

Robustness of Selected Learning Models under Label-Flipping Attack

Sarvagya Bhargava* Mark Stamp*†

January 23, 2025

Abstract

In this paper we compare traditional machine learning and deep learning models trained on a malware dataset when subjected to adversarial attack based on label-flipping. Specifically, we investigate the robustness of Support Vector Machines (SVM), Random Forest, Gaussian Naïve Bayes (GNB), Gradient Boosting Machine (GBM), LightGBM, XGBoost, Multilayer Perceptron (MLP), Convolutional Neural Network (CNN), MobileNet, and DenseNet models when facing varying percentages of misleading labels. We empirically assess the accuracy of each of these models under such an adversarial attack on the training data. This research aims to provide insights into which models are inherently more robust, in the sense of being better able to resist intentional disruptions to the training data. We find wide variation in the robustness of the models tested to adversarial attack, with our MLP model achieving the best combination of initial accuracy and robustness.

1 Introduction

Malicious software—malware—is a pernicious threat. Machine learning models have proven to be powerful tools for identifying and mitigating malware-based attacks. Since malware evolves, we need to constantly improve our defenses, which implies that research into learning models as applied in to the malware problem is essential.

One of the fundamental areas where we need to improve our defenses is in dealing with adversarial attacks on machine learning models. Poisoning attacks typically involve corrupting the training data or features vectors. The research in this paper, focuses on label-flipping adversarial attacks [20]. These attacks involve mislabeling data points during training, which serves to corrupt the training

*Department of Computer Science, San Jose State University

†mark.stamp@sjsu.edu

phase, and thereby degrade model performance. Understanding how various models respond to these attacks is the main focus of this paper. We consider both classic machine learning techniques and deep learning models.

Evaluating machine learning models against label-flipping attacks within the malware domain is important for the following reasons.

- The consequences of misclassification in malware detection can be severe, leading to security breaches, data compromise, and system vulnerabilities. Thus it is important to understand how different models respond to adversarial attacks.
- Many types of learning models have been shown to perform well in the malware domain. Comparing and evaluating the resilience and robustness of these architectures offers critical insights that can guide practitioners in selecting the most suitable models for defensive applications.

In short, understanding and mitigating the impacts of label-flipping adversarial attacks is imperative for the development of secure, reliable, and effective machine learning based malware detection systems. This research advances knowledge in the field by serving as a practical guide for practitioners to select and implement more secure machine learning models.

In this paper, we utilize the Malicia dataset (consisting of Windows malware) to evaluate the resilience of various machine learning and deep learning algorithms when faced with label-flipping attacks. Initially, we pre-process data comprising of 11,688 malware binaries, which are classified into 48 distinct malware families [14]. We exclude from our training and testing all classes containing fewer than 50 samples. We partition the resulting dataset into training and testing subsets, and we implement a procedure to simulate label-flipping attacks on the test set. This manipulated dataset is subsequently fed into a variety of trained models to assess their performance. These results enable us to analyze the effectiveness of the models under this attack scenario. We empirically analyze the robustness of Support Vector Machines (SVM), Random Forest, Gaussian Naïve Bayes (GNB), Gradient Boosting Machine (GBM), LightGBM, XGBoost, Multilayer Perceptron (MLP), Convolutional Neural Network (CNN), MobileNet, and DenseNet models.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide information on related work, that is, selected prior research into adversarial attacks involving malware datasets. Section 3 covers the technical details of our research, including an overview of the machine learning models used in this study. In Section 4, we detail the experiments conducted to evaluate the resilience of our models against label-flipping attacks. The discussion extends to the implications of our findings, emphasizing the strengths and limitations of current approaches. We conclude the paper in Section 5, where we also consider future work that could be undertaken to extend the results in this paper.

2 Related work

Adversarial attacks against malware detection systems have emerged as a challenging problem in cybersecurity research. In this section, we discuss representative examples of previous works related to adversarial attacks on malware detection and classification systems.

