

Improving Network Threat Detection by Knowledge Graph, Large Language Model, and Imbalanced Learning

Lili Zhang¹, Quanyan Zhu^{2*}, Herman Ray³, Ying Xie³

¹Hewlett Packard Enterprise

²Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, New York University

³College of Computing and Software Engineering, Kennesaw State University

*Corresponding Author: Quanyan Zhu, qz494@nyu.edu

Abstract

Network threat detection has been challenging due to the complexities of attack activities and the limitation of historical threat data to learn from. To help enhance the existing practices of using analytics, machine learning, and artificial intelligence methods to detect the network threats, we propose an integrated modelling framework, where Knowledge Graph is used to analyze the users' activity patterns, Imbalanced Learning techniques are used to prune and weigh Knowledge Graph, and LLM is used to retrieve and interpret the users' activities from Knowledge Graph. The proposed framework is applied to Agile Threat Detection through Online Sequential Learning. The preliminary results show the improved threat capture rate by 3%-4% and the increased interpretabilities of risk predictions based on the users' activities.

1. Introduction

Network threats have brought significant financial losses and public safety issues in recent years. The total reported loss from cybercrimes is over \$12.5 Billion in U.S. in 2023 according to FBI's Internet Crime Complaint Center (IC3) report [2]. Moreover, the public safety systems face an increasing disruption target on emergency communication systems and operations by malicious attacks [5]. These are caused by more complicated and new network attack activities that are not detected in time [6]. This presents a significant need for Agile Threat Detection, which aims to identify and respond to evolving threats rapidly and proactively [10].

Analytics, Machine Learning (ML), and Artificial Intelligence (AI) methods have been widely used by researchers and practitioners to discover the patterns of known threats and detect the unusual signals of unknown threats from the users' activities. Traditional ML/AI models typically need a lot of historical data to learn from to guarantee good model performance. However, there is very limited historical data on known threats which have been observed but are not detected every time they happen. And there is no data on unknown threats which have never been observed before. These challenge traditional ML/AI models to predict the network threats accurately.

Compared with other ML/AI models, Knowledge Graph shows higher efficiency of analyzing the users' activities and their relationships to discover the abnormalities. However, it has three challenges. The first one is to prune and weigh the information

properly in the graph to filter out the weak or redundant information for the network threats. The second one is to include the large sizes of texts as a part of graphs and graph analysis. The third one is to untangle, diagnose, and interpret the users' complex activities and relationships in the graph.

To overcome the challenges above, we propose to better detect the network threats by the combination of Knowledge Graph, Imbalanced Learning, and Large Language model (LLM), where Knowledge Graph is used to analyze the users' activity patterns, Imbalanced Learning techniques are used to prune and weigh Knowledge Graph, and LLM is used to retrieve and interpret the users' activities from Knowledge Graph.

By leveraging LLMs empowered with Knowledge Graphs enhanced by Imbalanced Learning, an adaptive and real-time monitoring framework can be implemented to achieve fast and early detection of malicious behaviors. This approach integrates the strengths of LLMs in contextual reasoning with the structured relationship modeling capabilities of Knowledge Graphs to monitor, predict, and explain potential threats as they unfold. The synergy between these components ensures both depth and immediacy in threat detection, making the system highly effective in dynamic environments.

2. Related Work

The data and modelling challenges in the network threat detection also present in other domains that many researchers and practitioners have made efforts to solve.

Knowledge Graph is an effective data structure of representing sparse big data based on their relationships and discovering abnormal patterns [16][17]. A graph is a representation of relationships between entities, where an entity (e.g., user) is represented as a node and a relationship (e.g., which use did which activity) is represented as an edge. Thanks to the flexibility of running different algorithms on graph data structures (e.g., similarity, centrality, community detection, path finding, shortest path, link prediction), Knowledge Graph has been used in a variety of applications, such as fraudulent transaction detection, network threat detection, social network influence maximization, product recommendation, route optimization, failure prediction in public infrastructure (e.g., power grid, water grid, transportation network) [18][19][20][21]. Despite all these advantages of Knowledge Graph, it can be challenged by weak or redundant information in the graph. And it is not an efficient practice to include large text data either on nodes or edges in a graph, for example, actual article text that a user read. Moreover, it takes lots of experts' knowledge and experience to diagnose and interpret the information from the graph.

- First, how to prune and weigh the nodes and edges in a graph properly?
- Second, how to incorporate large texts into the graph analysis?
- Third, how to retrieve and interpret the information from a graph efficiently?

