

A Survey on Vulnerability Prioritization: Taxonomy, Metrics, and Research Challenges

YUNING JIANG, National University of Singapore, Singapore
NAY OO, NCS Cyber Special Ops R&D, Singapore
QIAORAN MENG, National University of Singapore, Singapore
HOON WEI LIM, NCS Cyber Special Ops R&D, Singapore
BIPLAB SIKDAR, National University of Singapore, Singapore

In today's highly interconnected digital landscape, safeguarding complex infrastructures against cyber threats has become increasingly challenging due to the exponential growth in the number and complexity of vulnerabilities. Resource constraints necessitate effective vulnerability prioritization strategies, focusing efforts on the most critical risks. This paper presents a systematic literature review of 82 studies, introducing a novel taxonomy that categorizes metrics into severity, exploitability, contextual factors, predictive indicators, and aggregation methods. Our analysis reveals significant gaps in existing approaches and challenges with multi-domain applicability. By emphasizing the need for dynamic, context-aware metrics and scalable solutions, we provide actionable insights to bridge the gap between research and real-world applications. This work contributes to the field by offering a comprehensive framework for evaluating vulnerability prioritization methodologies and setting a research agenda to advance the state of practice.

CCS Concepts: • **Security and privacy** → **Systems security; Vulnerability management.**

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Risk Metrics, Risk Aggregation, Vulnerability Prioritization, Patch Rank, Cybersecurity

ACM Reference Format:

Yuning Jiang, Nay Oo, Qiaoran Meng, Hoon Wei Lim, and Biplab Sikdar. 2025. A Survey on Vulnerability Prioritization: Taxonomy, Metrics, and Research Challenges. 1, 1 (February 2025), 32 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 Introduction

In today's interconnected and digitized world, securing complex systems is paramount for protecting sensitive information and maintaining critical operations. As organizations increasingly rely on technology, the number and complexity of vulnerabilities within software and hardware systems have grown exponentially [50]. Effective and timely remediation strategies are essential to mitigate potential cyber threats. However, resource constraints and the overwhelming volume of vulnerabilities make it impractical to address every potential threat comprehensively [62, 71]. This limitation necessitates the prioritization of vulnerabilities based on their risk.

Authors' Contact Information: Yuning Jiang, yuning_j@nus.edu.sg, National University of Singapore, Singapore; Nay Oo, nay.oo@ncs.com.sg, NCS Cyber Special Ops R&D, Singapore; Qiaoran Meng, qiaoran@nus.edu.sg, National University of Singapore, Singapore; Hoon Wei Lim, hoonwei.lim@ncs.com.sg, NCS Cyber Special Ops R&D, Singapore; Biplab Sikdar, bsikdar@nus.edu.sg, National University of Singapore, Singapore.

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

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM XXXX-XXXX/2025/2-ART

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

Cybersecurity risk metrics play a crucial role in this prioritization, enabling organizations to focus defensive measures on the most critical vulnerabilities. These metrics aim to assess the technical severity of vulnerabilities and contextual factors that may influence their impact [16, 47]. Despite significant progress in this field, the increasing complexity of modern systems and networks calls for a systematic evaluation of how these metrics address both technical and contextual aspects of risk [115, 119].

In this paper, we aim to understand the evolving landscape of vulnerability prioritization. Our investigation is structured around the following research questions:

- RQ1:** *Which metrics are commonly used to prioritize vulnerabilities, and how do they capture the severity and exploitability of vulnerabilities?*
- RQ2:** *What are the predominant methodologies used for prioritizing vulnerabilities, and how do they address the challenges of effective vulnerability management?*
- RQ3:** *What are the key challenges in current vulnerability prioritization approaches, and what trends and future directions are emerging in the field?*

By addressing these research questions, we aim to provide a comprehensive analysis of how vulnerabilities are prioritized in practice and how future research can address existing limitations. **RQ1** investigates the commonly used metrics and evaluates their effectiveness in capturing both technical severity and contextual exploitability. **RQ2** examines the methodologies developed to prioritize vulnerabilities, highlighting their strengths, limitations, and practical applications across various environments. **RQ3** identifies the key challenges faced by current approaches and uncovers emerging trends and innovative techniques that could shape the future of vulnerability prioritization.

Using a systematic literature review, we collected and analyzed 82 studies from reputable databases such as the ACM Digital Library, IEEE Xplore, Scopus, and Google Scholar. From this analysis, we introduce a novel taxonomy of vulnerability prioritization metrics, organized into key categories: severity, exploitability, contextual and environmental factors, predictive metrics, and aggregated system-level factors. Severity metrics, particularly those based on the Common Vulnerability Scoring System (CVSS), are the most prevalent, focusing on potential impacts on confidentiality, integrity, and availability. Exploitability metrics assess the ease of exploitation, while contextual metrics incorporate asset criticality and operational constraints. Predictive metrics, though less frequently used, offer insights into potential future exploitation, and aggregation metrics provide a holistic view by combining various dimensions of risk.

Our analysis also extends to the methodologies and validation approaches employed in the reviewed studies. Despite the significant progress made, many challenges remain. Current approaches often rely on static models, which struggle to integrate real-time threat intelligence and fail to adapt to rapidly changing attack surfaces. Additionally, the lack of transparency in machine learning (ML) based methods complicates their practical implementation and reduces their interpretability for decision-makers. The future of vulnerability prioritization lies in the development of adaptive, context-aware metrics that leverage dynamic threat intelligence to enhance risk assessments. Furthermore, the shift towards scalable, automated solutions, driven by artificial intelligence (AI) and ML, is expected to play an increasingly important role in managing large volumes of vulnerabilities in complex environments. This trend is particularly evident in the industrial platforms we analyze.

The contributions of this paper are threefold:

- **Comprehensive systematic literature review:** We review 82 papers on vulnerability prioritization metrics, offering a detailed assessment of the current state of the field and its evolution up to December 2024.

- **A novel taxonomy of vulnerability prioritization metrics:** We propose a taxonomy that organizes metrics into severity, exploitability, contextual and environmental factors, predictive metrics, and aggregated system-level considerations.
- **Identification of research gaps and future directions:** We highlight key challenges, such as the need for dynamic and real-time prioritization models, the integration of adversarial and context-sensitive approaches, and the development of explainable AI-based techniques, providing clear recommendations for future research.

Section 2 introduces key concepts and definitions, including the major risk metrics and methodologies to lay the groundwork for the paper. Section 4 outlines the research methodology employed in this survey. Sections 5 to 9 provides an in-depth analysis of vulnerability prioritization metrics, as well as the utilized methodologies and validation techniques used in the 82 reviewed papers. Section 10 discusses emerging challenges and trends. Finally, Section 11 offers concluding remarks.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Key Concepts in Vulnerability Prioritization

In complex systems, ensuring robust security against vulnerabilities is critical for maintaining operational integrity and safeguarding sensitive information. This sub-section introduces a formalized representation that focuses on the foundational dimensions of vulnerability prioritization: impact, exploitability, and contextual factors. These dimensions are selected for their direct relevance to calculating risk scores and their established role in prioritization frameworks. Additional categories, such as predictive and aggregated metrics, are later introduced with examples and integrated into the taxonomy presented. By linking the formalism to the taxonomy, this framework provides a structured approach for understanding and evaluating prioritization strategies.

2.1.1 System and Vulnerability Representation. We represent a complex system as a set S , consisting of N components denoted as C_i , where $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. Each component C_i is associated with a set of vulnerabilities, where V_{ij} denotes vulnerability j in component C_i . Formally, each component is defined as:

$$S = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_N\}, \quad C_i = \{V_{i1}, V_{i2}, \dots, V_{iM}\}.$$

M is the amount of vulnerabilities in component C_i .

2.1.2 Risk Score Calculation. The risk score RS_i for each component C_i is a function of three key metrics:

$$RS_i = \alpha \cdot I_i + \beta \cdot E_i + \gamma \cdot C_i.$$

Impact I_i reflects the potential damage or disruption the vulnerability could cause in the component C_i . It is computed as the sum of the impact scores I_{ij} of each vulnerability j in component C_i :

$$S_i = \sum_{j=1}^M SV_{ij}.$$

The exploitability score E_i represents how likely a vulnerability is to be exploited. It combines the time-to-exploit TE_{ij} and the availability of an exploit EA_{ij} for each vulnerability j in component C_i :

$$E_i = \sum_{j=1}^M (TE_{ij} \cdot EA_{ij}).$$

Contextual or environmental factor C_i captures the criticality of the component and its dependencies within the system. It is defined as the sum of the criticality level L_i and system dependence D_i :

$$C_i = L_i + D_i.$$

2.1.3 Objective Function. The objective of the vulnerability prioritization process is to minimize the total risk score across all system components:

$$\text{Minimize } R_{\text{total}} = \sum_{i=1}^N RS_i.$$

This ensures that the system prioritizes the most critical vulnerabilities while accounting for severity, exploitability, and environmental factors.

The optimization process is subject to two main constraints, namely resource and operational constraints, respectively. Resource constraints suggest that the total remediation time must not exceed the available time. Operational constraints mean that the downtime for critical components must be minimized, ensuring that the system remains operational.

2.2 Metrics for Vulnerability Prioritization

In addition to the foundational metrics (i.e., impact (I_i), exploitability (E_i), contextual and environmental (C_i)) formalized earlier, this sub-section introduces a taxonomy that incorporates Predictive Metrics and Aggregated/System-Level Metrics, as presented in Fig. 1. This taxonomy is derived from a systematic review of 353 papers, of which 82 were selected for detailed analysis. By encompassing multiple dimensions of vulnerability prioritization, the taxonomy addresses the complexities of contemporary cybersecurity challenges, including regulatory pressures, the growing volume of vulnerabilities, and the need for holistic risk assessment frameworks.




Fig. 1. Taxonomy of Vulnerability Prioritization.

The proposed taxonomy clarifies the role of each metric type and serves as a decision-making framework, enabling organizations to select metrics tailored to specific needs. For instance, impact and exploitability metrics are integral to technical assessments, while contextual metrics address operational relevance and compliance requirements. Predictive and aggregated metrics offer insights

into future risks and system-wide dependencies, making them particularly valuable in resource-constrained or complex environments.

Impact Metrics quantify the inherent consequences of exploiting a vulnerability, focusing on its potential effects on system confidentiality, integrity, and availability. These metrics assess the intrinsic risk posed by a vulnerability, independent of contextual or exploitability considerations.

Exploitability Metrics evaluate the technical feasibility of exploiting a vulnerability, considering factors such as attack complexity, required privileges, user interaction, and exploit availability. These metrics prioritize vulnerabilities based on their ease of exploitation.

Contextual and Environmental Metrics incorporate deployment-specific and organizational factors to refine risk assessments. These metrics consider the criticality of affected components, business impact, operational constraints, and exposure levels, tailoring vulnerability prioritization to the system context.

Predictive Metrics provide forward-looking insights into the likelihood of future exploitation or evolving impacts. These metrics leverage statistical and machine learning models to anticipate potential threats and inform proactive risk management.

Aggregated and System-Level Metrics offer a holistic view of system-wide risk by integrating multiple dimensions into a comprehensive score. These metrics help identify vulnerabilities that contribute to cascading failures or affect interconnected components in complex environments.

2.3 Methodologies for Vulnerability Prioritization

This sub-section categorizes vulnerability prioritization methodologies into five main approaches: graph-based methods, ML and AI-based approaches, multi-objective optimization, rule-based and expert systems, and statistical methods.

Graph Based Methods model systems and vulnerabilities as interconnected nodes and edges, enabling the analysis of attack paths, dependencies, and cascading effects. These methods are particularly effective in complex environments where risks propagate across multiple assets. Structural models such as attack graphs, dependency graphs, and Bayesian networks help identify critical vulnerabilities and assess system-wide impacts, making them essential for prioritization in interconnected infrastructures.

ML and AI based Approaches leverage historical and real-time data to predict vulnerability risks and support data-driven decision-making. Techniques such as logistic regression, decision trees, and neural networks enable adaptive scoring, anomaly detection, and exploitation forecasting. These approaches are particularly advantageous in large-scale datasets, where traditional methods struggle to capture evolving attack patterns.

Multi-Objective Optimization Methods balance competing factors such as impact, exploitability, criticality, and resource constraints to generate optimized vulnerability rankings. By leveraging optimization algorithms, including genetic algorithms, integer programming, and evolutionary models, multi-objective approaches systematically evaluate and refine rankings to align with diverse security and operational goals.

Rule-Based and Expert Systems apply predefined rules, heuristics, and structured knowledge (e.g., ontologies, knowledge graphs) to assess vulnerabilities within specific domains. By integrating human expertise, they provide context-aware prioritization, ensuring reliable and repeatable assessments in environments where standardized models may be insufficient.

Statistical Methods use regression models, probabilistic techniques, and data distribution analysis to quantify risk factors and rank vulnerabilities. By identifying relationships between variables, these methods establish baseline risk metrics and refine prioritization rankings, providing a systematic, data-driven foundation for decision-making.

