBiLSTM		99.98	99.97	99.98	99.98	99.98	99.96	99.96	99.98	99.97	0.036	0.016	0.016	
CharGRU		<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	
CharLSTM		99.98	99.97	99.98	99.98	99.98	99.96	99.96	99.98	99.97	0.036	0.016	0.016	
CySecBERT		<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	
SecBERT		<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	
SecureBERT		<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	
BERT		<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	
URLBERT		99.98	99.97	99.98	99.98	99.98	99.96	99.96	99.98	99.97	0.036	0.016	0.016	
DomURLs_BERT		<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	
Mendeley_AK_Singh		CharBiGRU	98.82	83.53	98.69	98.82	77.42	93.41	93.41	77.42	54.91	6.589	22.584	22.584
	CharBiLSTM	98.88	83.99	98.74	98.88	77.18	95.71	95.71	77.18	54.40	4.286	22.821	22.821	
	CharCNN	98.80	82.20	98.62	98.80	74.96	<b>95.88</b>	<b>95.88</b>	74.96	49.96	<b>4.124</b>	25.041	25.041	
	CharCNNBiLSTM	98.76	81.46	98.57	98.76	74.15	95.69	95.69	74.15	48.35	4.308	25.850	25.850	
	CharGRU	98.85	83.49	98.70	98.85	76.74	95.15	95.15	76.74	53.54	4.851	23.257	23.257	
	CharLSTM	98.83	83.12	98.68	98.83	76.30	95.14	95.14	76.30	52.65	4.859	23.704	23.704	
	CySecBERT	98.97	86.40	98.89	98.97	81.39	93.44	93.44	81.39	62.85	6.563	18.611	18.611	
	SecBERT	98.81	83.83	98.69	98.81	78.60	91.59	91.59	78.60	57.30	8.410	21.401	21.401	
	SecureBERT	98.89	85.64	98.82	98.89	<b>81.58</b>	90.98	90.98	<b>81.58</b>	<b>63.27</b>	9.017	<b>18.418</b>	<b>18.418</b>	
	BERT	98.97	86.30	98.88	98.97	81.33	93.27	93.27	81.33	62.74	6.725	18.670	18.670	
	URLBERT	98.68	80.38	98.48	98.68	73.49	93.51	93.51	73.49	47.06	6.489	26.506	26.506	
	DomURLs_BERT	<b>99.00</b>	<b>86.70</b>	<b>98.92</b>	<b>99.00</b>	81.46	94.16	94.16	81.46	62.99	5.841	18.535	18.535	
	PhiUSIIL	CharBiGRU	99.80	99.79	99.80	99.80	99.76	99.82	99.82	99.76	99.53	0.179	0.237	0.237
CharBiLSTM		99.78	99.78	99.78	99.78	99.75	99.80	99.80	99.75	99.51	0.196	0.247	0.247	
CharCNN		99.79	99.79	99.79	99.79	99.76	99.82	99.82	99.76	99.52	0.182	0.239	0.239	
CharCNNBiLSTM		99.81	<b>99.81</b>	99.81	99.81	<b>99.78</b>	99.83	99.83	<b>99.78</b>	<b>99.56</b>	0.167	0.219	0.219	
CharGRU		99.79	99.78	99.79	99.79	99.76	99.82	99.82	99.76	99.51	0.185	0.244	0.244	
CharLSTM		99.78	99.78	99.78	99.78	99.75	99.81	99.81	99.75	99.50	0.192	0.251	0.251	
CySecBERT		<b>99.82</b>	<b>99.81</b>	<b>99.82</b>	<b>99.82</b>	<b>99.78</b>	<b>99.84</b>	<b>99.84</b>	<b>99.78</b>	99.57	<b>0.161</b>	<b>0.216</b>	<b>0.216</b>	
SecBERT		99.80	99.79	99.80	99.80	99.76	99.82	99.82	99.76	99.53	0.180	0.236	0.236	
SecureBERT		99.81	99.80	99.81	99.81	<b>99.78</b>	99.83	99.83	<b>99.78</b>	<b>99.56</b>	0.173	0.222	0.222	
BERT		99.80	99.80	99.80	99.80	<b>99.78</b>	99.82	99.82	<b>99.78</b>	99.55	0.180	0.223	0.223	
URLBERT		99.79	99.78	99.79	99.79	99.76	99.81	99.81	99.76	99.51	0.191	0.243	0.243	
DomURLs_BERT		99.80	99.80	99.80	99.80	99.77	99.83	99.83	99.77	99.54	0.170	0.229	0.229	