On the first challenge above, the pruning and weighing of the nodes and edges in a graph are based on the importance of the information represented on the nodes and edges in the graph. This typically depends on the problems that are being solved and the algorithms that are used. Wu employed a graph hierarchy inference method based on the Agony model to eliminate noisy nodes or edges in the graph [7]. Chong derived the graph weights based on the graph adjacency structure [8]. Jarnac used the bootstrapping via zero-shot analogical pruning to select relevant nodes or edges in the graph [9]. Given that our objective is to prune and weigh the nodes and edges in the graph based on their relationships to the network threat, a supervised learning approach is more suitable in our problem. And because there is less than 1% threat observations and more than 99% non-threat observations in the historical data, the Imbalanced Learning techniques are specifically used in our solution. Imbalanced Learning is the process of learning patterns from imbalanced data. Imbalanced data is defined as a dataset with less observations in the minority class (e.g., threat) compared with majority classes (e.g., non-threat). The traditional ML/AI models are designed to maximize the overall accuracy on the balanced dataset. To adapt ML/AI models on the imbalanced data, various approaches have been proposed, such as sampling, weighting, and thresholding [11]. On the extremely imbalanced data (e.g., the dataset with the ratio in the minority class less than 1%), the weighting approaches generally work better combined with the thresholding approaches [1]. The main reason is that the observations in the minority class are too few to do the sampling in a representative manner.




Figure 1. Imbalanced Data

On the second and third challenges above, LLM is a recent advancement of retrieving and interpreting information from a knowledge base, which can be used to diagnose the users' complex activities and their relationships. LLMs are trained to predict the next word in a sentence by a huge amount of data from the whole web [13]. The existing LLMs include ChatGPT, LLaMA, Gemini, Claude, and so on [12]. LLM have been used in applications of summarizing (e.g., summarizing user reviews for brevity), inferring (e.g., sentiment classification, topic extraction), transforming text (e.g., translation, spelling & grammar correction), expanding (e.g., automatically writing emails), and Retrieval-Augmented Generation (e.g., reference on knowledge base beyond its training data before response). However, the standard LLM retrieval process is based on similarity [15], where the similarity between the user's question and documents in the database are measured and the most similar documents are selected to answer the user's question, as shown in Figure 2.

The emerging practice is to combine Knowledge Graph and LLM for various use cases such as LLM pre-training, Graph Question Answering, and LLM as predictor [14] [15]. In our proposed framework, we focus on using LLM to enhance the large text analysis

capability of Knowledge Graph and using Knowledge Graph to enable the relationship-based search capability of LLM, which will be discussed in detail in Section 4.4.




Figure 2. LLM Question-Answer Process

3. Data

The Data used in this paper is Insider Threat Test Dataset [3]. It is a collection of synthetic insider threat test datasets that provide the synthetic information of users, computing devices, activities (i.e., logon/logoff, removable device connect/disconnect, email log, file access, web visit), and activity threat labels [4]. The dataset was generated by the CERT Division at Carnegie Mellon University in partnership with ExactData, LLC, and under sponsorship from DARPA I2O.

4. Modelling and Results

To effectively quantify the threat risk of users and computing devices based on their complex activities, we propose an integrated Analytics and Artificial Intelligence (AAI) modelling framework in Figure 3 with the following functions.

- Create a User-Activity Knowledge Graph.
- Prune and weigh Knowledge Graph by Imbalanced Learning techniques to capture the patterns of known threats.
- Measure Graph Similarity for the user activity changes over time to capture unusual signals of unknown threats.
- Retrieve and interpret the users' activities from Knowledge Graph using Large Language Model.




Figure 3. AAI Modeling Framework of Network Threat Detection

4.1 Knowledge Graph Creation

A Graph G uses the nodes and edges to represent relational information of users, computing devices, and activities, as shown in Figure 4.

- Nodes V : A node represents a user, user role, device, activity type (i.e., logon, email, file access, removable connect, removable disconnect, web visit, logoff), and activity time.
- Edges E : The edges connect the user, user role, device, activity type, and activity time, which describe what user did what activity on which device at what time.