Table 2 provides detailed mappings of the studied risk metric and utilized methodologies in the reviewed papers.

2.4 Existing Standards and Frameworks

The risk associated with vulnerabilities is often conceptualized using three factors, namely *Probability*, *Impact* and *Threat* [119]. *Probability* quantifies the likelihood of exploitation [30], *Impact* assesses the consequences of a successful exploit, and *Threat* identifies potential actors or circumstances exploiting the vulnerability.

CVSS [77] is the leading vulnerability prioritization method. CVSS version 3 (V3), for instance, categorizes metrics into Base, Temporal, and Environmental groups. Base metrics include Exploitability (Attack Vector, Attack Complexity, Privileges Required, User Interaction), Scope, and Impact (Confidentiality, Integrity, Availability). Temporal metrics reflect dynamic aspects like exploit techniques and patch availability. Environmental metrics consider deployment contexts. These metrics are aggregated to generate a severity score for vulnerabilities.

The Exploit Prediction Scoring System (EPSS) [94] is a statistical model that estimates the likelihood of a vulnerability being exploited in the wild within the next 30 days [53]. It provides a score between 0 and 1, where a higher score indicates a higher likelihood of exploitation. It uses logistic regression to evaluate features such as software vendor, exploit code availability, vulnerability characteristics, and associated references.

In addition to CVSS and EPSS, the cybersecurity landscape employs various other standards and frameworks for vulnerability assessment and management. These include Common Platform Enumeration (CPE) [23], Common Weakness Enumeration (CWE) [73], Industrial Control Systems Cyber Emergency Response Team (ICS-CERT) [52] advisories. The Security Content Automation Protocol (SCAP) [78] provides a standardized approach to maintaining system security. Compliance frameworks such as North American Electric Reliability Corporation Critical Infrastructure Protection (NERC CIP) [22] and Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard (PCI DSS) [26] further guide organizations in maintaining robust cybersecurity practices. These diverse tools and standards collectively form a comprehensive ecosystem for vulnerability prioritization and risk management.

3 Related Works

Le et al. [62] provide a comprehensive overview of data-driven software vulnerability (SV) assessment and prioritization, focusing on the use of ML, deep learning (DL), and NLP techniques to automate tasks in the SV management lifecycle. However, their scope is limited to the phases between SV discovery and remediation, excluding studies that rely solely on manual analysis or descriptive statistics.

Elder et al. [30] focus on methods for assessing the exploitability of vulnerabilities, categorizing them into manual CVSS-based assessments, automated deterministic assessments, and automated probabilistic assessments.

In contrast, our work introduces a broader taxonomy that includes compliance and contextual metrics, which have received limited attention in prior surveys. Furthermore, we analyze real-world challenges, such as explainability and vulnerability data quality, which extend beyond the data-driven focus of [62]. By addressing these gaps, our study provides actionable insights into improving vulnerability prioritization frameworks for both research and industrial applications.

4 Methodology

4.1 Data Sources

We conducted a systematic literature review using four major academic databases: ACM Digital Library, Scopus, IEEE Xplore, and Google Scholar (primarily for snowballing). To ensure comprehensive coverage, we formulated structured queries incorporating key terms related to vulnerability prioritization, risk assessment, exploitability, and cybersecurity frameworks. Papers published before December 2024 were queried, yielding 98 results from ACM Digital Library, 239 from Scopus, and 130 from IEEE Xplore. After deduplication and merging across databases, 353 unique papers remained.

4.2 Selection Process

We applied a two-stage filtering process. First, we conducted title and abstract screening, during which papers were excluded if they did not explicitly address vulnerability prioritization, risk-based decision-making, or security metric evaluation. We then continued with full-text review, whereby papers were assessed for methodological depth, use of structured risk metrics, and validation techniques. The following exclusion criteria were applied:

- Irrelevant Content: Studies focusing solely on patch management, general cybersecurity frameworks, or qualitative discussions without prioritization-specific analysis.
- Non-English Publications: To ensure interpretability and avoid translation inconsistencies.
- Non-Peer-Reviewed Sources: Including white papers, blog posts, and non-academic industry reports.

Applying these criteria, 78 papers were selected for detailed review. We further conducted forward and backward snowballing, examining references in the selected papers and identifying additional citations. This process led to the inclusion of 4 additional studies, resulting in a final dataset of 82 papers for in-depth analysis.

4.3 Data Extraction and Analysis

The data extraction process was designed to systematically capture key aspects of each selected study to facilitate a thorough comparative analysis. Beyond collecting fundamental contextual information, such as the study's objectives, research methodology, key findings, and evaluation or validation techniques, we performed a detailed manual extraction of specific, targeted data points relevant to vulnerability prioritization.

To enhance reliability, two independent reviewers annotated each paper, followed by consensus discussions to resolve discrepancies. In cases of ambiguity (e.g., distinguishing between rule-based and statistical models), a third reviewer conducted tie-breaking assessments to ensure objective categorization.

The extracted data points include:

- We documented vulnerability prioritization metrics, focusing on severity, exploitability, contextual factors, predictive indicators, and aggregation methods, and other novel metrics to provide a comprehensive view.
- The risk assessment methodologies and frameworks employed in the studies were systematically cataloged. These included graph-based approaches, rule-based systems, ML techniques, multi-objective and statistical methods. We also examined whether the risk assessments were static or dynamic in nature.
- Validation methods, such as case studies, controlled experiments, simulations, and interviews, were analyzed to evaluate reliability and applicability across contexts.

- Studies were assessed for their use of real-world data (e.g., NVD, CVE, industry reports, threat intelligence feeds) versus synthetic datasets, highlighting the extent of real-world applicability.
- We examined alignment with security standards (e.g., ISO/IEC 27005, MITRE ATT&CK), including custom adaptations for specific research objectives.
- We documented the challenges and limitations reported in each study, such as issues with scalability, difficulties in integrating new data sources, reliance on static metrics, lack of adaptability to real-time threats, and concerns regarding the explainability of advanced models, particularly those based on ML techniques.

This comprehensive extraction process lays the foundation for the development of a novel taxonomy that categorizes vulnerability prioritization metrics and methods, providing a structured understanding of the field's current state and future directions. Such analysis also enables a deeper understanding of the methodologies and frameworks used in the field, providing a foundation for comparative analysis and the identification of trends, gaps, and emerging practices in vulnerability prioritization.

5 Impact Metrics

5.1 Definition and Importance

Impact Metrics quantify the inherent consequences of a vulnerability's exploitation, focusing on its effects on the confidentiality, integrity, and availability (CIA triad) of the affected system. These metrics evaluate the intrinsic risk posed by a vulnerability without considering contextual or exploitability factors.

Inherent Impact Score (IIS_{ij}) represents the inherent impact of vulnerability j in component i , often derived from standardized frameworks such as the CVSS base score. Over 70% of reviewed studies, including [6, 59, 105], have utilized CVSS as the primary metric for vulnerability prioritization. However, CVSS base score has limitations, including its static nature [61, 95] and lack of contextualization. While widely adopted, CVSS base score does not reflect evolving threats such as active exploitation or new attack vectors. Additionally, it overlooks operational context; a high CVSS base score may pose minimal risk in a well-segmented environment, while a low score could endanger critical infrastructure in less secure systems.

Component-Level Impact (CLI_i) measures the potential disruption caused by a vulnerability in component i to system performance, data security, or critical functionality [76].

5.2 Methodology Trends

Impact metrics are most frequently used in rule-based and expert systems (21 studies), graph-based approaches (17 studies), and machine learning (17 studies). Multi-objective methods (8 studies) are used to a lesser extent, while statistical methods appear in only 6 studies. Below, we discuss key methodologies and representative studies.

Rule-Based and expert systems rely on predefined rules to assess vulnerability impact. For example, [60] presents a rule-based approach for automating the quantification of security risks related to SQL injection and cross-site scripting attacks using CVSS. By leveraging vulnerability reports from NVD and real-time dynamic analysis of attack vectors (e.g., attacker's IP location, privilege level, and network proximity), the system calculates CVSS vectors to assign risk scores to detected attacks.

[28] adjusts vulnerability severity scores by modifying the exploitability metrics of the CVSS framework, specifically Attack Vector (AV) and Attack Complexity (AC), based on the target environment's topology and implemented security mechanisms. This adjustment process results

in a dynamic vulnerability score that reflects the exploitability of a vulnerability within a specific ICS environment, moving beyond generic CVSS scores to provide a more context-aware risk assessment. This paper also considers the impact on various system components (e.g., host, network, application, and containers) and uses root cause analysis to identify underlying factors contributing to vulnerabilities.

Graph-based approaches model vulnerabilities as nodes in a network, incorporating attack paths and dependencies. Attack tree [64] and Bayesian network [15, 106, 108] based approaches enhance vulnerability impact estimation. Specifically, vulnerability risk assessment using directed graph models necessitates quantifying nodes and paths with metrics categorized into node-, path-, and probabilistic-metrics. For example, [64] constructs an attack tree model that maps out potential attack paths, where the root node represents the ultimate attack goal, intermediate nodes denote steps in the attack sequence, and leaf nodes signify specific attack methods. Logical relationships between nodes (e.g., AND, OR and SAND) are used to model different attack scenarios. CVSS is applied to assess the severity of vulnerabilities at each leaf node, while a subjective-objective weighting method combines expert judgment with objective data to calculate the occurrence probability of security events.

ML approaches are utilized to automate vulnerability scoring using text mining and ML techniques [2, 24, 45, 72, 81]. For example, [76] recalculates CWE base scores using context similarity, a metric that measures the semantic similarity between CWE and CVE descriptions. Additionally, the paper uses weighted CWE frequency, where the impact of each weakness is adjusted based on how often it appears in the software. These metrics combine to generate an overall software security score.

Multi-objective methods strive to balance multiple conflicting criteria in vulnerability prioritization, considering factors beyond just impact. A more detailed discussion can be found in later sections where impact is typically treated as only one of several prioritization criteria.

Statistical approaches focus on empirical validation and predictive modeling of security impact. For instance, [6] propose a statistical framework using mid-quantile regression to prioritize vulnerabilities and introduce agreement of grounded rankings as accuracy measure, which maintains rank invariance despite incomplete information. This framework incorporates ordinal and quantitative metrics, including CIA, access vector and complexity from the NVD, alongside quantitative data like the number of vulnerable hosts and exploit availability.

[43] employs statistical methods to analyze the effectiveness of various system-level vulnerability metrics by examining their correlation with the time-to-compromise metric during actual cyber-attacks. The study uses Pearson correlation to assess how well different CVSS-based metrics, including weakest link models and aggregated vulnerability scores, predict system security. Additionally, it explores the concept of vulnerability exposure, measuring the duration that vulnerabilities remain unpatched, and how this impacts system risk.

Observation: CVSS remains the dominant standard for vulnerability prioritization despite its static nature and lack of contextualization. Hybrid models, integrating CVSS with Bayesian networks, attack graphs, or ML-based ranking, show promise in refining impact assessments by incorporating dynamic system conditions and adversary behaviors.

6 Exploitability Metrics

6.1 Definition and Importance

Exploitability Metrics assess the technical ease of exploiting a vulnerability, focusing on factors such as attack complexity, required privileges, user interaction, and the availability of public exploit

tools or code. These metrics operate independently of the deployment environment or contextual considerations.

Public Exploit Availability (PEA_i) indicates whether a publicly known exploit exists for vulnerabilities in component i . A known exploit increases urgency for remediation [89, 91].

Time-to-Exploit (TTE_i) estimates how soon a functional exploit is likely to emerge in the wild for vulnerabilities in component i . This metric is essential for prioritizing vulnerabilities that may soon have active exploits but are not currently being used in attacks [25].

Exploit Difficulty (ED_i) measures the difficulty of exploiting a vulnerability, considering factors like user interaction and the presence of security mechanisms such as firewalls or sandboxing. Exploit difficulty can be adjusted based on environmental factors, such as the presence of firewalls or intrusion detection systems [118].

Observation: Exploitability metrics have evolved beyond static scoring systems to integrate signals from exploit repositories, social media, and dark web discussions. ML and graph-based approaches are increasingly used to predict exploitability, but challenges remain in leveraging noisy, adversarial, and incomplete threat intelligence data.

Open Problems:

1. Addressing potential data poisoning and misinformation in social media and dark web sources.
2. Integrating threat intelligence from diverse sources (e.g., CVEs, MITRE ATT&CK, dark web, malware databases) into unified exploitability risk frameworks.

6.2 Methodology Trends

Exploitability metrics are predominantly used in ML-based methods (17 studies) and graph-based approaches (13 studies), with rule-based systems (9 studies) and statistical methods (6 studies) playing a secondary role. Multi-objective (2 studies) is the least utilized.

ML techniques are widely applied to predict exploitability by analyzing textual and structured vulnerability data. For example, [25] introduces the vulnerabilities' risk of exploitation system (V-REx), which prioritizes software security patches based on the estimated probability of exploitation. This probability is computed using interconnected neural networks optimized with a genetic algorithm. V-REx incorporates multiple factors, including exploit availability, severity, and the likelihood of exploitation, to rank vulnerabilities effectively.