Aryal et al. in [1] provide a detailed survey of adversarial attacks within malware detection systems. Their work systematically highlights the vulnerabilities of various machine learning models to these such threats. Our research aims to build upon this previous work by investigating the resiliency of various machine learning and deep learning techniques to label-flipping attacks. A goal of our research is to uncover any inherent model-specific strengths and weaknesses.

Paudice et al. in [16] conducts an in-depth study utilizing three distinct datasets (MNIST, BreastCancer, and SpamBase) to explore the efficacy of label-flipping attacks on machine learning models. Their research demonstrates the significant impact of such adversarial tactics on the performance of learning systems, and they also consider a k -Nearest Neighbor based defense mechanism. This mechanism focuses on label sanitization, effectively identifying and correcting maliciously altered labels to mitigate the adverse effects of these attacks.

In their research, Xiao, et al. in [20] examined the resilience of Support Vector Machines (SVMs) against adversarial label noise attacks. Such attacks aim to manipulate SVM classification through strategic label-flipping. Their analysis, focuses on both linear and non-linear SVMs, across synthetic and real-world datasets.

Taheri et al. in [19] introduce two novel defense strategies against silhouette clustering-based label-flipping attacks, specifically designed for deep-learning-based malware systems. Additionally, Bootkrajang and Kabán in [3] discuss the utility of robust logistic regression algorithms that can withstand label-flipping, underscoring the relevance in practical applications.

Aryal et al.in [2] examine the resilience of various machine learning models to label-poisoning within the realm of malware detection by evaluating the detrimental impact of data corruption on the performance of ML-based malware detectors. This paper emphasize the critical importance of developing robust defense mechanisms to safeguard machine learning applications from adversarial attacks.

Jha et al. in [11] introduced “FLIP,” a novel label-only backdoor attack method that subverts machine learning models by manipulating the labels on training data. Demonstrating significant efficacy, FLIP achieved a high attack success rate on the CIFAR-10 dataset with a minimal amount of label corruption, while maintaining high accuracy on clean data. This highlights a critical vulnerability in machine learning systems and underscores the need to understand which models are more susceptible to these types of attacks.

3 Background

In this section, we introduce the various learning models that are considered in our experiments. These models range from classic machine learning techniques to cutting-edge pre-trained deep learning models.

3.1 Classic Models

Support Vector Machines (SVM) [4] are powerful supervised learning models used for classification and regression tasks. When training an SVM for binary classification, the goal is to find a separating hyperplane that splits the classes. SVMs are effective in high-dimensional spaces and can handle non-linear relationships via kernel functions. SVMs easily generalize to the multiclass case, where they are sometimes referred to as Support Vector Classifiers (SVC).

Random Forest [5] models are constructed by using multiple decision trees. They are a category of ensemble learning models and often perform well in classification and regression tasks. By combining a number of decision trees, a Random Forest reduces overfitting and increases the robustness of the model. They are noted for handling high-dimensional data well.

Gaussian Naïve Bayes (GNB) [8] is a probabilistic algorithm which is relatively simple, efficient, and can be highly effective in some cases. GNB is a variant of Naïve Bayes that works especially well when the independence assumption holds true.

3.2 Boosting Models

We place an emphasis on boosting models, since mislabeled training data is considered a weakness of boosting [18]. Thus, we expect that boosting models will generally be susceptible to failure under a label-flipping attack, and we would like to determine whether there are meaningful differences in the robustness of different boosting techniques.

Gradient Boosting Machines (GBM) [7] are a class of ensemble learning techniques which are known for incrementally improving model accuracy. This is achieved by generating new models to correct misjudgments of preceding models. These models are generated in sequence until no substantial improvements are observable. GBM employs decision trees as the base learners and refines them through an iterative approach. Specifically, GBM minimizes a loss function by employing weak learners, following a method akin to gradient descent. This process addresses errors primarily by focusing on the residuals of earlier learners in the sequence, and is accomplished through the sequential addition of shallow trees tailored to correct previous mistakes.