Figure 4. User-Activity Knowledge Graph Schema

4.2 Graph Pruning and Graph Weighting using Imbalanced Learning techniques

To reduce the redundant and insignificant information in Knowledge Graph and improve the algorithm efficiency, we prune and weigh the graph using Imbalanced Learning techniques, which evaluate how the information represented by the nodes and edges in the graph are related to the threats in the historical data. First, the numerical representations of the users' activities in the graph and the historical threats are created

as independent variables (i.e., features) and dependent variable respectively. Then, their relationships are examined through information value and variable clustering techniques filter out the independent variables with weak predictive power or redundant information. The nodes and edges representing those weak or redundant information are pruned from the graph. Lastly, a predictive model is trained with a customized imbalanced learning technique to predict whether a logon session is a threat. The predicted value from this predictive model is used to weigh the nodes in the graph.

4.2.1 Feature Creation

In the predictive model, the dependent variable is a binary variable with 1 indicating a threat logon and 0 indicating a normal logon. The independent variables are 56 variables (i.e., features) representing the users' current and past activities, such as the number of executable files running in the current session and the number of executable files running in the past sessions.

4.2.2 Feature Selection

Then, the relationships between these independent variables and the dependent variable are examined through the information value, and the interrelationships among these independent variables are examined through the variable clustering. 16 independent variables are selected to be used in the modelling. The nodes and edges representing the information of these 16 variables are kept.

4.2.3 Imbalanced Learning

In the historical data, the percentage of detected threats is 0.34%. To mitigate the data bias, the weight of each training sample λ_i is first learned through a customized log-likelihood function [1], as shown in Equation 1, from the training data, where i is the training sample index, y_i is the dependent variable value of the training sample i , \mathbf{x}_i is the independent variable vector value of the training sample i , and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is the coefficient vector of independent variables. The training data is 70% of the historical data while the remaining 30% of historical data is held out as validation data to evaluate the model performance later.

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \sum_{i=1}^m [\lambda_i y_i \log(\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i)) + (1 - y_i) \log(1 - \pi(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i))]$$

where $\lambda_i > 0$, a parameter learned from the data:

$$\text{cost}_i = \begin{cases} -\lambda_i y_i \log(\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i)) & \text{if } y_i = 1, \\ -(1 - y_i) \log(1 - \pi(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i)) & \text{if } y_i = 0. \end{cases}$$

Equation 1. Customized Log-Likelihood Function

The learned sample weights λ_i are applied to the training process of machine learning models (e.g., Gradient Boosting Model). Two models are built in this experiment. Their

performance is evaluated on the validation data based on the metrics of Gain and Area under Precision-Recall Curve, as shown in Table 1.

- Model 1: Gradient Boosting Model trained without learnable weights
- Model 2: Gradient Boosting Model trained with learnable weights from Equation 1

Table 1. Model Performance

Performance Metric	Model 1: Gradient Boosting Model trained <u>without</u> learnable weights	Model 2: Gradient Boosting Model trained <u>with</u> learnable weights
% captured true threats among all true threats (gain) at top 3% predicted risky logons	56%	60%
% captured true threats among all true threats (gain) at top 30% predicted risky logons	95%	98%
Area under Precision-Recall Curve	0.186	0.204

Compared with Model 1, Model 2 trained with learnable weights can capture 4% more of true threats at top 3% predicted risky logons and 3% more of true threats at top 30% predicted risky logons. The overall improvement is around 2% under different probability cutoffs of converting the predicted threat probability into binary values. This can potentially prevent the loss of \$0.2 billion in 2021, \$0.3 billion in 2022, and \$0.4 billion in 2023 [2].

Model 2 is used to predict the threat probability for current and new logons. The predicted probabilities are used to weigh the logon activity nodes and their connected user nodes and device nodes in the graph.

4.3 Graph Similarity

To measure the user's activity change over time, the current activity graph and the past activity graph are first built. And then the weighted similarity (e.g., Weighted Jaccard Similarity) between these two graphs is computed, where A represents the user's current activity graph and B represents the user's past activity graph as visualized in Figure 5.

$$Weighted[J(A, B)] = \frac{Weighted(|A \cap B|)}{Weighted(|A \cup B|)} = \frac{Weights\ of\ Nodes\ 3,4}{Weights\ of\ Nodes\ 1,2,3,4,5}$$




Figure 5. Weighted Jaccard Similarity Computation Example

To show the result, take User CSC0217 as an example in Figure 6. Its current activity graph shows it logs on the device PC5866 in the afternoon and connects to a removable device, while its past activity graph shows it logged on the devices PC3742, PC6377, and PC2288 in the morning and visited some websites. The Jaccard Similarity Score between these two graphs is very small, resulting in a high activity change score.