[51] employs multiple ML classifiers to predict the exploitability of newly disclosed vulnerabilities using CVE descriptions, CVSS base scores, and online discussions from Security Focus and Exploit Database. They evaluate multiple classifiers, finding Logistic Regression to provide the best trade-off between precision and recall, while Random Forest achieves the highest precision. Pre-trained Large Language Models (LLMs) underperform, acting as majority-class predictors. Their proposed method also integrates SMOTE (or synthetic minority over-sampling technique) for data balancing, which improves prediction accuracy in imbalanced datasets.

[89] uses a combination of a bidirectional long-short term memory (Bi-LSTM) network and attention mechanisms to link exploits from Dark Web hacker forums to known vulnerabilities. Based on the generated exploit-vulnerability linkages, this metric incorporates factors like exploit post date, the number of vulnerabilities on a device and the age of associated exploits to create an aggregated risk score for devices.

[91] integrates the availability of exploits, directly influencing the risk score by indicating immediate exploitation potential. In addition, the authors consider the volume of social media activity (e.g., tweets, likes, and retweets), which reflects public attention; engagement in public code repositories (e.g., the number of forks and stars on GitHub), indicating the level of exploit or

mitigation development; and mentions in cybersecurity news and advisories, which highlight the vulnerability's prominence in the industry. They also consider dark web activity as a risk indicator, with mentions on hacker forums suggesting active interest in exploitation.

Graph-based methods model exploitability by capturing relationships among vulnerabilities, assets, and attacker behaviors. [18] introduces the CVE-Author-Tweet (CAT) graph, a multi-layer directed graph that predicts vulnerability exploitability using Twitter discussions, independent of CVSS scores. It comprises three interconnected layers: CVE graph, linking vulnerabilities via co-mentions in tweets; Author graph, modeling user interactions (e.g., mentions, follower-followee); and Tweet graph, representing tweet relationships (e.g., retweets, shared CVEs). Cross-layer edges propagate information across authors, tweets, and vulnerabilities, enabling real-time tracking of vulnerability discussion dynamics.

Rule-based methods rely on predefined criteria to assess exploitability likelihood, while statistical approaches analyze historical data to infer exploitability trends. For instance, [31] prioritizes SCADA vulnerabilities by analyzing how common certain vulnerability types are (CWE density), how many have publicly available exploits (CWE exploit density), and the potential impact and exploitability of each vulnerability based on their CVSS scores.

[118] incorporates statistical modeling to estimate the probability of successful exploitation based on exploit code availability and exploit use probability. The system integrates data from various sources, including the MITRE ATT&CK framework and CVE databases, and then employs a structured mapping methodology to connect CVEs to ATT&CK-defined adversary tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTPs) used by attackers. Their method is tailored for vulnerability assessment in Operational Technology (OT) and ICS environments, with a focus on Industrial Internet of Things (IIoT) devices.

7 Contextual and Environmental Metrics

Contextual and Environmental Metrics evaluate vulnerability risk based on system-specific and organizational factors, such as the criticality of the affected component, potential disruption to business operations, and broader financial or reputational implications. These metrics adapt risk assessments to reflect the unique context of the deployment environment.

7.1 Definition and Importance

7.1.1 Business and System Impact Metrics. These metrics measure how the vulnerability's impact extends beyond the technical scope to affect broader business and system objectives.

Criticality Level (CL_i) reflects the importance of component i within the overall system. Components critical to business operations or system functionality receive a higher priority in remediation decisions [1, 48].

Operational Disruption Risk (OD_i) measures the potential for a vulnerability to disrupt essential business processes or cause system downtime [39, 57, 67, 68].

Business Impact (BI_i) evaluates the potential financial, regulatory, or reputational damage from exploiting a vulnerability in component i [46, 112].

7.1.2 Network and Host Exposure. These metrics measure how accessible vulnerable components are from external networks or internally exposed surfaces. These metrics help prioritize vulnerabilities based on their level of exposure to potential attackers.

Network Exposure level (NE_i) evaluates the degree of exposure of component i to external networks, such as the internet or unsecured network segments. Vulnerabilities in externally facing components, such as web servers or public APIs, pose higher risks and are prioritized accordingly [19, 70].

Host Exposure Level (HE_i) measures the exposure of component i to potential internal threats due to host-level mis-configurations, open ports, or unnecessary services [107, 119].

7.1.3 Operational Feasibility Considerations. These metrics account for factors such as time-to-remediation, resource constraints, and regulatory requirements. These metrics are crucial for understanding the practical challenges in vulnerability remediation and ensuring compliance with industry standards.

Time-to-Remediation (TTR_i) estimates the time required to apply a patch or mitigation for component i . Vulnerabilities with shorter remediation timelines are prioritized to minimize the window of exposure, while those with longer timelines may necessitate interim measures, such as temporary mitigations or enhanced monitoring [33, 86, 103, 105].

Resource Constraints (RC_i) reflects the availability of resources (e.g., personnel, budget, and tools) needed to remediate vulnerabilities in component i . Limited resources necessitate prioritizing vulnerabilities that can be resolved with minimal disruption or cost, balancing overall risk mitigation with operational efficiency [33].

Compliance and Regulatory Impact (CR_i) assess the legal and regulatory obligations associated with component i . Vulnerabilities in components subject to regulatory frameworks (e.g., GDPR and HIPAA) are prioritized for timely remediation to avoid penalties, legal action, or reputational damage [33].

Compliance regimes, such as PCI DSS, HIPAA, or NERC CIP, impose specific timelines (e.g., service level objectives (SLOs) [83] and service level agreements (SLAs) [69]) for vulnerability remediation. These requirements often prioritize regulatory adherence over traditional security risk metrics, shaping how vulnerabilities are addressed in practice. For example, vulnerabilities with medium CVSS scores may be prioritized over high-severity ones if they affect systems covered under compliance mandates with tight remediation deadlines.

[33] highlights a critical challenge in cyber-insurance: establishing standardized metrics to quantify organizational cybersecurity risk. This article emphasizes the need to scientifically identify key vulnerability features that most significantly impact overall threat exposure, particularly in the context of regulatory frameworks like HIPAA and PCI DSS.

[28] suggests securing data in a MongoDB-based system to comply with HIPAA regulations, especially concerning authentication, authorization, encryption, and auditing. The specific use of HIPAA as a metric for vulnerability prioritization does not feature in the paper's primary methodology though.

Observation: Regulatory frameworks, such as SLAs and compliance mandates, often dictate remediation priorities, sometimes overriding risk-based assessments. However, existing models struggle to integrate these constraints effectively, leading to misaligned prioritization.

Open Problems:

1. Incorporating compliance requirements into contextual risk models without overshadowing technical risk factors.
2. Developing frameworks that adjust to evolving regulatory landscapes while maintaining security efficiency.
3. Balancing risk-based, operational, and regulatory constraints within a unified decision-making framework.

7.2 Methodology Trends

Contextual metrics are heavily utilized in graph-based approaches (21 studies), emphasizing their ability to model system dependencies and environmental factors. Rule-based systems (17 studies) are

also widely applied, integrating contextual information into predefined scoring mechanisms. ML-based approaches (8 studies) leverage structured data to refine prioritization models. Multi-objective and statistical approaches appear less frequently (5 and 3 studies, respectively).

Graph-based models provide a structured approach to vulnerability assessment by capturing attack sequences, exploit dependencies, system relationships, and contextual risk factors. Various studies leverage different graph structures to enhance vulnerability prioritization and risk estimation.

Attack graphs represent sequences of attack steps that an adversary can take to compromise a system [7, 38, 80, 115]. Nodes correspond to vulnerabilities, while edges depict potential exploit transitions. These graphs facilitate risk quantification, exploit dependency analysis, and multi-step attack simulations.

Exploit dependency graphs is a specialized subset of attack graphs, focusing on exploit dependencies and illustrating how one exploit enables another. For example, [39] introduces an in-degree dependency metric, measuring the number of attack paths in which an exploit appears. Exploits with higher in-degrees are deemed more critical due to their involvement in multiple attack scenarios.

Heterogeneous information network (HIN) extend attack graph methodologies by modeling multiple types of entities and relationships, such as hosts, vulnerabilities, and access controls. Unlike traditional attack graphs, HINs provide a more scalable and adaptable framework for network-aware vulnerability prioritization. [107] introduces a HIN-based risk assessment model, representing vulnerabilities, hosts, and their interconnections. The model integrates CVSS impact and exploitability metrics alongside contextual factors such as network topology, component importance, and exposure levels. A PageRank-inspired ranking algorithm iteratively refines risk scores, prioritizing vulnerabilities based on their effect on network assets. The model's extensibility allows for the incorporation of additional contextual factors, improving the adaptability of vulnerability rankings.

System dependency graphs model software/hardware dependencies and how vulnerabilities propagate across interconnected components. For instance, [68] proposes an extended dependency graph (EDG) to model industrial system vulnerabilities, incorporating CVSS-based risk metrics. The EDG tracks vulnerability origins, dependency chains, and patch prioritization, validated through a case study on OpenPLC. Building on this work, [67] extends this work by aggregating CVSS scores, incorporating functionality disruption and deployment context into vulnerability rankings.

A complementary approach integrates graph-based patch prioritization with game theory (GT). PatchRank [113] applies GT to model the interaction between attackers and defenders, where attackers maximize exploitation, and defenders seek optimal patching strategies. PatchRank further employs a two-player non-cooperative game to calculate the probability of attacks and defenses, with a mixed Nash equilibrium used to determine the optimal patching strategy. The model computes risk scores iteratively, considering network topology, asset criticality, and resource constraints. SmartPatch [112] builds on PatchRank, introducing a residual impact score to refine prioritization based on patch effectiveness over time.

Vulnerability relation networks focus exclusively on relationships between vulnerabilities, identifying structural risk factors through graph-theoretic metrics. [70] employs network-level and node-level metrics to rank vulnerabilities based on their structural significance. Network-level metrics such as average degree, network density, and clustering coefficient assess how vulnerabilities are interconnected within a network. Node-level metrics like betweenness centrality and closeness centrality evaluate the influence and position of vulnerabilities within the network. These metrics reveal previously overlooked vulnerabilities, showing that some low-CVSS vulnerabilities can still be critical due to their centrality in attack propagation.

Knowledge graphs (KGs) integrate multi-source intelligence, providing semantic contextualization of vulnerabilities and their relationships. In industrial and network environments, these

models facilitate vulnerability ranking by integrating path-based reasoning and contextual relationships. For instance, [109] leverages critical path aggregation that uses a KG to identify exploitable vulnerabilities and evaluate and weight multiple relation paths between an attacker and vulnerabilities, based on connectivity, privilege levels, and attacker accessibility. A query relation reasoning mechanism evaluates attack feasibility based on system constraints, prioritizing vulnerabilities that enable high-impact adversary objectives.

Similarly, [19] applies attack path analysis through KGs, mapping vulnerabilities to assets and attack routes. A modified PageRank algorithm ranks vulnerabilities based on severity, exposure scope, and asset criticality.

Open Problems:

1. Enhancing attack and knowledge graphs for large-scale systems while maintaining computational efficiency.
2. Establishing unified graph-based vulnerability assessment frameworks for consistent cross-model integration.
3. Developing real-time updates for evolving threat landscapes, ensuring resilience against adaptive attacks.

Rule-based approaches rely on structured heuristics to prioritize vulnerabilities based on contextual factors. CAVSS [56] employs expert-validated rules to compute temporal vulnerability scores, integrating base, temporal, and environmental factors into a comprehensive risk metric. It considers exploit maturity, remediation levels, and report confidence, assigning higher scores to vulnerabilities with verified exploits or official fixes. The system incorporates real-world contextual data from vendors and authoritative sources to tailor prioritization to specific environments.

[71] introduces a three-phase automated risk management system containing predefined steps such as patch testing, verification, and rollback. A feedback loop refines prioritization based on historical patch success rates and organizational constraints, such as patching time, expert availability, system downtime, and software dependencies. Similarly, [1] filters vulnerabilities using predefined rules based on asset inventories and vulnerability scans, applying access policies to classify application/unit/services (AUS) as internal or external. Expert interviews further refine patch prioritization criteria and scoring.

[57] enhances prioritization by modeling functional dependencies between assets and business processes. The system evaluates how operability loss in one asset propagates to dependent assets and ultimately impacts critical business functions. Meanwhile, [103] extends CVSS by incorporating environmental metrics (e.g., Collateral Damage Potential, Target Distribution) alongside time-to-remediation and asset value, enabling dynamic vulnerability assessment. This approach integrates real-time data from vulnerability scans and asset management tools to optimize patch prioritization. On top of this, [105] further automates the CVSS environmental scoring process.