LightGBM [12] is a gradient boosting ensemble modeling technique, which focuses on fast and efficient training with reduced memory usage. LightGBM uses a histogram-based method where it bins the data using a histograms of the distribution which, in turn are used to iterate, calculate the gain, and split the

data. LightGBM also uses feature bundling, where it combines various features together to reduce dimensionality and make the training more efficient.

XGBoost [6] (eXtreme Gradient Boosting) is an enhancement to the foundational concepts of GBM. The benefits of XGBoost are that it is efficient to train, it handles complex relationships, it employs regularization techniques that reduce overfitting, it can incorporate parallel processing to improve computation speed, and it is robust.

3.3 Deep Learning Models

Multilayer Perceptrons (MLP) [17] are a type of feedforward artificial neural network characterized by multiple layers of interconnected nodes (i.e., neurons). An MLP has an input layer and an output layers, along with one or more hidden layers, with each layer being full-connected to the layers above and below. MLPs often perform well even on relatively small datasets.

Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) [13] are a category of deep learning algorithms that are designed to be efficient for dealing with data where local structure dominates, such as is the case for images. The architecture of a CNN typically involves a sequence of interleaved convolutional and pooling layers, with one or more fully connected layers for classification. The convolutional layers apply a number of filters to the input to create feature maps that abstract higher-level features from the raw input data. Pooling layers reduce the dimensionality for the next convolutional layer, thereby reducing the number of parameters and improving the computational efficiency. CNNs have proven to be highly effective for image image classification and object detection, and have been successfully applied to many non-image problems as well.

MobileNets [9] are a streamlined class of convolutional neural networks designed for efficiency and are suitable for environments with limited computational resources such as mobile devices. MobileNets employ a unique architecture involving depthwise separable convolutions, significantly reducing the number of parameters and computational overhead. This makes MobileNets particularly suitable for small datasets, as their compact structure minimizes the risk of overfitting while facilitating faster training via transfer learning.

DensetNets [10] have shown remarkable performance in image classification, object detection, and segmentation tasks. Their ability to leverage information from previous layers makes them particularly effective for tasks where preserving spatial hierarchies in images is crucial.

4 Experiments and Results

This section provides details on all of our label-flipping experiments. We begin with a discussion of the dataset, the preprocessing of the data, and feature extraction. We then move on to the experimental results for each of the models, where we vary the percentages of labels that are flipped.

4.1 Dataset and Data Preprocessing

We train models using the Malicia dataset [15]. In the preprocessing phase, the dataset is filtered to seven malware families, based on the criterion that each family should have at least 50 samples. The malware families and number of samples per family are listed in Table 1. In all of our experiments, we consider multiclass classification, based on the seven classes in Table 1.

Table 1: Number of samples

Family	Samples
Cridex	74
Harebot	53
SecurityShield	58
Smarthdd	68
Winwebsec	4360
Zbot	2136
Zeroaccess	1305
Total	8054

The models introduced in Section 3 can be categorized as follows.

- Classic models — SVM, Random Forest, and GNB
- Boosting models — GBM, Light GBM, and XGBoost
- Deep learning models — MLP, CNN, MobileNet, and DenseNet

Initially, we train each model without any label-flipping. Then we test each of these model by varying the percentage of labels randomly flipped during training, and we discuss the insights gained from these experiments. The percentage of labels flipped ranges from 10% to 100%, in increments of 10%. Note that the smallest class, Harebot, has only 53 samples, while the largest class, Winwebsec, has 4360 samples. Label-flipping is implemented on a per-class basis, that is, for a given flipping percentage, that percentage of labels is randomly flipped in the training data for each class.

To train our classic machine learning, boosting models, and MLP, features are obtained by extracting the mnemonic opcodes, and applying the TF-IDF vectorizer to the sequence extracted from each sample. This method was chosen because TF-IDF is effective at emphasizing crucial information within a sequence, while also serving to minimize background noise.