Table 7 summarizes the obtained results for malicious URLs multi-class classification. The overall obtained results show that DomURLs\_BERT achieve comparable results to the best performing models (SecureBERT and CySecBERT). For kaggle malicious urls dataset, DomURLs\_BERT yields slightly better Accuracy, F1\_wted, F1\_micro, NPV, specificity (SPC), and false positive rate (FPR) performances, while SecureBERT obtains slightly better F1\_macro, recall (TPR), precision, diagnostic efficiency (DE), false detection rate (FDR), and false negative rate (FNR). Although CySecBERT outperforms all evaluated models on the ThreatFox\_MalURLs dataset, DomURLs\_BERT, BERT, SecureBERT also demonstrate performances that are closely comparable. In accordance with the previously reported results, most BERT-based models, especially those adapted to cybersecurity domain, yields state-of-the-art performances on malicious URLs classification tasks.



## 5 Conclusion

In this work, we introduced DomURLs\_BERT, a novel state-of-the-art pre-trained language model for detecting and classifying malicious or suspicious domain names and URLs. DomURLs\_BERT is pre-trained using the masked language modeling objective on a large-scale, multilingual corpus comprising URLs, domain names, and domain generation algorithm datasets. We presented a detailed methodology for data collection, preprocessing, and domain-adaptive pre-training.

To evaluate the performance of our model, we conducted experiments on several binary and multi-class classification tasks related to domain names and URLs, including phishing and malware detection, DGA identification, and DNS tunneling. Our results demonstrate that DomURLs\_BERT achieves state-of-the-art performance across multiple datasets. Furthermore, the findings highlight that character-based deep learning models, such as RNNs, CNNs, and their combinations, serve as strong end-to-end baselines for URL and domain name classification. In comparison, fine-tuning a domain-generic pre-trained BERT model and adapting BERT-based models to the cybersecurity domain consistently outperforms the baseline character-based models on most benchmark datasets. Future work includes evaluating the model performance on other domain names and URLs classification tasks and exploring robust fine-tuning approaches for dealing with adversarial attacks.

## References

- [1] Sandeep Yadav, Ashwath Kumar Krishna Reddy, AL Narasimha Reddy, and Supranamaya Ranjan. Detecting algorithmically generated malicious domain names. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM SIGCOMM conference on Internet measurement*, pages 48–61, 2010.
- [2] Doyen Sahoo, Chenghao Liu, and Steven CH Hoi. Malicious url detection using machine learning: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.07179*, 2017.
- [3] Kang Li, Xiangzhan Yu, and Jiujiu Wang. A review: How to detect malicious domains. In Xingming Sun, Xiaorui Zhang, Zhihua Xia, and Elisa Bertino, editors, *Advances in Artificial Intelligence and Security*, pages 152–162, Cham, 2021. Springer International Publishing.
- [4] Malak Aljabri, Hanan S Altamimi, Shahd A Albelali, Maimunah Al-Harbi, Haya T Alhuraib, Najd K Alotaibi, Amal A Alahmadi, Fahd Alhaidari, Rami Mustafa A Mohammad, and Khaled Salah. Detecting malicious urls using machine learning techniques: review and research directions. *IEEE Access*, 10:121395–121417, 2022.
- [5] Boyang Yu, Fei Tang, Daji Ergu, Rui Zeng, Bo Ma, and Fangyao Liu. Efficient classification of malicious urls: M-bert-a modified bert variant for enhanced semantic understanding. *IEEE Access*, 2024.
- [6] Hung Le, Quang Pham, Doyen Sahoo, and Steven CH Hoi. Urlnet: Learning a url representation with deep learning for malicious url detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.03162*, 2018.
- [7] Gagatay Catal, Görkem Giray, Bedir Tekinerdogan, Sandeep Kumar, and Suyash Shukla. Applications of deep learning for phishing detection: a systematic literature review. *Knowledge and Information Systems*, 64(6):1457–1500, 2022.
- [8] Yong Shi, Gong Chen, and Juntao Li. Malicious domain name detection based on extreme machine learning. *Neural Processing Letters*, 48(3):1347–1357, 2018.
- [9] Alessandro Cucchiarelli, Christian Morbidoni, Luca Spalazzi, and Marco Baldi. Algorithmically generated malicious domain names detection based on n-grams features. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 170:114551, 2021.
- [10] Carlo Marcelo Revoredo da Silva, Eduardo Luzeiro Feitosa, and Vinicius Cardoso Garcia. Heuristic-based strategy for phishing prediction: A survey of url-based approach. *Computers & Security*, 88:101613, 2020.
- [11] Cherifa Hamroun, Ahmed Amamou, Kamel Haddadou, Hayat Haroun, and Guy Pujolle. A review on lexical based malicious domain name detection methods. *Annals of Telecommunications*, pages 1–17, 2024.
- [12] Tong Anh Tuan, Nguyen Viet Anh, Tran Thi Luong, and Hoang Viet Long. Utl\_dga22-a dataset for dga botnet detection and classification. *Computer Networks*, 221:109508, 2023.
- [13] Ahmet Selman Bozkir, Firat Coskun Dalgic, and Murat Aydos. Grambeddings: a new neural network for url based identification of phishing web pages through n-gram embeddings. *Computers & Security*, 124:102964, 2023.
- [14] Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey Hinton. Deep learning. *nature*, 521(7553):436–444, 2015.
- [15] Anu Vazhayil, R Vinayakumar, and KP Soman. Comparative study of the detection of malicious urls using shallow and deep networks. In *2018 9th International Conference on Computing, Communication and Networking Technologies (ICCCNT)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2018.