ML models automate the integration of contextual factors for vulnerability prioritization. [46] combines CVSS scores with network context (e.g., asset importance, existing defenses) in a decision-support system that first ranks vulnerabilities for mitigation and then optimally assigns tasks to security personnel based on their skillsets.

Multi-objective approaches balance risk prioritization under multiple constraints. [21] develops evolutionary algorithms to generate ranked vulnerabilities, optimizing factors such as risk, vulnerability age, and application importance. A fitness function evaluates solutions, refining rankings iteratively. They also integrate a multi-objective post-optimization process that fine-tunes the solutions by adjusting the ranking to correct any inconsistencies. Additionally, SmartPatch [112],

a framework for SCADA system patch prioritization, calculates a Residual Impact Score (RIS) to assess unpatched vulnerabilities' effects while integrating functional and topological dependency scores to measure subsystem criticality. Exploitability and patch interdependencies are incorporated to optimize patching, with Nash equilibrium-based game theory determining optimal strategies under resource constraints.

Statistical approaches provide quantitative models for contextual vulnerability risk. [86] extends CVSS with risk factor (RF) metrics, incorporating probability of occurrence and impact assessments. The model calculates total vulnerabilities per IP (TV) to evaluate system-wide exposure and average organizational risk (AOR) to adjust CVSS scores based on environment-specific factors. Additionally, probability of exploitation (PoE) and average remediation time (AVT) guide prioritization, emphasizing vulnerabilities with high likelihood of exploitation and long mitigation times.

8 Aggregated and System-Level Metrics

8.1 Definition and Importance

Aggregated and System-Level Metrics provide a holistic view of system risk by combining multiple dimensions of risk into a single, comprehensive score. This category accounts for the overall impact of vulnerabilities on the entire system, including attack paths and system-wide dependencies. These metrics are particularly useful for prioritization in environments with complex dependencies, such as supply chains and cloud systems.

Composite Risk Score (CR_i) for component i combines metrics such as impact, exploitability, and exposure into a single score, often weighted based on organizational priorities [14, 119, 120].

Chained Vulnerability Impact (CV_i) assesses the risk of multi-step attack paths where vulnerabilities in one component enable lateral movement or privilege escalation across the system [93].

Cascading Impact (CI_i) measures the potential for cascading failures across interconnected components due to a single vulnerability. High dependency on vulnerable components can elevate system-wide risk [16, 58, 115].

Observation: Aggregated metrics offer a holistic risk assessment by integrating exploitability, impact, and system dependencies. However, averaging and weighting mechanisms can obscure critical vulnerabilities, reducing interpretability and prioritization accuracy.

Open Problems:

1. Dynamically weighting risks based on asset importance, evolving attack paths and real-time dependencies.
2. Capturing how local vulnerabilities escalate into system-wide threats.
3. Enhancing transparency to prevent information loss in aggregated scores.

8.2 Methodology Trends

Research on vulnerability prioritization utilizing aggregation metrics spans rule-based (10 studies), graph-based (7), ML-based (3), and multi-objective optimization (3), and statistical (1) approaches.

Rule-based methods aggregate multiple risk factors by applying structured heuristics for vulnerability prioritization. [3] employs an attack graph-based penetration testing model to aggregate risk across attack paths in IoT networks. The model integrates exploitability metrics (e.g., programming language, exploit availability), impact metrics (e.g., CVSS scores, privilege escalation potential), and contextual factors (e.g., network topology, vendor reputation, exploit age). Adjacency matrices and NetworkX tools enable the aggregation of attack paths for critical path analysis, identifying shortest and most impactful attack routes.

[48] aggregates urgency scores by combining CVSS base scores, exploit maturity, and cloud-native security features. A cloud-native remediation level assesses existing security controls (e.g., firewalls, endpoint detection) to determine whether vulnerabilities require immediate patching or alternative mitigation. The risk reduction rate measures the effectiveness of mitigations, while an asset value score further prioritizes vulnerabilities affecting mission-critical infrastructure.

In power grid security, [14] introduces an approach where the impact factor and vulnerability index evaluate cascading failures across substations. The intrusion credibility index assesses cyber intrusion risks based on external network access, while a priority ranking system categorizes substations by criticality and cascading effects.

Graph-based models provide network-aware risk assessments that incorporate attack path aggregation and asset interdependencies. For example, [16] introduces a model that dynamically adjusts vulnerability severity within ICS environments by integrating exploitability metrics which are then modified based on network topology and security mechanisms. The model uses attack trees to assess inter-dependencies between vulnerabilities and calculate aggregated scores for assets with multiple vulnerabilities. Also, fuzzy cognitive maps (FCM) simulate attack paths and provide a dynamic vulnerability score by integrating exploitability metrics and asset relationships.

For power grids, [58] integrates fault chain theory with cascading failure analysis to assess vulnerabilities that contribute to system-wide failures. A vulnerability index is derived by combining power flow disruptions and fault propagation likelihood, providing a comprehensive risk metric for critical transmission lines.

[115] develops a network security model for SCADA systems, calculating exploit probabilities across direct and indirect attack paths while considering factors like defense bypass and high-risk vulnerabilities. Attacker capabilities and defense mechanisms are incorporated into an exploitation likelihood model, while physical disruption metrics (e.g., minimum shedding load) assess aggregate system impact from cyberattacks.

[93] employs vulnerability tree analysis to evaluate the interconnectedness of vulnerabilities based on asset value, exploitation likelihood, and potential impact. This method enhances risk visualization by identifying critical paths where vulnerabilities propagate across interconnected systems.

Hybrid approaches aggregate ML-driven risk predictions with rule-based logical models to improve prioritization accuracy. For instance, the AVIA [98] framework aggregates cross-dependency analysis and binary impact metrics to model system-wide vulnerability propagation. By mapping how vulnerabilities propagate across shared binaries and system objects, the framework generates risk scores that reflect cumulative exploitability effects.

[119] integrates ML and rule-based logical programming to enhance vulnerability prioritization. The methodology employs neural networks and neuro-symbolic computing to learn adversary behavior patterns, vulnerability interactions, and network constraints. Probabilistic logic programming (ProbLog) refines risk assessments by incorporating host reachability and attack likelihood. Building upon LICALITY [120], [119] introduces network-specific interaction constraints, considering vulnerable services, network topology, and adversary behavior.

Multi-objective optimization methods aggregate vulnerability prioritization under competing constraints. [33] proposes VULCON that uses a mixed-integer multi-objective optimization algorithm to prioritize vulnerabilities for patching. VULCON optimizes conflicting objectives using goal programming and mixed-integer programming. Total vulnerability exposure (TVE) measures the overall exposure of unmitigated vulnerabilities within a network, while Time-to-vulnerability remediation (TVR) tracks the time between vulnerability discovery and remediation. The mitigation utility (MU) score prioritizes vulnerabilities based on severity, persistence, age, and the mission-criticality of the affected hosts. This method emphasizes the importance of mitigation

utility scoring for vulnerabilities, based on their severity, persistence, and the mission-criticality of the assets they affect.

Building on VULCON, [92] introduces individual vs. multiple attribute value optimization, where individual attribute optimization ranks vulnerabilities based on a single criterion (e.g., persistence), while multi-attribute optimization refines prioritization using an aggregated function.

9 Predictive Metrics

9.1 Definition and Importance

Predictive Metrics evaluate how vulnerability risk evolves over time, using models to forecast future exploitation or impact to inform timely remediation. Predictive metrics forecast future risks by leveraging historical data, threat intelligence, and machine learning. These metrics are particularly valuable for proactive risk management, enabling organizations to prioritize vulnerabilities likely to be exploited in the near term. Their effectiveness relies heavily on high-quality, real-time data, which remains a persistent challenge.

Predicted Time-to-Exploit ($PTTE_i$) is a model-based estimation of how quickly a vulnerability in component i might be exploited after discovery, based on historical trends and threat intelligence [34, 51, 116].

Among existing models, EPSS [54, 118] stands out for its comprehensive feature set, incorporating over 1,400 attributes such as CVSS metrics, public exploit code availability, and social media mentions. EPSS is particularly effective for short-term exploit predictions (e.g., 30 days) due to its focus on dynamic threat signals.

Predictive Risk Score (PR_i) combines likelihood and impact forecasts into a single risk score generated by predictive models (e.g., ML techniques), offering a holistic view of future risks [59, 120].

9.2 Methodology Trends

Predictive metrics primarily appear in ML-based methods (13 studies), followed by graph-based models (3 studies). Rule-based systems and statistical models show minimal adoption, with only 2 studies each incorporating predictive metrics.

ML models utilize historical and real-time threat intelligence to predict future vulnerability exploitation. These approaches integrate text analysis, latent risk estimation, and (un)supervised learning algorithms to refine predictive accuracy. For example, [59] introduces a topic extraction-based risk prediction model, assigning cybersecurity topics to CVEs using Wikipedia-derived text features. A time-series risk score is computed by multiplying occurrence and impact metrics, and random forest models are trained on historical data to forecast future risks.

[121] employs deep learning for time-dependent exploitability prediction, integrating neural networks to dynamically adjust risk scores. The model is trained on CVSS metrics, CWE categories, software attributes, and text-based features (TF-IDF bi-grams) to classify vulnerabilities exploitability. It incorporates two scheduling algorithms: a baseline NP-hard optimization method and a group-based scheduling method, which reduces computational complexity by dividing assets into groups.

[34] presents V-REx, an neural network based vulnerability exploitability prediction system. It classifies vulnerabilities using three neural network models (standard, enhanced, interconnected enhanced), leveraging textual features, CVSS scores, and metadata from CVE/NVD sources. The system fine-tunes hyperparameters using an enhanced genetic algorithm.

Several studies integrate ML with optimization and rule-based reasoning to enhance predictive risk assessment. [120] develops a neuro-symbolic model that prioritizes vulnerabilities based on past exploitability trends and future impact potential. A neural network analyzes historical threat data

using latent semantic analysis (LSA), while criticality metrics (CVSS CIA impact, access complexity) refine prioritization. The model integrates these factors into a hybrid risk computation framework, combining ML-based probability estimation with rule-based reasoning.

[47] combines deep reinforcement learning (DRL) with integer programming to optimize resource allocation under uncertainty and limited security resources. The DRL agent anticipates critical vulnerabilities by integrating asset criticality, CVSS scores, and intrusion detection system (IDS) alerts, dynamically adjusting prioritization based on evolving threat conditions.

Graph-based methods predict exploitability by analyzing structural risk propagation and interdependencies within complex systems. [116] improves exploitability prediction using graph-based ML. The model applies topological vulnerability graph analysis, incorporating PageRank, degree centrality, and label propagation to capture structural risk relationships. Additionally, heterogeneous graph neural networks (HGNNs) generate node embeddings, refining vulnerability risk prediction beyond traditional CVSS-based assessments.

[17] introduces a social media-enhanced vulnerability risk model, using graph convolutional networks (GCN) to analyze Twitter discussions for early vulnerability risk detection. Nodes represent CVEs, and edges capture semantic similarities in tweets. Attention-based embeddings refine feature extraction, enabling predictive CVSS scoring based on the first three days of Twitter discussions following a CVE's public disclosure.

10 Discussions

Through the exploration of key metrics, methodologies, and validation techniques, this section synthesizes the current trends, challenges, and emerging directions in vulnerability prioritization research.

10.1 Cross-Metric Trends and Insights

10.1.1 Metric Usage. A quantitative analysis of the reviewed studies reveals the prevalence and gaps in metric usage. Impact metrics dominate, appearing in 60 of 82 studies, yet they often insufficient for capturing operational relevance or future risks. Exploitability metrics, featured in 40 studies, emphasize the technical feasibility of exploitation (e.g., network accessibility, exploit availability) but their integration with other dimensions remains limited. Contextual metrics, present in 48 studies, reflect a growing focus on asset criticality and operational relevance. Used in 20 studies, aggregated metrics combine multiple dimensions of risk but remain under-explored in system-wide prioritization frameworks. Predictive metrics, despite their potential for proactive decision-making, appear in only 17 studies, indicating a substantial opportunity for further research. Table 1 in the Appendix maps the reviewed studies, detailing their use of data sources and metric categories.

The integration of multiple metrics remains limited. Only 22 studies combine exploitability and contextual metrics, while predictive and aggregated metrics are seldom jointly applied (only in 2 studies). These findings emphasize the need for multidimensional approaches that incorporate operational and holistic risk assessments.