Figure 6. User CSC0217 Activity Graph and Change Score

4.4 Graph Retrieval and Interpretation using Large Language Model

4.4.1 Graph Schema Creation - Extended

The Contents from the user's Email, File, and Web Visits are important behavior factors. Due to its long text size, it typically cannot be integrated efficiently by traditional Knowledge Graph techniques. Thanks to the advancement of text embedding and vector databases, they can be efficiently integrated into Knowledge Graph by linking to their embedding values stored in a vector database, as shown in Figure 7.




Figure 7. User-Activity Knowledge Graph Schema Extended with Content Texts

4.4.2 Large Language Model

To more efficiently retrieve and interpret the users' activities and contents for network threat diagnosis and detection, Large Language Model (LLM) can be combined with Knowledge Graph in four manners, as shown in Figure 8.

- LLM translates the user's question in English into Graph Database query language and does the relationship-based search in Knowledge Graph.
- LLM standardizes the text data (e.g., user role) and improves the data quality in Knowledge Graph.
- LLM summarizes the user activity information from Knowledge Graph and the content information from Vector Database.
- LLM interprets the user's activities for the user's interest and intention based on its own training knowledge base from the whole web.




Figure 8. LLM-based Knowledge Graph Retriever and Interpreter

In this experiment, the open-source graph database Nebula is used to build and store the users' activity graphs, the python package llama-index is used to index Knowledge Graph, the embedding model text-embedding-3-large is used to vectorize the contents, and the LLM model gpt-3.5-turbo is used to query and generate the answer.

For the data used in this experiment, we first tried the contents in the Insider Threat Test Dataset, but we got the response "The text appears to be a mix of random words and phrases that do not form coherent sentences or convey a clear message. It seems to be a jumble of disconnected information that does not provide a clear context or topic. It is difficult to interpret any specific interest or meaning from this text."

Alternatively, for the demonstration purpose, we generated the following graph with the connected information in Figure 9. Given this graph data, we asked questions about User 1's current content visits, past content visits, and topic interest changes, and got the answers reflecting the true data in the graph, as shown in Table 2.




Figure 9. User 1 Activity Retrieval and Interpretation Graph

Table 2. User 1 Activity Retrieval and Interpretation Q&A

Question	Answer
What contents did User 1 visit on October 1, 2024? Please summarize the visited contents and interpret the user’s interest.	User 1 visited the contents “What is HPE?”, “What is HPE GreenLake”, and “What is HPE Private Cloud AI?”. This suggests that User 1 is interested in the cloud and AI solutions offered by Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) . HPE is a global edge-to-cloud company. HPE GreenLake is a hybrid cloud platform for deploying and managing resources across your private and public clouds while retaining control of your data and flexibility. HPE Private Cloud AI is a turnkey, cloud-based experience co-developed with NVIDIA to help businesses of every size build and deploy generative AI applications.
What file does User 1 visit currently on October 2, 2024? Please summarize the visited contents and interpret the user’s interest.	User 1 visits the video game web. This indicates that User 1 is interested in video games.
How do you think the topics of the contents that the user currently visits are different from or related to the contents that the user visited in the past?	The topics of the contents that the user currently visits are very different from the contents that the user visited in the past.

5. Application: Agile Threat Detection through Online Sequential Monitoring

In this setup, Knowledge Graphs provide a robust backbone to model the evolving relationships between entities, such as users, devices, and activities, in real time. Each new event—whether it is a login attempt, file access, or data transfer—is dynamically integrated into the graph. Mathematically, the graph is represented as $G_t = (V_t, E_t, A_t)$, where V_t are nodes, E_t are edges, and A_t are attributes such as timestamps or embeddings. The graph evolves incrementally with new events ΔE_t , updating to

$G_{t+1} = G_t \oplus \Delta E_t$. This incremental update mechanism ensures computational efficiency by modifying only the affected parts of the graph, allowing the system to handle large-scale, real-time data streams.

A critical enabler of fast detection is the use of graph-based representations that efficiently encode complex relational data into formats suitable for real-time analysis. Techniques such as localized similarity computations, including weighted Jaccard similarity, allow for the rapid identification of deviations in graph structures. For example, comparing a user's current activity subgraph G_t to their historical activity subgraph G_{t-1} can yield insights into behavioral changes through Equation 2.

$$\text{Weighted Jaccard Similarity} = \frac{\sum_{e \in E_t \cap E_{t-1}} w(e)}{\sum_{e \in E_t \cup E_{t-1}} w(e)}$$

Equation 2. Weighted Jaccard Similarity

where $w(e)$ represents the importance of an edge. Significant deviations, reflected by low similarity scores, trigger further analysis by LLMs to interpret these anomalies.