- [16] Sara Afzal, Muhammad Asim, Abdul Rehman Javed, Mirza Omer Beg, and Thar Baker. Urldeeptdetect: A deep learning approach for detecting malicious urls using semantic vector models. *Journal of Network and Systems Management*, 29:1–27, 2021.
- [17] Sea Ran Cleon Liew and Ngai-Fong Law. Use of subword tokenization for domain generation algorithm classification. *Cybersecur.*, 6(1):49, 2023.
- [18] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In Isabelle Guyon, Ulrike von Luxburg, Samy Bengio, Hanna M. Wallach, Rob Fergus, S. V. N. Vishwanathan, and Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, pages 5998–6008, 2017.
- [19] Jackaduma. Secbert: Pretrained bert model for cyber security text, learned cybersecurity knowledge. Available online: <https://github.com/jackaduma/SecBERT>, 2022. Accessed: Aug. 02, 2024.
- [20] Ehsan Aghaei, Xi Niu, Waseem Shadid, and Ehab Al-Shaer. Securebert: A domain-specific language model for cybersecurity. In *Security and Privacy in Communication Networks: 18th EAI International Conference, SecureComm 2022, Virtual Event, October 2022, Proceedings*, pages 39–56. Springer, 2023.
- [21] Markus Bayer, Philipp Kuehn, Ramin Shanehsaz, and Christian Reuter. Cysecbert: A domain-adapted language model for the cybersecurity domain. *ACM Trans. Priv. Secur.*, 27(2):18, 2024.
- [22] HanXiang Xu, ShenAo Wang, Ningke Li, Yanjie Zhao, Kai Chen, Kailong Wang, Yang Liu, Ting Yu, and HaoYu Wang. Large language models for cyber security: A systematic literature review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04760*, 2024.
- [23] Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, Yifan Du, Chen Yang, Yushuo Chen, Zhipeng Chen, Jinhao Jiang, Ruiyang Ren, Yifan Li, Xinyu Tang, Zikang Liu, Peiyu Liu, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*, 2023.
- [24] Shervin Minaee, Tomas Mikolov, Narjes Nikzad, Meysam Chenaghlu, Richard Socher, Xavier Amatriain, and Jianfeng Gao. Large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06196*, 2024.
- [25] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2019.
- [26] Weiling Chang, Fei Du, and Yijing Wang. Research on malicious url detection technology based on bert model. In *2021 IEEE 9th International Conference on Information, Communication and Networks (ICICN)*, pages 340–345. IEEE, 2021.
- [27] Denish Omondi Otieno, Faranak Abri, Akbar Siami Namin, and Keith S Jones. Detecting phishing urls using the bert transformer model. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (BigData)*, pages 2483–2492. IEEE, 2023.
- [28] Ming-Yang Su and Kuan-Lin Su. Bert-based approaches to identifying malicious urls. *Sensors*, 23(20):8499, 2023.
- [29] Yujie Li, Yanbin Wang, Haitao Xu, Zhenhao Guo, Zheng Cao, and Lun Zhang. Urlbert: A contrastive and adversarial pre-trained model for url classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11495*, 2024.
- [30] Ruitong Liu, Yanbin Wang, Haitao Xu, Zhan Qin, Yiwei Liu, and Zheng Cao. Malicious url detection via pretrained language model guided multi-level feature attention network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12372*, 2023.
- [31] Yanbin Wang, Weifan Zhu, Haitao Xu, Zhan Qin, Kui Ren, and Wenrui Ma. A large-scale pretrained deep model for phishing url detection. In *ICASSP 2023 - 2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1–5, 2023.
- [32] Yu Tian and Zhenyu Li. Dom-bert: Detecting malicious domains with pre-training model. In *International Conference on Passive and Active Network Measurement*, pages 133–158. Springer, 2024.
- [33] Pranav Maneriker, Jack W. Stokes, Edir Garcia Lazo, Diana Carutasu, Farid Tajaddodianfar, and Arun Gururajan. Urltran: Improving phishing url detection using transformers. In *MILCOM 2021 - 2021 IEEE Military Communications Conference (MILCOM)*, pages 197–204, 2021.
- [34] Jinhyuk Lee, Wonjin Yoon, Sungdong Kim, Donghyeon Kim, Sunkyu Kim, Chan Ho So, and Jaewoo Kang. Biobert: a pre-trained biomedical language representation model for biomedical text mining. *Bioinformatics*, 36(4):1234–1240, 2020.