10.1.2 Methodological Insights. A balanced interest exists between data-driven techniques (graph-based, ML/AI) and expert-driven methods, each appearing in 24–27 studies. Graph-based methods are the most frequently employed, appearing in 27 of the reviewed papers. These methods leverage network or dependency graphs to model the relationships between system components or vulnerabilities [3, 64, 67, 107, 113]. These graph-based approaches normally aim to propagate risks across interconnected nodes to identify critical vulnerabilities. ML and AI-based methods are utilized in 24 papers, focusing on predictive analysis and anomaly detection [25, 32, 47, 51, 91]. These approaches rely on historical data to train models that prioritize vulnerabilities based on previous exploitation

patterns or system configurations. Rule-based and expert systems are also present in 24 papers, employing predefined heuristics or expert knowledge to prioritize vulnerabilities [19, 56, 60, 105, 109]. These systems, though less flexible than ML, are effective in environments with well-established risk metrics and clear vulnerability classifications. Multi-objective optimization are utilized in 10 papers, balancing different aspects such as severity, exploitability, and system impact to rank vulnerabilities [9, 33, 35, 92]. These approaches are generally integrated into broader methodologies or combined with graph-based techniques for more nuanced results. A smaller subset of papers (9) explore statistical methods in combination with other approaches [6, 43, 76, 117]. They often played a role in establishing baseline risk metrics or adjusting prioritization rankings through statistical adjustments, or use data-driven approaches like probabilistic techniques to rank vulnerabilities.

10.1.3 Validation Methods. Validation approaches vary based on methodological choices. Controlled experiments are the most common, used in 33 papers [34, 59, 60, 71, 110], particularly for graph-based and ML/AI approaches. These studies focus on evaluating the accuracy and performance of the prioritization models in a controlled setting. Case studies, presented in 27 papers, typically focusing on real-world scenarios to validate their proposed methodologies [16, 49, 89, 93, 107]. Case studies are often selected for their relevance to the systems or networks under consideration, providing valuable insight into the applicability of the techniques in practice. Simulations, appearing in 13 studies, offer an environment to test theoretical models, though their reliance on synthetic data may limit generalizability [57, 96, 106, 115, 119]. Interviews, appearing in 6 papers, represent a smaller effort to capture expert opinions and contextual insights [4, 11, 43, 55, 68, 89].

Validation approaches vary based on methodological choices. Controlled experiments are the most common, used in 33 papers [34, 59, 60, 71, 110], particularly for graph-based and ML/AI approaches. These studies focus on evaluating the accuracy and performance of the prioritization models in a controlled setting. Case studies, presented in 27 papers, typically focusing on real-world scenarios to validate their proposed methodologies [16, 49, 89, 93, 107]. Case studies are often selected for their relevance to the systems or networks under consideration, providing valuable insight into the applicability of the techniques in practice. Simulations, appearing in 13 studies, offer an environment to test theoretical models, though their reliance on synthetic data may limit generalizability [57, 96, 106, 115, 119]. Interviews, appearing in 6 papers, represent a smaller effort to capture expert opinions and contextual insights [4, 11, 43, 55, 68, 89].

Table 3 in the Appendix summarizes the methodologies and validation approaches used across studies. Validation trends for specific methodologies are as follows.

- Graph-based methods partially utilize controlled experiments (12 studies), often using synthetic data or isolated models to test vulnerability propagation. Case studies (11 papers) provide real-world validation, such as network architectures or interconnected devices. Simulations are the least common (7 papers), likely due to their limitations in replicating real-world complexity.
- ML-based methods heavily utilize experiments (22 out of 24 studies) which test model accuracy through training and testing on known data splits, such as historical vulnerability datasets. Case studies (6 studies) are also utilized to validate usefulness of the proposed approaches.
- Validation of multi-objective optimization methods shows a mixed pattern across experiments (6 out of 10 papers), case studies (5 papers), and simulations (4 papers). Experiments test the methods' ability to balance trade-offs in controlled settings, while case studies provide real-world validation of operational constraints.
- Rule-based systems rely on controlled experiments (14 studies), reflecting their dependence on isolated testing. Case studies (studies) are used to test predefined rules and domain knowledge.

- Statistical methods use controlled experiments (3 studies) and case studies (3 studies) to test quantitative models using empirical data.

Despite the prevalence of controlled experiments and real-world case studies, crucial details—such as host configurations and network architectures—are often omitted, limiting reproducibility and applicability.

10.2 Data Quality Challenges

Table 1 (Appendix) summarizes the data sources used in the reviewed papers. Most studies rely on standard vulnerability databases such as CVE/NVD (70 out of 82) [59, 76, 108] and Shodan [6, 86] as foundational inputs. For exploitability-oriented assessments, additional sources include exploit databases (e.g., ExploitDB [89, 118]), security reports (e.g., FireEye APT reports [120], Symantec attack signatures [4, 18]), and collaborative platforms (e.g., ICS-CERT [118]). Emerging sources, such as social media (Twitter [54, 91], GitHub [118]), offer real-time insights into exploit announcements. Domain-specific studies, particularly for ICS and automotive systems, incorporate system-specific data to provide contextualized risk assessments [16, 47, 64].

Vulnerability databases, such as CVE and NVD, are foundational for vulnerability prioritization frameworks. However, their widespread reliance exposes limitations, including data inconsistencies, incompleteness, and delays, which hinder effective and comprehensive vulnerability prioritization. Over-reliance on a single source also limits coverage and reduces adaptability to rapidly evolving threats. For instance, [29] finds discrepancies in software version vulnerabilities between CVE and NVD, with only a fraction of entries matching accurately. Similarly, [111] reveals issues with incorrect or inconsistent software names and versions, emphasizing the need for identifying original vulnerable software. [65] criticizes existing databases for lacking detailed metadata and contextual information, limiting their capacity to support advanced analytical tools effectively. These gaps are particularly problematic for frameworks requiring asset-specific configurations or real-time exploit maturity assessments. Emerging approaches attempt to address these shortcomings. For example, Hong et al. [44] introduced an enhanced database construction method that correlates NVD entries with additional sources like GitHub, issue trackers (e.g., Bugzilla), and Q&A sites (e.g., Stack Overflow) to augment data scope and completeness.

Another dimension of data quality is the potential for biases, such as the over-reporting of critical vulnerabilities due to incentives for attention or funding [27]. These biases skew prioritization efforts, diverting resources from vulnerabilities that may pose greater operational risks in specific contexts.

Addressing these challenges requires advancing data aggregation techniques, improving the timeliness and consistencies of vulnerability feeds, and incorporating mechanisms to evaluate and mitigate data biases. By enhancing data quality, prioritization frameworks can deliver more accurate and actionable insights, better aligning with the needs of both researchers and practitioners.

10.3 Integration of Standards and Compliance

In our analysis of 82 papers, several key standards (including CVSS, CPE, CWE, CWSS, EPSS, and SCAP) emerged as essential to vulnerability prioritization methodologies. These standards guide the evaluation of vulnerabilities and form the foundation for risk metrics.

CVSS is the most widely used standard, serving as a baseline for severity assessment and risk prioritization. Its dominance reflects its simplicity and broad applicability across domains. CWE [60, 76, 116] provides a hierarchical categorization of software weaknesses, that enables more structured vulnerability assessments and aligns vulnerabilities with root causes. However, standards like CVSS and CWE are inherently static, offering limited adaptability to real-time changes,

such as active exploitation trends or system-specific contexts. This reduces their effectiveness in dynamic environments. Developing extensions to static standards like CVSS and CWE that account for real-time exploitability, asset criticality, and operational environments is crucial [30]. For example, integrating EPSS predictions with CVSS scores can bridge the gap between severity and exploitation likelihood. CPE supports system and software identification, as observed in studies focusing on system-specific analyses [15]. Its value lies in mapping vulnerabilities to specific software configurations. SCAP is critical for automating vulnerability management and ensuring policy compliance, as highlighted in [15]. However, its adoption remains limited to studies explicitly addressing automated workflows.

Many frameworks overlook aligning standard-based prioritization with compliance regimes (e.g., PCI DSS, HIPAA, NERC CIP). These regulations impose SLOs/SLA deadlines for remediation, which often conflict with risk-based approaches. Future research should explore adaptive frameworks that incorporate standards like CVSS, CPE, and SCAP alongside compliance-driven metrics (e.g., SLA deadlines). This integration can align risk-based and regulatory priorities for more effective vulnerability management.

10.4 Adaptive, Explainable, and Scalable Vulnerability Prioritization

To overcome the limitations of static models, there is a clear shift toward the development of adaptive, context-aware metrics. These metrics incorporate environmental factors such as system configurations, network topology, asset criticality, and operational impact, resulting in more accurate and timely risk assessments that better reflect real-world conditions.

Many advanced vulnerability prioritization models, particularly ML-based methods, achieve high performance but often lack explainability, functioning as black-box systems [74]. This limited interpretability reduces trust among cybersecurity practitioners who require clear justifications for risk scores to make actionable decisions. Furthermore, there is often a trade-off between fine-grained analysis and computational efficiency, as highly granular models demand greater resources, impacting scalability. Formal methods and symbolic analysis present promising avenues for addressing these challenges. For example, MulVAL [99] leverages logic-based attack graph generation to systematically infer exploit chains. Similarly, techniques like Automatic Exploit Generation (AEG) [13] can provide concrete examples of exploit presence, enhancing explainability by demonstrating real-world exploitability. Additionally, quantitative robustness methods [40, 41] can improve the replicability and reliability of exploit assessments, enabling finer-grained analyses of vulnerabilities under varied conditions. These techniques not only offer deeper insights into exploit behavior but also bridge gaps between interpretability and model performance.

As systems grow in complexity and scale, vulnerability prioritization frameworks must process large datasets and intricate dependencies efficiently. Scalability challenges are compounded by the need for automation, particularly in large-scale networks or real-time prioritization settings [88]. Scalability can be improved through hierarchical frameworks that filter vulnerabilities at a high level while focusing fine-grained analyses on critical assets. Automated tools and standardized vulnerability feeds can streamline workflows while maintaining performance.

10.5 Industrial Trends

We analyze several widely adopted industrial solutions (i.e., Tenable One platform [101], Qualys VMDR [85], Skybox Security VTM [90], and Claroty xDome [20]) to elucidate current industrial trends in vulnerability prioritization.

Scalability for Large, Dynamic Environments: The proliferation of cloud infrastructures, IoT devices, and hybrid IT-OT environments has necessitated scalable vulnerability prioritization solutions. Industry-leading platforms such as Tenable One [101] and Qualys VMDR [85] process

high volumes of data across expansive infrastructures while maintaining optimal performance. A notable industry shift is the integration of managed security services (MSSPs), as organizations increasingly rely on third-party providers for vulnerability management, rather than deploying in-house solutions. The MSSP model enables continuous monitoring with minimal internal effort, a trend expected to grow as security providers transition to SaaS-based commercial solutions [102]. Additionally, Claroty xDome [20] and Skybox Security VTM [90] demonstrate adaptability in securing both IT and OT environments, emphasizing automated exposure management rather than traditional manual assessments.

Increased Granularity in Risk Assessments: Tools such as Skybox Security VTM [90] offer detailed vulnerability analyses, encompassing individual attack vectors, asset configurations, and system inter-dependencies. This shift towards higher granularity is particularly significant in sectors like OT and manufacturing, where precise risk identification is critical for maintaining operational safety and security. Fine-grained analysis also helps prioritize vulnerabilities that pose the greatest risk to specific components within a larger system, thereby providing more actionable intelligence for security teams. Additionally, Skybox Security offers virtual patching options, enabling vulnerability prioritization without operational disruption.

Adoption of Context-Aware and Multi-Domain Metrics: A paradigm shift is observable in the development of context-aware and multi-domain metrics for vulnerability prioritization. These metrics consider factors such as asset criticality, operational impact and network topology. For instance, Claroty xDome [20] provides comprehensive risk assessments that incorporate device characteristics, compensating controls, and their position within broader industrial networks. This trend reflects the growing recognition that a vulnerability's impact can vary significantly depending on its environment, and prioritization models must account for this variability.

Integration of AI and ML: The adoption of AI-driven threat exposure management is gaining traction in industry, surpassing traditional signature-based vulnerability detection. Qualys TotalAI [84] utilizes LLMs to assess vulnerabilities in AI workloads, detecting data leaks, injection vulnerabilities, and model theft—a capability not widely explored in academic studies. Similarly, Tenable AI Aware [100] employs network monitoring agents to proactively detect AI-related security risks. Such industrial implementations focus on real-time threat exposure mapping, integrating AI into managed detection & response workflows to continuously refine attack surface visibility.

11 Conclusion

This paper presents a comprehensive systematization of cybersecurity risk metrics, offering a novel taxonomy of vulnerability prioritization metrics and identifying key gaps in the existing literature.

A quantitative analysis of vulnerability prioritization metrics highlights a dominance of impact metrics (60/82 studies) but reveals gaps in operational and predictive assessments. Contextual metrics (48 studies) and exploitability metrics (40 studies) are gaining traction, yet their integration remains limited, with only 22 studies combining them. Methodologically, graph-based (27 studies) and ML/AI-driven approaches (24 studies) are balanced against expert-driven rule-based systems (24 studies), while multi-objective optimization and statistical methods remain underexplored. Validation trends indicate a preference for controlled experiments (33 studies) and case studies (27 studies), though critical details on system configurations are often lacking, limiting reproducibility. These findings emphasize the need for more holistic, multidimensional frameworks integrating operational, predictive, and system-wide risk considerations.