For training our CNN and pre-trained deep learning models, a different pre-processing approach was necessary, since these models expect image data. To accommodate this case, we convert each malware sample into an image representation by assigning a unique number to each opcode and interpreting the first 4096 opcodes as a 64×64 image. If a sample has fewer than 4096 opcodes, we simply pad with 0 to fill out the 64×64 image.

4.2 Baseline Results

First, we train each of the 10 models under consideration on clean data, that is, data without any label-flipping. These results are summarized in the form of a bar graph in Figure 1. Here, accuracy is defined as the number of correctly classified samples divided by the total number of samples classified.




Figure 1: Baseline accuracies without label-flipping

From Figure 1, we observe that a eight of the 10 models perform well, with the top five models (Random Forest, GBM, XGBoost, LightGBM, MLP) all achieving about 98% accuracy, or higher. The next three best (SVM, CNN, MobileNet) all attain an accuracy of about 96%. Only the DenseNet and GNB models fail to produce strong results on this dataset.

The differences in accuracy among the top eight models is relatively small. Hence, we might be willing to choose from among these models based on robust their inherent robustness to label-flipping attack, as opposed to accuracy alone. Next, we consider label-flipping attacks on each of the 10 models.

4.3 Label-Flipping Results for Classic Models

As discussed above, the traditional machine learning models we selected for our experimentation are SVM, Random Forest, and GNB. Each of these models was chosen for its distinct approach to data analysis: SVM excels in separating data in high-dimensional spaces through margin maximization, Random Forest leverages ensembles of decision trees to improve predictive accuracy and robustness, and GNB relies on the probabilistic assumptions of data distributions. Here, we present and discuss the results of our label-flipping experiment for each of these models.

4.3.1 Support Vector Machine Results

From Figure 2(a) we observe that SVM achieved high accuracy and that the accuracy was virtually unchanged until more than 60% of the labels were flipped, and even at 70% label-flipping, the accuracy only diminished slightly. After 70% label flipping, the accuracy drops precipitously. These results indicate that SVM is remarkably robust when faced with a label-flipping adversarial attack.

4.3.2 Random Forest Results

In Figure 2(b) we see that the accuracy of our Random Forest model is very high without any label-flipping. The accuracy then degrades consistently, and almost linearly up to about 60% label-flipping. Although Random Forest is the most accurate of our classic models, it is not as robust to label-flipping attacks as SVM (and MLP, as we note below).

4.3.3 Gaussian Naïve Bayes Results

Figure 2(c) shows that GNB performed very poorly initially and, of course, it also performed poorly with respect to label-flipping. This model is clearly not suitable for this particular problem, most likely due to the selected features failing to be conditionally independent.




Figure 2: Accuracy, precision and recall graphs for classic ML techniques

4.4 Label-Flipping Results for Boosting Techniques

We also consider label-flipping attacks on advanced boosting techniques. As discussed above, the specific models we consider are XGBoost, GBM, and LightGBM

4.4.1 Gradient Boosting Machine Results

Our GBM results appear in Figure 3(a). We see that this model delivers strong performance and robustness to label-flipping adversarial attack. The results for GBM are comparable to the MLP model in Figure 4(a), below.

4.4.2 XGBoost Results

From the Figure 3(b), we observe that qualitatively, XGBoost performs similarly to the Random Forest model in Figure 2(b), with XGBoost is slightly more robust to label-flipping. This result is not too surprising, since XGBoost and Random Forest are both based on multiple decision trees. It is also worth noting that XGBoost has similar initial accuracy as GBM, but it is far less robust in the face of label-flipping.

4.4.3 LightGBM Results

In Figure 3(c) we see that LightGBM yields almost identical performance as our XGBoost model, but well below that of the GBM model. This is interesting, as it indicates that the LightGBM is—in the sense of robustness—much weaker than the GBM model from which it is derived.