- [35] Iz Beltagy, Kyle Lo, and Arman Cohan. SciBERT: A pretrained language model for scientific text. In Kentaro Inui, Jing Jiang, Vincent Ng, and Xiaojun Wan, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3615–3620, Hong Kong, China, November 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [36] Priyanka Ranade, Aritran Piplai, Anupam Joshi, and Tim Finin. Cybert: Contextualized embeddings for the cybersecurity domain. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, pages 3334–3342. IEEE, 2021.
- [37] Abir Rahali and Moulay A Akhlofi. Malbert: Using transformers for cybersecurity and malicious software detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03806*, 2021.
- [38] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.10683*, 2019.
- [39] Guilherme Penedo, Quentin Malartic, Daniel Hesslow, Ruxandra Cojocaru, Alessandro Cappelli, Hamza Alobeidli, Baptiste Pannier, Ebtesam Almazrouei, and Julien Launay. The RefinedWeb dataset for Falcon LLM: outperforming curated corpora with web data, and web data only. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01116*, 2023.
- [40] Victor Le Pochat, Tom Van Goethem, Samaneh Tajalizadehkhoob, Maciej Korczyński, and Wouter Joosen. Tranco: A research-oriented top sites ranking hardened against manipulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.01156*, 2018.
- [41] Mattia Zago, Manuel Gil Pérez, and Gregorio Martínez Pérez. UMUDGA: A dataset for profiling dga-based botnet. *Computers & Security*, 92:101719, 2020.
- [42] Taku Kudo and John Richardson. Sentencepiece: A simple and language independent subword tokenizer and detokenizer for neural text processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.06226*, 2018.
- [43] Suchin Gururangan, Ana Marasović, Swabha Swayamdipta, Kyle Lo, Iz Beltagy, Doug Downey, and Noah A. Smith. Don’t stop pretraining: Adapt language models to domains and tasks, 2020.
- [44] Yakov Bubnov. DNS tunneling queries for binary classification, 2019.
- [45] Singh A.K. Dataset of malicious and benign webpages. Mendeley Data, 2020.
- [46] Manu Siddhartha. Malicious urls dataset. Kaggle, 2021. Accessed: 05-May-2024.
- [47] Ahmet Selman Bozkir, Firat Coskun Dalgic, and Murat Aydos. Grambeddings: A new neural network for url based identification of phishing web pages through n-gram embeddings. *Computers & Security*, 124:102964, 2023.
- [48] Giovanni Apruzzese and V. S. Subrahmanian. Mitigating adversarial gray-box attacks against phishing detectors. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, pages 1–19, 2022.
- [49] Arvind Prasad and Shalini Chandra. Phiusiil: A diverse security profile empowered phishing url detection framework based on similarity index and incremental learning. *Computers & Security*, 136:103545, 2024.
- [50] Nguyet Quang Do, Ali Selamat, Hamido Fujita, and Ondrej Krejcar. An integrated model based on deep learning classifiers and pre-trained transformer for phishing url detection. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 161:269–285, 2024.
- [51] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*. OpenReview.net, 2019.