Our analysis highlights the growing need for adaptive, scalable, and context-aware metrics that integrate real-time threat intelligence and dynamically adjust to evolving threats. Existing approaches often rely on static models that struggle to keep pace with the rapidly changing cyber landscape. Future research should focus on developing scalable, automated solutions capable of

handling the increasing complexity of modern systems, particularly through adversarial intelligence and dynamic prioritization techniques. Additionally, a critical gap remains in the explainability of AI-driven models, as lack of transparency continues to hinder their adoption in operational settings. While many studies focus on individual systems or isolated vulnerabilities, holistic approaches that account for inter-dependencies across systems and networks are necessary for more effective risk management. Addressing these challenges will be essential for advancing the next generation of vulnerability prioritization frameworks that are not only technically robust but also practically applicable across various domains and industries.

References

- [1] Vida Ahmadi Mehri, Patrik Arlos, and Emiliano Casalicchio. 2022. Automated context-aware vulnerability risk management for patch prioritization. *Electronics* 11, 21 (2022), 3580. <https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics11213580>
- [2] Georgios Aivatoglou, Mike Anastasiadis, Georgios Spanos, Antonis Voulgaridis, Konstantinos Votis, Dimitrios Tzovaras, and Lefteris Angelis. 2022. A RAKEL-based methodology to estimate software vulnerability characteristics & score-an application to EU project ECHO. *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 81, 7 (2022), 9459–9479. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-021-11073-x>
- [3] Omar Almazrouei and Pritheega Magalingam. 2022. The Internet of Things Network Penetration Testing Model Using Attack Graph Analysis. In *2022 International Symposium on Multidisciplinary Studies and Innovative Technologies (ISMSIT)*. IEEE, 360–368. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISMSIT56059.2022.9932758>
- [4] Mohammed Almkaynizi, Eric Nunes, Krishna Dharaiya, Manoj Senguttuvan, Jana Shakarian, and Paulo Shakarian. 2017. Proactive identification of exploits in the wild through vulnerability mentions online. In *2017 International Conference on Cyber Conflict (CyCon US)*. IEEE, 82–88. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CYCONUS.2017.8167501>
- [5] Kenneth Alperin, Allan Wollaber, Dennis Ross, Pierre Trepagnier, and Leslie Leonard. 2019. Risk prioritization by leveraging latent vulnerability features in a contested environment. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security*. 49–57. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3338501.3357365>
- [6] Mario Angelelli, Serena Arima, Christian Catalano, and Enrico Ciavolino. 2024. A robust statistical framework for cyber-vulnerability prioritisation under partial information in threat intelligence. *Expert Systems with Applications* 255 (2024), 124572. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2024.124572>
- [7] Marco Angelini, Graziano Blasilli, Tiziana Catarci, Simone Lenti, and Giuseppe Santucci. 2018. Vulnus: Visual vulnerability analysis for network security. *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics* 25, 1 (2018), 183–192. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2018.2865028>
- [8] Uchenna Daniel Ani, Hongmei He, and Ashutosh Tiwari. 2020. Vulnerability-based impact criticality estimation for industrial control systems. In *2020 International Conference on Cyber Security and Protection of Digital Services (Cyber Security)*. IEEE, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CyberSecurity49315.2020.9138886>
- [9] Misbah Anjum, PK Kapur, Vernika Agarwal, and Sunil Kumar Khatri. 2020. Evaluation and selection of software vulnerabilities. *International Journal of Reliability, Quality and Safety Engineering* 27, 05 (2020), 2040014. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218539320400148>
- [10] Misbah Anjum, PK Kapur, Vernika Agarwal, and Sunil Kumar Khatri. 2020. A framework for prioritizing software vulnerabilities using fuzzy best-worst method. In *2020 8th International Conference on Reliability, Infocom Technologies and Optimization (Trends and Future Directions)(ICRITO)*. IEEE, 311–316. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICRITO48877.2020.9197854>
- [11] Nor Badrul Anuar, Steven Furnell, Maria Papadaki, and Nathan Clarke. 2011. A risk index model for security incident prioritisation. (2011).
- [12] Nor Badrul Anuar, Maria Papadaki, Steven Furnell, and Nathan Clarke. 2013. Incident prioritisation using analytic hierarchy process (AHP): Risk Index Model (RIM). *Security and communication networks* 6, 9 (2013), 1087–1116. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sec.673>
- [13] Thanassis Avgerinos, Sang Kil Cha, Alexandre Rebert, Edward J Schwartz, Maverick Woo, and David Brumley. 2014. Automatic exploit generation. *Commun. ACM* 57, 2 (2014), 74–84. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2560217.2560219>
- [14] Rashiduzzaman Bulbul, Chee-Wooi Ten, and Andrew Ginter. 2014. Cyber-contingency evaluation for multiple hypothesized substation outages. In *ISGT 2014*. IEEE, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISGT.2014.6816491>
- [15] Aristeidis Chatzipoulidis, Dimitrios Michalopoulos, and Ioannis Mavridis. 2015. Information infrastructure risk prediction through platform vulnerability analysis. *Journal of Systems and Software* 106 (2015), 28–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2015.04.062>
- [16] Pavlos Cheimonidis and Konstantinos Rantos. 2024. Dynamic vulnerability severity calculator for industrial control systems. *International Journal of Information Security* (2024), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10207-024-00858-4>

- [17] Haipeng Chen, Jing Liu, Rui Liu, Noseong Park, and VS Subrahmanian. 2019. VASE: A twitter-based vulnerability analysis and score engine. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 976–981. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDM.2019.00110>
- [18] Haipeng Chen, Rui Liu, Noseong Park, and VS Subrahmanian. 2019. Using twitter to predict when vulnerabilities will be exploited. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data Mining*. 3143–3152. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3292500.3330742>
- [19] Jinyan Cheng, Xiaobin Tan, Hao Wang, Jian Wang, Xiaofeng Jiang, and Zhaoyan Jin. 2023. Network Vulnerability Assessment based on Knowledge Graph. In *2023 9th International Conference on Big Data Computing and Communications (BigCom)*. IEEE, 48–55. <https://doi.org/10.1109/BIGCOM61073.2023.00015>
- [20] Claroty. 2024. Claroty xDome for Industrial Environments. <https://claroty.com/industrial-cybersecurity/xdome> Accessed: 2024-09-25.
- [21] Felipe Colombelli, Vitor Kehl Matter, Bruno Iochins Grisci, Leomar Lima, Karine Heinen, Marcio Borges, Sandro José Rigo, Jorge Luis Victória Barbosa, Rodrigo Da Rosa Righi, Cristiano André Da Costa, et al. 2022. Multi-objective prioritization for data center vulnerability remediation. In *2022 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC)*. IEEE, 01–08. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CEC55065.2022.9870289>
- [22] North American Electric Reliability Corporation. 2024. North American Electric Reliability Corporation Critical Infrastructure Protection (NERC CIP). <https://www.nerc.com/pa/Stand/pages/reliabilitystandards.aspx>. Accessed: 2024-09-25.
- [23] The MITRE Corporation. 2024. Common Platform Enumeration (CPE). <https://cpe.mitre.org/>. Accessed: 2024-09-25.
- [24] Joana Cabral Costa, Tiago Roxo, João BF Sequeiros, Hugo Proenca, and Pedro RM Inacio. 2022. Predicting CVSS metric via description interpretation. *IEEE Access* 10 (2022), 59125–59134. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3179692>
- [25] Thiago Figueiredo Costa and Mateus Tymburibá. 2022. Challenges on prioritizing software patching. In *2022 15th International Conference on Security of Information and Networks (SIN)*. IEEE, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SIN56466.2022.9970537>
- [26] PCI Security Standards Council. 2024. Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard (PCI DSS). <https://www.pcisecuritystandards.org/>. Accessed: 2024-09-25.
- [27] Roland Croft, M Ali Babar, and Li Li. 2022. An investigation into inconsistency of software vulnerability severity across data sources. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER)*. IEEE, 338–348. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SANER53432.2022.00050>
- [28] Akalanka Mailewa Dissanayaka, Susan Mengel, Lisa Gittner, and Hafiz Khan. 2020. Vulnerability prioritization, root cause analysis, and mitigation of secure data analytic framework implemented with mongodb on singularity linux containers. In *Proceedings of the 2020 4th International Conference on Compute and Data Analysis*. 58–66. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3388142.3388168>
- [29] Ying Dong, Wenbo Guo, Yueqi Chen, Xinyu Xing, Yuqing Zhang, and Gang Wang. 2019. Towards the detection of inconsistencies in public security vulnerability reports. In *28th USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 19)*. USENIX Association, 869–885. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity19/presentation/dong>
- [30] Sarah Elder, Md Rayhanur Rahman, Gage Fringer, Kunal Kapoor, and Laurie Williams. 2024. A Survey on Software Vulnerability Exploitability Assessment. *Comput. Surveys* 56, 8 (2024), 1–41. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3648610>
- [31] Gregory Falco, Carlos Caldera, and Howard Shrobe. 2018. IIoT cybersecurity risk modeling for SCADA systems. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 5, 6 (2018), 4486–4495. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JIOT.2018.2822842>
- [32] Yong Fang, Yongcheng Liu, Cheng Huang, and Liang Liu. 2020. FastEmbed: Predicting vulnerability exploitation possibility based on ensemble machine learning algorithm. *Plos one* 15, 2 (2020), e0228439. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0228439>
- [33] Katheryn A Farris, Ankit Shah, George Cybenko, Rajesh Ganesan, and Sushil Jajodia. 2018. Vulcon: A system for vulnerability prioritization, mitigation, and management. *ACM Transactions on Privacy and Security (TOPS)* 21, 4 (2018), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3196884>
- [34] Thiago Figueiredo Costa and Mateus Tymburibá. 2022. Exploitability Assessment with Genetically Tuned Interconnected Neural Networks. In *Brazilian Conference on Intelligent Systems*. Springer, 596–610. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-21686-2_41
- [35] Igor Forain, Robson de Oliveira Albuquerque, and Rafael Timóteo de Sousa Júnior. 2022. REVS: A Vulnerability Ranking Tool for Enterprise Security.. In *ICEIS (2)*. 126–133.
- [36] Stefan Frei, Martin May, Ulrich Fiedler, and Bernhard Plattner. 2006. Large-scale vulnerability analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2006 SIGCOMM workshop on Large-scale attack defense*. 131–138. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1162666.1162671>
- [37] Christian Fruhwirth and Tomi Mannisto. 2009. Improving CVSS-based vulnerability prioritization and response with context information. In *2009 3rd International symposium on empirical software engineering and measurement*. IEEE, 535–544. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ESEM.2009.5314230>