4.5 Label-Flipping Results for Deep Learning Models

In addition to traditional machine learning models and boosting models, we consider deep learning architectures. As discussed above, we analyze three image-based deep learning models, namely, MLP, a generic CNN, as well as the pre-trained models MobileNet and DenseNet.

4.5.1 Multilayer Perceptron Results

As can be seen in Figure 4(a), our MLP model performs similar to—although slightly better than—the SVM model, both initially, and at each label-flipping percentage. The similarity of SVM and MLP is not too surprising, as these are closely related techniques. Roughly speaking, an MLP can be viewed as a generalization of an SVM, where the equivalent of the kernel function is learned, rather than being specified as a hyperparameter during training [18].




Figure 3: Accuracy, precision and recall graphs for boosting techniques

4.5.2 Convolutional Neural Network Results

From the graphs in Figure 4(b), we see that our CNN model gives us accuracies comparable to the Random Forest model in Figure 2(b). This model is not nearly as robust as the classic SVM and MLP models, and it also is far weaker than the GBM model.

4.5.3 MobileNet Results

In Figure 4(c), we observe that, as compared to CNN, the performance of MobileNet is slightly better across the full range of label-flipping attacks. However, as with our CNN model, MobileNet trails far behind the SVM, MLP, and GBM models.

4.5.4 DenseNet Results

DenseNet results in Figure 4(d). We found DenseNet difficult to train, and hence the poor and erratic results for this model are not surprising. We believe that there is insufficient data in our training set for this particular model.




Figure 4: Accuracy, precision and recall graphs for deep learning techniques


4.6 Discussion

Figure 5(a) depicts the accuracy of all models tested, while Figures 5(b) and (c) give the precision and recall, respectively. These graphs serve to emphasize that, overall, our best model is the MLP. The MLP has nearly the highest initial accuracy, and it is remarkably robust to label-flipped training data. The SVM model yields slightly worse results than MLP, while also providing robustness. The GBM model also performs well, both in terms of initial accuracy, and robustness to label-flipping.


CNN and MobileNet, two of the three image-based deep learning techniques considered, performed well on the malware classification problem. However, these two techniques are quite fragile with respect to label flipping.

5 Conclusion and Future Work


In this paper, we compared the robustness of various learning model under a label-flipping attack scenario. The underlying learning problem was malware classification, and the we considered a variety of classic machine learning techniques, boosting techniques, and deep learning techniques. Specifically, the classic techniques tested were Support Vector Machine (SVM), Random Forest, and Gaussian Naïve Bayes (GNB); the boosting techniques we analyzed were Gradient Boosting



(a) Accuracy



(b) Precision



(c) Recall

Figure 5: Accuracy, precision, and recall for all models tested

Machine (GBM), XGBoost, and LightGBM; while the deep learning techniques were Multilayer Perceptron (MLP), Convolutional Neural Network (CNN), MobileNet, and DenseNet. Although most of these techniques performed well on the original classification problem, the MLP and SVM were the most robust, with the boosting technique of GBM also performing well with respect to robustness. The Random Forest model was the least robust, while the image-based models and two of the boosting techniques (XGBoost and LightGBM) also did not hold up well under our label-flipping adversarial attack.

These results have practical implications. In an environment where adversarial attacks are likely, and defenses could be challenging to implement, we might be willing to give up a small amount of initial accuracy for a model that is inherently more robust to such an attack. Of the models tested, MLP stands out as giving high initial accuracy—within 1% of the best model—yet also being the most robust under a label-flipping scenario. Furthermore, as mentioned in Section 3.2, mislabeled data is generally considered to be an inherent weakness of boosting

techniques, However, we found that GBM is reasonably robust in this regard. Thus, GBM might be preferred in cases where a boosting strategy is needed, and mislabeled data (or label-flipping attack) is a legitimate concern.