LLMs enhance this real-time graph monitoring by embedding and interpreting node attributes A_t and relationships within the graph. Attributes are vectorized as $\varphi(v) = \text{EmbeddingModel}(A_t(v))$, and LLMs evaluate the likelihood of malicious intent based on the graph context, as defined in Equation 3.

$$P(\text{Threat} | \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k\}, G_t) = g(\varphi(v), H_t)$$

Equation 3. Threat Likelihood Estimation

where g represents the probabilistic inference function, and H_t encapsulates the historical context provided by the Knowledge Graph. This probabilistic reasoning enables the model to anticipate potential threats, such as a sequence of minor but suspicious activities (e.g., failed logins followed by successful access from an unknown device) that might precede a significant security breach.

Real-time data processing is further supported by streaming pipelines that ingest, preprocess, and analyze activity logs as they are generated. Advanced indexing mechanisms ensure near-instantaneous updates to the graph, while vectorized embeddings enable the integration of high-dimensional data, such as email content or file metadata. The seamless interaction between these components ensures that the system remains both responsive and accurate, adapting quickly to emerging threats. For instance, an LLM might generate an insight such as, "User X has accessed sensitive files during atypical hours and initiated a remote connection, which deviates significantly from their usual behavior."

To ensure early detection, the system employs sequential probability updates to refine its threat assessments dynamically. Using a smoothing factor α , the probability of a threat is updated as Equation 4.

$$P_t(\text{Threat}|G_t) = \alpha P_{t-1}(\text{Threat}) + (1 - \alpha)F(G_t, E_t)$$

Equation 4. Threat Likelihood Estimation with Smoothing Factor

where $F(G_t, E_t)$ evaluates the likelihood of a threat based on the latest event. This approach integrates historical probabilities with new observations, allowing the model to adapt continuously as new data arrives.

Another critical aspect of agile detection is the system's ability to prioritize alerts based on contextual risk assessments. By assigning dynamic risk score $R_t(v)$ to nodes in the graph, as defined below.

$$R_t(v) = P_t(\text{Threat}|G_t) \cdot \omega_t(v)$$

Equation 5. Dynamic Risk Score Estimation

The system focuses on high-priority threats. Here, $\omega_t(v)$ represents the contextual weight, incorporating factors like the sensitivity of accessed data or the criticality of the device involved. This prioritization reduces false positives and ensures efficient allocation of security resources.

Agile threat detection, combining the real-time monitoring capabilities of Knowledge Graphs with the interpretive and predictive power of LLMs, offers a comprehensive solution for identifying and addressing threats quickly. By continuously adapting to new data, integrating contextual insights, and prioritizing risks effectively, this framework delivers actionable and timely defense against sophisticated adversaries. The mathematical rigor underlying the system ensures scalability and responsiveness, making it an essential tool for modern cybersecurity operations.

6. Future Work

In the future, we plan to more comprehensively implement and evaluate the performance of the proposed modeling framework in the application "Agile Threat Detection through Online Sequential Monitoring" by collecting real-time feedback. Moreover, the proposed modeling framework can be applied in other domains of monitoring the users' activities over time like bank transactions.

7. Discussions and Conclusions

To help enhance the existing practices of using analytics, machine learning, and artificial intelligence methods to detect network threats, we propose an integrated Analytics and Artificial Intelligence (AAI) modelling framework, which helps effectively quantify the threat risk of users and computing devices based on their complex activities. In this framework, Knowledge Graph is used to analyze the users' activity patterns and signals for threats. Imbalanced Learning techniques are used to prune and weigh Knowledge Graph. And LLM is used to retrieve and interpret

information, including large texts, from Knowledge Graph. This approach integrates the strengths of LLMs in contextual reasoning with the structured relationship modeling capabilities of Knowledge Graphs to monitor, predict, and explain potential threats as they unfold. The synergy between these components ensures both depth and immediacy in threat detection, making the system highly effective in dynamic environments. The preliminary results show the improved threat capture rate by 3%-4% and the increased interpretabilities of risk predictions based on the users' activities.