- [38] Urvashi Garg, Geeta Sikka, and Lalit K Awasthi. 2018. Empirical analysis of attack graphs for mitigating critical paths and vulnerabilities. *Computers & Security* 77 (2018), 349–359. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2018.04.006>
- [39] Nirnay Ghosh, Ishan Chokshi, Mithun Sarkar, Soumya K Ghosh, Anil Kumar Kaushik, and Sajal K Das. 2015. NetSecuritas: An integrated attack graph-based security assessment tool for enterprise networks. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Distributed Computing and Networking*, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2684464.2684494>
- [40] Guillaume Girol, Benjamin Farinier, and Sébastien Bardin. 2021. Not all bugs are created equal, but robust reachability can tell the difference. In *International Conference on Computer Aided Verification*. Springer, 669–693. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-81685-8_32
- [41] Guillaume Girol, Guilhem Lacombe, and Sébastien Bardin. 2024. Quantitative Robustness for Vulnerability Assessment. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 8, PLDI (2024), 741–765. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3656407>
- [42] Sri Nikhil Gupta Gouriseti, Michael Mylrea, and Hirak Patangia. 2019. Cybersecurity vulnerability mitigation framework through empirical paradigm (CyFER): prioritized gap analysis. *IEEE Systems Journal* 14, 2 (2019), 1897–1908. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JSYST.2019.2913141>
- [43] Hannes Holm, Mathias Ekstedt, and Dennis Andersson. 2012. Empirical analysis of system-level vulnerability metrics through actual attacks. *IEEE Transactions on dependable and secure computing* 9, 6 (2012), 825–837. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TDSC.2012.66>
- [44] Hyunji Hong, Seunghoon Woo, Eunjin Choi, Jihyun Choi, and Heejo Lee. 2022. xVDB: A high-coverage approach for constructing a vulnerability database. *IEEE Access* 10 (2022), 85050–85063.
- [45] Mohammad Shamsul Hoque, Norziana Jamil, Nowshad Amin, and Muhamad Mansor. 2023. Risk-ranking matrix for security patching of exploitable vulnerabilities. In *AIP Conference Proceedings*, Vol. 2808. AIP Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0134560>
- [46] Soumyadeep Hore, Fariha Moomtaheen, Ankit Shah, and Xinming Ou. 2022. Towards optimal triage and mitigation of context-sensitive cyber vulnerabilities. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* 20, 2 (2022), 1270–1285. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TDSC.2022.3152164>
- [47] Soumyadeep Hore, Ankit Shah, and Nathaniel D Bastian. 2023. Deep VULMAN: A deep reinforcement learning-enabled cyber vulnerability management framework. *Expert Systems with Applications* 221 (2023), 119734. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2023.119734>
- [48] Tian Hu, Shangyuan Zhuang, Jiyan Sun, Yinlong Liu, Wei Ma, and Hongchao Wang. 2023. A Cost-effective Automation Method of Massive Vulnerabilities Analysis and Remediation Based on Cloud Native. In *2023 IEEE 22nd International Conference on Trust, Security and Privacy in Computing and Communications (TrustCom)*. IEEE, 772–779. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TrustCom60117.2023.00112>
- [49] Chien-Cheng Huang, Feng-Yu Lin, Frank Yeong-Sung Lin, and Yeali S Sun. 2013. A novel approach to evaluate software vulnerability prioritization. *Journal of Systems and Software* 86, 11 (2013), 2822–2840. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2013.06.040>
- [50] Emanuele Iannone, Roberta Guadagni, Filomena Ferrucci, Andrea De Lucia, and Fabio Palomba. 2022. The secret life of software vulnerabilities: A large-scale empirical study. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 49, 1 (2022), 44–63. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2022.3140868>
- [51] Emanuele Iannone, Giulia Sellitto, Emanuele Iaccarino, Filomena Ferrucci, Andrea De Lucia, and Fabio Palomba. 2024. Early and Realistic Exploitability Prediction of Just-Disclosed Software Vulnerabilities: How Reliable Can It Be? *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3654443>
- [52] Industrial Control Systems Cyber Emergency Response Team (ICS-CERT). 2024. Industrial Control Systems Cyber Emergency Response Team. <https://www.cisa.gov/topics/industrial-control-systems>. Accessed: 2024-09-25.
- [53] Jay Jacobs, Sasha Romanosky, Benjamin Edwards, Idris Adjerid, and Michael Roytman. 2021. Exploit prediction scoring system (epss). *Digital Threats: Research and Practice* 2, 3 (2021), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3436242>
- [54] Jay Jacobs, Sasha Romanosky, Octavian Suciu, Ben Edwards, and Armin Sarabi. 2023. Enhancing Vulnerability Prioritization: Data-driven exploit predictions with community-driven insights. In *2023 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops (EuroS&PW)*. IEEE, 194–206. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EuroSPW59978.2023.00027>
- [55] Yuning Jiang, Manfred A Jeusfeld, Jianguo Ding, and Elin Sandahl. 2023. Model-Based Cybersecurity Analysis: Extending Enterprise Modeling to Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity. *Business & Information Systems Engineering* 65, 6 (2023), 643–676. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-023-00811-0>
- [56] Bill Jung, Yan Li, and Tamir Bechor. 2022. CAVP: A context-aware vulnerability prioritization model. *Computers & Security* 116 (2022), 102639. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2022.102639>
- [57] Omer Keskin, Nick Gannon, Brian Lopez, and Unal Tatar. 2021. Scoring cyber vulnerabilities based on their impact on organizational goals. In *2021 Systems and Information Engineering Design Symposium (SIEDS)*. IEEE, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SIEDS52267.2021.9483741>
- [58] Parviz Khaledian, Brian K Johnson, and Saied Hemati. 2018. Power grid security improvement by remedial action schemes using vulnerability assessment based on fault chains and power flow. In *2018 IEEE International Conference*

- on *Probabilistic Methods Applied to Power Systems (PMAPS)*. IEEE, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/PMAPS.2018.8440412>
- [59] Arash Negahdari Kia, Finbarr Murphy, Barry Sheehan, and Darren Shannon. 2024. A cyber risk prediction model using common vulnerabilities and exposures. *Expert Systems with Applications* 237 (2024), 121599. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2023.121599>
- [60] Aditya Kurniawan, Mohamad Yusof Darus, Muhammad Azizi Mohd Ariffin, Yohan Muliono, and Chrisando Ryan Pardomuan. 2023. Automation of Quantifying Security Risk Level on Injection Attacks Based on Common Vulnerability Scoring System Metric. *Pertanika Journal of Science & Technology* 31, 3 (2023).
- [61] Triet HM Le, Huaming Chen, and M Ali Babar. 2021. A Survey on Data-Driven Software Vulnerability Assessment and Prioritization. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2107.08364* (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3529757>
- [62] Triet HM Le, Huaming Chen, and M Ali Babar. 2022. A survey on data-driven software vulnerability assessment and prioritization. *Comput. Surveys* 55, 5 (2022), 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3529757>
- [63] Triet Huynh Minh Le, Bushra Sabir, and Muhammad Ali Babar. 2019. Automated software vulnerability assessment with concept drift. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 16th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*. IEEE, 371–382. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSR.2019.00063>
- [64] Shiyong Li, Shasha Wu, and Xinglin Guo. 2023. Security Risk Assessment Method for Measurement Control Systems Based on Attack Tree Model and Common Vulnerability Scoring System. In *Proceedings of the 2023 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Systems and Network Security*. 360–369. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3661638.3661706>
- [65] Xiaozhou Li, Sergio Moreschini, Zheyang Zhang, Fabio Palomba, and Davide Taibi. 2023. The anatomy of a vulnerability database: A systematic mapping study. *Journal of Systems and Software* 201 (2023), 111679.
- [66] Yangyang Liu, Zhao Wang, Yanan Zhang, Peiji Shi, and Xuebin Shao. 2019. Study on vulnerability rating of the intelligent and connected vehicle's cybersecurity. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, Vol. 1187. IOP Publishing, 052054. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1187/5/052054>
- [67] Angel Longueira-Romero, Jose Luis Flores, Rosa Iglesias, and Inaki Garitano. 2022. Gotta Catch'em All: Aggregating CVSS Scores. *XVII Reunión española sobre criptología y seguridad de la información. RECSI 2022* 265 (2022), 144.
- [68] Ángel Longueira-Romero, Rosa Iglesias, Jose Luis Flores, and Iñaki Garitano. 2022. A novel model for vulnerability analysis through enhanced directed graphs and quantitative metrics. *Sensors* 22, 6 (2022), 2126. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s22062126>
- [69] Jesus Luna, Ahmed Taha, Ruben Trapero, and Neeraj Suri. 2015. Quantitative reasoning about cloud security using service level agreements. *IEEE Transactions on Cloud Computing* 5, 3 (2015), 457–471. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCC.2015.2469659>
- [70] Basim Mahmood. 2021. Prioritizing CWE/SANS and OWASP Vulnerabilities: A Network-Based Model. *International Journal of Computing and Digital Systems* 10, 1 (2021), 361–372. <https://doi.org/10.12785/ijcds/100137>
- [71] Vida Ahmadi Mehri, Patrik Arlos, and Emiliano Casalicchio. 2023. Automated Patch Management: An Empirical Evaluation Study. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Cyber Security and Resilience (CSR)*. IEEE, 321–328. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CSR57506.2023.10224970>
- [72] Prarna Mehta, Shubhangi Aggarwal, and Abhishek Tandon. 2023. The Effect of Topic Modelling on Prediction of Criticality Levels of Software Vulnerabilities. *Informatica* 47, 6 (2023).
- [73] The MITRE Corporation (MITRE). 2024. Common Weakness Enumeration (CWE). <https://cwe.mitre.org/>. Accessed: 2024-09-25.
- [74] Azqa Nadeem, Daniël Vos, Clinton Cao, Luca Pajola, Simon Dieck, Robert Baumgartner, and Sicco Verwer. 2023. Sok: Explainable machine learning for computer security applications. In *2023 IEEE 8th European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*. IEEE, 221–240. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EuroSP57164.2023.00022>
- [75] Bradley Northern, Trey Burks, Marlana Hatcher, Michael Rogers, and Denis Ulybyshev. 2021. Vercasm-cps: Vulnerability analysis and cyber risk assessment for cyber-physical systems. *Information* 12, 10 (2021), 408. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info12100408>
- [76] Sabrina Mamtaz Nourin, Foteini C Argiropoulos, and George Karabatis. 2021. Measuring Software Security Using Improved CWE Base Score.. In *CIKM Workshops*.
- [77] Forum of Incident Response and Security Teams. 2024. Common Vulnerability Scoring System (CVSS). <https://www.first.org/cvss/>. Accessed: 2024-09-25.
- [78] National Institute of Standards and Technology. 2024. Security Content Automation Protocol (SCAP). <https://csrc.nist.gov/projects/security-content-automation-protocol>. Accessed: 2024-09-25.
- [79] Pascal Oser, Rens W van der Heijden, Stefan Lüders, and Frank Kargl. 2022. Risk prediction of IoT devices based on vulnerability analysis. *ACM Transactions on Privacy and Security* 25, 2 (2022), 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3510360>
- [80] Moussa Ouedraogo, Manel Khodja, and Djamel Khadraoui. 2013. Towards a Risk Based Assessment of QoS Degradation for Critical Infrastructure. In *2013 International Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security*. IEEE, 538–545. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ARES.2013.71>

- [81] Shengyi Pan, Lingfeng Bao, Jiayuan Zhou, Xing Hu, Xin Xia, and Shanping Li. 2024. Towards More Practical Automation of Vulnerability Assessment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering*. 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3597503.3639110>
- [82] David Pecl, Yehor Safonov, Zdenek Martinasek, Matej Kacic, Lubomir Almer, and Lukas Malina. 2021. Manager Asks: Which Vulnerability Must be Eliminated First?. In *Innovative Security Solutions for Information Technology and Communications: 13th International Conference, SecITC 2020, Bucharest, Romania, November 19–20, 2020, Revised Selected Papers 13*. Springer, 146–164. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69255-1_10
- [83] Haoran Qiu, Subho S Banerjee, Saurabh Jha, Zbigniew T Kalbarczyk, and Ravishankar K Iyer. 2020. {FIRM}: An intelligent fine-grained resource management framework for {SLO-Oriented} microservices. In *14th USENIX symposium on operating systems design and implementation (OSDI 20)*. USENIX Association, 805–825. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi20/presentation/qiu>
- [84] Qualys. 2024. Qualys TotalAI, De-risk Your LLMs and Generative AI. <https://www.qualys.com/apps/totalai/> Accessed: 2024-09-25.
- [85] Qualys. 2024. Qualys Vulnerability Management, Detection and Response (VMDR). https://docs.qualys.com/en/vmdr/latest/get_started/get_started.htm Accessed: 2024-09-25.
- [86] Jorge Reyes, Walter Fuertes, Paco Arévalo, and Mayra Macas. 2022. An environment-specific prioritization model for information-security vulnerabilities based on risk factor analysis. *Electronics* 11, 9 (2022), 1334. <https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics11091334>
- [87] Yaman Roumani and Joseph Nwankpa. 2020. Examining exploitability risk of vulnerabilities: a hazard model. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* 46, 1 (2020), 18. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.04618>
- [88] Abdulkhakim Sabur, Ankur Chowdhary, Dijiang Huang, and Adel Alshamrani. 2022. Toward scalable graph-based security analysis for cloud networks. *Computer Networks* 206 (2022), 108795. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comnet.2022.108795>
- [89] Sagar Samtani, Yidong Chai, and Hsinchun Chen. 2022. Linking Exploits from the Dark Web to Known Vulnerabilities for Proactive Cyber Threat Intelligence: An Attention-Based Deep Structured Semantic Model1. *MIS quarterly* 46, 2 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2022/15392>
- [90] Skybox Security. 2024. Skybox Security Vulnerability and Threat Management (VTM). <https://www.skyboxsecurity.com/solutions/vulnerability-threat-management/> Accessed: 2024-09-25.
- [91] Ensar Seker and Weizhi Meng. 2023. XVRS: Extended Vulnerability Risk Scoring based on Threat Intelligence. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Metaverse Computing, Networking and Applications (MetaCom)*. IEEE, 516–523. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MetaCom57706.2023.00094>
- [92] Ankit Shah, Kathryn A Farris, Rajesh Ganesan, and Sushil Jajodia. 2022. Vulnerability selection for remediation: An empirical analysis. *The Journal of Defense Modeling and Simulation* 19, 1 (2022), 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548512919874129>
- [93] Gaurav Sharma, Stilianos Vidalis, Catherine Menon, and Niharika Anand. 2023. Analysis and implementation of semi-automatic model for vulnerability exploitations of threat agents in NIST databases. *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 82, 11 (2023), 16951–16971. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-022-14036-y>
- [94] Special Interest Group (SIG). 2024. Exploit Prediction Scoring System (EPSS) API. <https://www.first.org/epss/api>. Accessed: 2024-09-25.
- [95] Jonathan Spring, Eric Hatleback, Allen Householder, Art Manion, and Deana Shick. 2021. Time to Change the CVSS? *IEEE Security & Privacy* 19, 2 (2021), 74–78.
- [96] Anurag Srivastava, Thomas Morris, Timothy Ernster, Ceeman Vellaithurai, Shengyi Pan, and Uttam Adhikari. 2013. Modeling cyber-physical vulnerability of the smart grid with incomplete information. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid* 4, 1 (2013), 235–244. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSG.2012.2232318>
- [97] Kun Sun, Sushil Jajodia, Jason Li, Yi Cheng, Wei Tang, and Anoop Singhal. 2011. Automatic security analysis using security metrics. In *2011-MILCOM 2011 Military Communications Conference*. IEEE, 1207–1212. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MILCOM.2011.6127465>
- [98] Yulia Tatarinova. 2018. Avia: Automatic vulnerability impact assessment on the target system. In *2018 IEEE Second International Conference on Data Stream Mining & Processing (DSMP)*. IEEE, 364–368. <https://doi.org/10.1109/DSMP.2018.8478519>
- [99] David Tayouri, Nick Baum, Asaf Shabtai, and Rami Puzis. 2023. A survey of MulVAL extensions and their attack scenarios coverage. *IEEE Access* 11 (2023), 27974–27991. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3257721>
- [100] Tenable. 2024. Tenable AI Aware. <https://www.tenable.com/products/vulnerability-management/ai-aware> Accessed: 2024-09-25.
- [101] Tenable. 2024. Tenable Vulnerability Management (VM). <https://docs.tenable.com/vulnerability-management.html> Accessed: 2024-09-25.