There are many possible avenues for future work. Additional models could be considered, as well as additional datasets and learning problems. We could consider more advanced and targeted label-flipping attacks, as well as other classes of attacks. Defenses against attacks, and countermeasures to those defenses would be additional interesting related problems.

References

- [1] Kshitiz Aryal, Maanak Gupta, and Mahmoud Abdelsalam. A survey on adversarial attacks for malware analysis. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.08223>, 2021.
- [2] Kshitiz Aryal, Maanak Gupta, and Mahmoud Abdelsalam. Analysis of label-flip poisoning attack on machine learning based malware detector. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Big Data*, pages 4236–4245, 2022.
- [3] Jakramate Bootkrajang and Ata Kabán. Label-noise robust logistic regression and its applications. In Peter A. Flach, Tjil De Bie, and Nello Cristianini, editors, *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases, ECML PKDD*, 2012.
- [4] Dustin Boswell. Introduction to support vector machines. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Introduction-to-Support-Vector-Machines-Boswell/ea2ea7c6e280c1cfb67ee38ea63a327b1ba3ca36>, 2002.
- [5] Leo Breiman. Random forests. *Machine Learning*, 45:5–32, 2001.
- [6] Tianqi Chen and Carlos Guestrin. XGBoost: A scalable tree boosting system. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 785–794, 2016.
- [7] Jerome H. Friedman. Greedy function approximation: A gradient boosting machine. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 1189–1232, 2001.
- [8] David J. Hand and Keming Yu. Idiot’s Bayes — Not so stupid after all? *International Statistical Review*, 69(3):385–398, 2001.
- [9] Andrew G. Howard, Menglong Zhu, Bo Chen, Dmitry Kalenichenko, Weijun Wang, Tobias Weyand, Marco Andreetto, and Hartwig Adam. MobileNets: Efficient convolutional neural networks for mobile vision applications. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.04861>, 2017.
- [10] Gao Huang, Zhuang Liu, Laurens Van Der Maaten, and Kilian Q. Weinberger. Densely connected convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4700–4708, 2017.

- [11] Rishi Jha, Jonathan Hayase, and Sewoong Oh. Label poisoning is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:71029–71052, 2023.
- [12] Guolin Ke, Qi Meng, Thomas Finley, Taifeng Wang, Wei Chen, Weidong Ma, Qiwei Ye, and Tie-Yan Liu. LightGBM: A highly efficient gradient boosting decision tree. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 2017.
- [13] Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, 1998.
- [14] Ritik Mehta, Olha Jurečková, and Mark Stamp. A natural language processing approach to malware classification. *Journal of Computer Virology and Hacking Techniques*, 20(1):173–184, 2024.
- [15] Antonio Nappa, M. Zubair Rafique, and Juan Caballero. The malicia dataset: identification and analysis of drive-by download operations. *International Journal of Information Security*, 14:15–33, 2015.
- [16] Andrea Paudice, Luis Muñoz-González, and Emil C. Lupu. Label sanitization against label flipping poisoning attacks. In Carlos Alzate et al., editors, *ECML PKDD 2018 Workshops*, pages 5–15, 2019.
- [17] David E. Rumelhart, Geoffrey E. Hinton, and Ronald J. Williams. Learning internal representations by error propagation, parallel distributed processing, explorations in the microstructure of cognition. *Biometrika*, 71:599–607, 1986.
- [18] Mark Stamp. *Introduction to Machine Learning with Applications in Information Security*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2nd edition, 2022.
- [19] Rahim Taheri, Reza Javidan, Mohammad Shojafar, Zahra Pooranian, Ali Miri, and Mauro Conti. On defending against label flipping attacks on malware detection systems. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 32:14781–14800, 2020.
- [20] Huang Xiao, Battista Biggio, Blaine Nelson, Han Xiao, Claudia Eckert, and Fabio Roli. Support vector machines under adversarial label contamination. *Neurocomputing*, 160(C):53–62, 2015.