Reference

- [1] Zhang, L., Geisler, T., Ray, H., & Xie, Y. (2022). Improving logistic regression on the imbalanced data by a novel penalized log-likelihood function. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 49(13), 3257-3277.
- [2] Internet Crime Report 2023. Federal Bureau of Investigation. Retrieved November 1, 2024, from https://www.ic3.gov/AnnualReport/Reports/2023_IC3Report.pdf
- [3] Insider Threat Test Dataset. Carnegie Mellon University. Retrieved October 1, 2023, from <https://insights.sei.cmu.edu/library/insider-threat-test-dataset/>
- [4] Glasser, J., & Lindauer, B. (2013, May). Bridging the gap: A pragmatic approach to generating insider threat data. In 2013 IEEE Security and Privacy Workshops (pp. 98-104). IEEE.
- [5] Cyber Incident Response to Public Safety Answering Points: A State's Perspective. Retrieved November 1, 2024, from https://www.cisa.gov/sites/default/files/publications/22_0414_cyber_incident_case_studies_state_final_508c.pdf
- [6] Zhu, Q., Fung, C., Boutaba, R., & Basar, T. (2012). GUIDEX: A game-theoretic incentive-based mechanism for intrusion detection networks. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 30(11), 2220-2230.
- [7] Wu, C., Zeng, Z., Yang, Y., Chen, M., Peng, X., & Liu, S. (2023). Task-driven cleaning and pruning of noisy knowledge graph. *Information Sciences*, 646, 119406.
- [8] Chong, Y., Ding, Y., Yan, Q., & Pan, S. (2020). Graph-based semi-supervised learning: A review. *Neurocomputing*, 408, 216-230.
- [9] Jarnac, L., Couceiro, M., & Monnin, P. (2023, October). Relevant Entity Selection: Knowledge Graph Bootstrapping via Zero-Shot Analogical Pruning. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management* (pp. 934-944).
- [10] Zhu, Q. (2024). Foundations of cyber resilience: The confluence of game, control, and learning theories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.01205*.
- [11] He, H., & Ma, Y. (Eds.). (2013). *Imbalanced learning: foundations, algorithms, and applications*.
- [12] Zhao, W. X., Zhou, K., Li, J., Tang, T., Wang, X., Hou, Y., ... & Wen, J. R. (2023). A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*.
- [13] Min, B., Ross, H., Sulem, E., Veyseh, A. P. B., Nguyen, T. H., Sainz, O., ... & Roth, D. (2023). Recent advances in natural language processing via large pre-trained language models: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 56(2), 1-40.

- [14] Pan, S., Luo, L., Wang, Y., Chen, C., Wang, J., & Wu, X. (2024). Unifying large language models and knowledge graphs: A roadmap. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*.
- [15] Steck, H., Ekanadham, C., & Kallus, N. (2024, May). Is cosine-similarity of embeddings really about similarity?. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024* (pp. 887-890).
- [16] Ma, X., Wu, J., Xue, S., Yang, J., Zhou, C., Sheng, Q. Z., ... & Akoglu, L. (2021). A comprehensive survey on graph anomaly detection with deep learning. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 35(12), 12012-12038.
- [17] Janev, V., Graux, D., Jabeen, H., & Sallinger, E. (2020). *Knowledge graphs and big data processing* (p. 209). Springer Nature.
- [18] Zhou, H. J., Shen, T. T., Liu, X. L., Zhang, Y., Guo, P., & Zhang, J. (2020). Survey of knowledge graph approaches and applications. *Journal on Artificial Intelligence*, 2(2), 89-101.
- [19] Huang, H., Chen, Y., Lou, B., Hongzhou, Z., Wu, J., & Yan, K. (2019, August). Constructing knowledge graph from big data of smart grids. In *2019 10th International Conference on Information Technology in Medicine and Education (ITME)* (pp. 637-641). IEEE.
- [20] Zhao, Q., Liu, J., Sullivan, N., Chang, K., Spina, J., Blasch, E., & Chen, G. (2021, April). Anomaly detection of unstructured big data via semantic analysis and dynamic knowledge graph construction. In *Signal Processing, Sensor/Information Fusion, and Target Recognition XXX* (Vol. 11756, pp. 126-142). SPIE.
- [21] Zhang, L., Priestley, J., DeMaio, J., Ni, S., & Tian, X. (2021). Measuring customer similarity and identifying cross-selling products by community detection. *Big data*, 9(2), 132-143.