- [102] Tenable. 2024. Tenable Vulnerability Management (VM) MSSP. <https://www.tenable.com/partners/mssp-partner-program> Accessed: 2024-09-25.
- [103] Michał Walkowski, Maciej Krakowiak, Marcin Jaroszewski, Jacek Oko, and Sławomir Sujecki. 2021. Automatic CVSS-based vulnerability prioritization and response with context information. In *2021 International Conference on Software, Telecommunications and Computer Networks (SoftCOM)*. IEEE, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.23919/SoftCOM52868.2021.9559094>
- [104] Michał Walkowski, Maciej Krakowiak, Jacek Oko, and Sławomir Sujecki. 2020. Efficient algorithm for providing live vulnerability assessment in corporate network environment. *Applied Sciences* 10, 21 (2020), 7926. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app10217926>
- [105] Michał Walkowski, Jacek Oko, and Sławomir Sujecki. 2021. Vulnerability management models using a common vulnerability scoring system. *Applied Sciences* 11, 18 (2021), 8735. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app11188735>
- [106] Jiali Wang, Martin Neil, and Norman Fenton. 2020. A Bayesian network approach for cybersecurity risk assessment implementing and extending the FAIR model. *Computers & Security* 89 (2020), 101659. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2019.101659>
- [107] Wenrui Wang, Fan Shi, Min Zhang, Chengxi Xu, and Jinghua Zheng. 2020. A vulnerability risk assessment method based on heterogeneous information network. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 148315–148330. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3015551>
- [108] Yinghui Wang, Bin Yu, Haiyang Yu, Lingyun Xiao, Haojie Ji, and Yanan Zhao. 2022. Automotive cybersecurity vulnerability assessment using the common vulnerability scoring system and Bayesian network model. *IEEE Systems Journal* 17, 2 (2022), 2880–2891. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JSYST.2022.3230097>
- [109] Zibo Wang, Chaobin Huo, Yaofang Zhang, Shengtao Cheng, Yilu Chen, Xiaojie Wei, Chao Li, and Bailing Wang. 2023. Critical Relation Path Aggregation-Based Industrial Control Component Exploitable Vulnerability Reasoning. *Computers, Materials & Continua* 75, 2 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.32604/cmc.2023.035694>
- [110] Tao Wen, Yuqing Zhang, Ying Dong, and Gang Yang. 2015. A Novel Automatic Severity Vulnerability Assessment Framework. *J. Commun.* 10, 5 (2015), 320–329. <https://doi.org/10.12720/jcm.10.5.320-329>
- [111] Seunghoon Woo, Dongwook Lee, Sunghan Park, Heejo Lee, and Sven Dietrich. 2021. {V0Finder}: Discovering the Correct Origin of Publicly Reported Software Vulnerabilities. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*. USENIX Association, 3041–3058. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity21/presentation/woo>
- [112] Geeta Yadav, Praveen Gauravaram, Arun Kumar Jindal, and Kolin Paul. 2022. SmartPatch: A patch prioritization framework. *Computers in Industry* 137 (2022), 103595. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compind.2021.103595>
- [113] Geeta Yadav and Kolin Paul. 2019. PatchRank: Ordering updates for SCADA systems. In *2019 24th IEEE International Conference on Emerging Technologies and Factory Automation (ETFA)*. IEEE, 110–117. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ETFA.2019.8869110>
- [114] Geeta Yadav, Kolin Paul, Alaa Allakany, and Koji Okamura. 2020. IoT-PEN: An E2E penetration testing framework for IoT. *Journal of Information Processing* 28 (2020), 633–642. <https://doi.org/10.2197/ipsjip.28.633>
- [115] Kang Yan, Xuan Liu, Yidan Lu, and Fanglu Qin. 2022. A cyber-physical power system risk assessment model against cyberattacks. *IEEE Systems Journal* 17, 2 (2022), 2018–2028. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JSYST.2022.3215591>
- [116] Jiao Yin, Guihong Chen, Wei Hong, Hua Wang, Jinli Cao, and Yuan Miao. 2023. Empowering vulnerability prioritization: A heterogeneous graph-driven framework for exploitability prediction. In *International Conference on Web Information Systems Engineering*. Springer, 289–299. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-7254-8_23
- [117] Seong-Su Yoon, Do-Yeon Kim, Ga-Gyeong Kim, and Iech-Chae Euom. 2023. Vulnerability Assessment Based on Real World Exploitability for Prioritizing Patch Applications. In *2023 7th Cyber Security in Networking Conference (CSNet)*. IEEE, 62–66. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CSNet59123.2023.10339782>
- [118] Seong-Su Yoon, Do-Yeon Kim, Ka-Kyung Kim, and Iech-Chae Euom. 2023. Vulnerability exploitation risk assessment based on offensive security approach. *Applied Sciences* 13, 22 (2023), 12180. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app132212180>
- [119] Zhen Zeng, Dijiang Huang, Guoliang Xue, Yuli Deng, Neha Vadnere, and Liguang Xie. 2023. ILLATION: Improving Vulnerability Risk Prioritization By Learning From Network. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TDSC.2023.3294433>
- [120] Zhen Zeng, Zhun Yang, Dijiang Huang, and Chun-Jen Chung. 2021. Locality–likelihood and criticality: Vulnerability risk prioritization through logical reasoning and deep learning. *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management* 19, 2 (2021), 1746–1760.
- [121] Fengli Zhang and Qinghua Li. 2020. Dynamic risk-aware patch scheduling. In *2020 IEEE Conference on Communications and Network Security (CNS)*. IEEE, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CNS48642.2020.9162225>
- [122] Deqing Zou, Ju Yang, Zhen Li, Hai Jin, and Xiaojing Ma. 2019. Autocvss: An approach for automatic assessment of vulnerability severity based on attack process. In *Green, Pervasive, and Cloud Computing: 14th International Conference, GPC 2019, Uberlândia, Brazil, May 26–28, 2019, Proceedings 14*. Springer, 238–253. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-19223-5_17

A Appendix

Table 1 summarizes the data sources and severity metrics utilized in the reviewed papers.

Table 2 correlates the utilized methodologies with the applied risk metrics in the reviewed papers.

Table 3 summarizes the methodologies and validation methods adopted in the reviewed papers.

Table 1. Data Source and Severity Metric Coverage by Reviewed Paper

Paper	Data Sources				Severity Metrics				
	Standard	Exploit	Social	System	Impact	Exploitability	Contextual	Predictive	Aggregation
[59]
[6]
[119]
[16]
[51]
[91]
[47]
[116]
[64]
[60]
[93]
[118]
[109]
[19]
[48]
[108]
[71]
[54]
[55]
[79]
[115]
[92]
[46]
[35]
[89]
[3]
[25]
[56]
[112]
[1]
[34]
[21]
[86]
[68]
[67]
[120]
[105]
[76]
[75]
[70]
[57]
[82]
[103]
[104]
[32]
[87]
[106]
[9]
[8]
[114]
[10]
[42]
[121]
[107]
[28]
[66]
[17]
[5]
[122]
[113]
[7]
[18]
[63]
[33]
[98]
[58]
[31]
[38]
[4]
[15]
[110]
[39]
[14]
[80]
[96]
[49]
[12]
[43]
[11]
[37]
[36]

Table 2. Summary of methodologies and metrics for reviewed papers.

Paper	Methodologies					Metrics				
	Graph	ML	Multi-Objective	Rule	Statistical	Impact	Exploitability	Contextual	Predictive	Aggregation
[59]		•				•	•		•	
[6]					•	•	•	•	•	
[119]		•		•		•	•	•	•	•
[16]	•			•		•	•	•		•
[51]		•				•	•		•	
[91]		•				•	•			
[47]		•				•	•	•	•	
[116]	•	•					•			
[64]	•			•		•	•			•
[60]				•		•	•	•		
[93]				•		•	•	•		•
[118]					•		•			
[109]	•						•	•		
[19]	•					•		•		
[48]				•		•		•		•
[71]				•				•		
[54]		•					•		•	
[55]	•			•		•		•		
[79]				•		•			•	
[115]	•						•	•		
[92]			•			•				•
[46]		•				•		•	•	•
[35]			•			•	•			
[89]		•				•	•	•	•	
[3]	•					•	•	•		•
[25]		•				•	•			
[56]				•		•	•	•		•
[21]			•			•		•		
[86]				•	•	•	•	•		
[68]	•					•			•	
[120]		•					•	•	•	
[105]				•		•		•		
[76]		•			•	•		•		
[75]				•		•		•		
[70]	•							•		
[57]				•		•		•		
[82]				•		•	•	•		
[103]				•		•		•		
[104]		•				•		•		
[32]		•				•	•		•	
[87]					•		•			
[106]	•						•			•
[9]			•							
[8]	•					•		•		
[114]	•					•		•		
[10]				•						•
[42]			•							•
[121]		•				•	•		•	
[107]	•					•	•	•		
[28]				•		•				
[66]				•		•		•		•
[17]	•	•				•	•		•	
[5]		•				•	•		•	
[122]				•		•				
[113]	•					•	•	•		
[7]	•					•	•	•		
[18]	•	•					•			
[63]		•				•				
[33]			•			•		•		•
[98]	•	•					•	•		•
[58]	•								•	
[31]					•	•				
[38]	•					•		•		
[4]		•				•				
[15]	•				•	•			•	
[110]		•				•				
[14]				•			•	•		•
[80]	•						•	•		•
[96]	•					•		•		•
[39]	•								•	
[49]			•			•				
[12]			•			•		•		
[43]					•	•				•
[11]			•			•		•		
[97]				•		•				•
[37]				•		•				
[36]					•		•	•		

Table 3. Methodologies and Validation Methods of Reviewed Paper

Paper	Methodology					Validation Method			
	Graph	ML	Multi-Objective	Rule	Statistical	Case Study	Experiment	Simulation	Interview
[59]		•				•	•		
[6]					•			•	
[119]		•		•		•		•	
[16]	•			•		•	•		
[51]		•					•		
[91]		•					•		
[47]		•					•	•	
[116]	•	•					•		
[64]	•			•		•			
[60]				•			•		
[93]				•		•	•		
[118]					•	•			
[109]	•						•		
[19]	•						•		
[48]				•			•		
[108]	•	•					•		
[71]				•			•		
[54]		•					•		
[55]	•			•		•			•
[79]				•			•		
[115]	•							•	
[92]			•				•		
[46]		•					•		
[35]			•				•	•	
[89]		•				•	•		•
[3]	•								
[25]		•					•		
[56]				•		•			
[112]			•			•			
[1]				•			•		
[34]		•					•		
[21]			•				•		
[86]				•	•		•		
[68]	•					•			•
[67]	•					•			
[120]		•				•			
[105]				•			•		
[76]		•			•		•		
[75]				•			•		
[70]	•					•			
[57]				•				•	
[82]				•		•			
[103]				•			•		
[104]		•					•		
[32]		•					•		
[87]					•		•		
[106]	•							•	
[9]			•			•			
[8]	•					•		•	
[114]	•						•		
[10]				•		•			
[42]			•				•		
[121]		•					•		
[107]	•					•			
[28]				•			•		
[66]				•		•			
[17]	•	•				•	•		
[5]		•				•	•		
[122]				•			•		
[113]	•						•	•	
[7]	•						•		
[18]	•	•				•	•		
[63]		•					•		
[33]			•			•			
[98]	•	•				•	•		
[58]	•					•		•	
[31]					•				
[38]	•						•		
[4]		•					•		•
[15]	•				•	•			
[110]		•					•		
[14]				•			•		
[80]	•							•	
[96]	•							•	
[39]	•							•	
[49]			•			•			
[12]			•				•		
[43]					•	•			•
[11]			•				•		•
[97]				•				•	
[87]								•	
[36]					•				