

Multi-Task DNS Security Analysis via High-Order Heterogeneous Graph Embedding

Meng Qin
Independent Research
mengqin_az@foxmail.com

Abstract—DNS is an essential Internet infrastructure to support network applications and services, but is also a significant tool exploited by various cyberattacks. Existing DNS security analysis techniques mostly focus on one specific task associated with one single entity (e.g., domain) via conventional feature engineering. They rely heavily on the labor-intensive feature selection and largely ignore the intrinsic correlations among the heterogeneous DNS entities (e.g., domain and IP). In this paper, I explore the potential of heterogeneous graph embedding to automatically learn the behavior features of multiple DNS entities, and to simultaneously support more than one security tasks. Considering the joint optimization of malicious domain detection and IP reputation evaluation as an example, I propose a novel joint DNS embedding (JDE) model to formulate the DNS query behavior via a similarity-enhanced graph with heterogeneous entities. The random walk technique is applied to the heterogeneous graph to comprehensively explore the hidden homogeneous and heterogeneous high-order proximities among domains and IPs. Extensive experiments on real DNS traffic demonstrate that the joint optimization of multiple tasks with the latent high-order proximities can lead to better security analysis performance for all the tasks than respectively optimizing each single task with the observable low-order proximity.

Index Terms—Malicious Domain Detection, IP Reputation Evaluation, Heterogeneous Graph Embedding

I. INTRODUCTION

As one of the infrastructures to support various network applications and services, the domain name system (DNS) is a critical component to ensure the availability, security and reliability of the Internet. Unfortunately, DNS is also a significant tool exploited by a wide spectrum of cyberattacks, e.g., phishing, botnets, and advanced persistent attacks (APT). Thus ensuring DNS security (e.g., by identifying and blocking malicious domains for preventing the potential cyberattacks and mitigating risks) is a long-standing challenge in the networking and security research community [1].

By retrieving the *IP addresses* of network systems based on their *domain names*, DNS often serves as the first step to establish data communication for most Internet applications. It offers unique insights to understand the communication mechanism of applications, protocols, and end hosts. Hence, characterizing DNS entities (e.g., domain names and IP addresses) based on machine learning (ML) techniques [2], [3] has naturally become a popular approach in DNS security analysis. However, most existing ML-based methods are inherently based on the conventional feature engineering paradigm, which first uses a set of pre-designed rules to extract the specific features (e.g., time-to-live (TTL) and lookup patterns),

and then utilizes them to train a downstream classifier for security applications. In practice, to select the appropriate set of features is labor-intensive and impractical due to the heavy reliance on a great amount of expert domain knowledge. In addition, the selected features may also suffer from the lack of robustness to adapt to the highly dynamic DNS traffic and evolving intrusion strategies of adversaries [4].

Inspired by the automatic feature learning in the ML community, a few recent studies [4]–[6] have applied the word embedding in natural language processing (NLP) and graph embedding in network analysis to the specific DNS security tasks (e.g., malicious domain detection). These studies aim to automatically learn the low-dimensional features (also called embeddings) for certain DNS entities (e.g., domains) from the raw DNS traffic and leverage the learned features to train a downstream classifier to support concrete security tasks.

Despite the sound effectiveness of these embedding-based approaches, they still have several limitations. First, most existing embedding-based methods only utilize the observable low-order proximity among homogeneous DNS entities (e.g., the similarity between each pair of domains). However, there are multiple different entities (e.g., domains, IPs, and end hosts) involved in the DNS query behavior. The latent high-order proximities among heterogeneous DNS entities are inherently ignored by existing embedding-based methods. From the perspective of graph theory, the heterogeneous high-order proximities of a certain DNS entity can be described as the similarities between its high-order neighbors within K -step ($K \geq 1$) random walk on the relation graph with different DNS entities (e.g., domains and IPs). They are not directly observable from the DNS traffic, but provide complementary information regarding the DNS query behavior that can further boost the security application performance. For instance, domain p_i should have similar properties (e.g., good or poor reputation) with IP q_j even though p_i is not directly resolved to q_j , if (i) an end host h_k frequently queries the DNS resolution of p_i or (ii) most of the other domains queried by h_k are resolved to q_j in the same time window

Secondly, existing embedding-based techniques mostly focus on one specific task w.r.t. one single DNS entity. As DNS query involves more than one entities, DNS security analysis should ideally cover multiple aspects (e.g., malicious domain detection and IP reputation evaluation) with each aspect corresponding to one entity. More importantly, the close relations between different DNS entities indicate that there

should be hidden intrinsic correlations between different tasks, which has not been fully considered by existing methods. Recent studies on multi-task learning [7] have proved that the joint optimization of more than one related tasks can potentially result in better performance for all the tasks than respectively optimizing each individual task. This paper attempts to improve the performance of more than one DNS security applications via the joint learning of multiple tasks associated with different entities.

To overcome the aforementioned limitations, this paper explores the heterogeneous high-order graph embedding (i) to automatically learn the features of multiple DNS entities from the passive DNS traffic and (ii) to simultaneously support more than one DNS security tasks. In particular, I take the joint optimization of *malicious domain detection* (MDD) and *IP reputation evaluation* (IRE) as an example, which are both major DNS security tasks regarding two entities of DNS query behaviors (i.e., domain and IP).

To jointly learn domain and IP features, I propose a novel joint DNS embedding (JDE) method. Based on the bipartite relation between the two entities, I first model the DNS query behavior as a heterogeneous similarity-enhanced graph with all the domains and IPs considered as nodes. As a result, the primary DNS query patterns are comprehensively encoded in the weighted graph topology. Subsequently, I apply the random-walk-based graph embedding to this heterogeneous graph, where one could explore both homogeneous and heterogeneous high-order proximities between domains and IPs to jointly learn the domain and IP embeddings. Given the unsupervised nature of the aforementioned steps, I also develop an advanced semi-supervised objective by introducing the graph regularization and an end-to-end auxiliary classifier, where the label information is integrated to enhance the learned embeddings.

The contributions of this paper are highlighted as follows:

- To the best of my knowledge, this paper is the first systematic effort to utilize graph embedding to explore both homogeneous and heterogeneous high-order proximities between multiple DNS entities, while simultaneously completing more than one security analysis tasks.
- This paper introduces a novel JDE model, which not only captures the high-order proximity of DNS query behavior, but also integrate the supervised label information to enhance the learned embeddings.
- Extensive experiments on real DNS traffic demonstrated that the multi-task joint optimization schema can significantly improve the performance of all the security analysis tasks compared with respectively optimizing each single task.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the definitions of MDD, IRE, and graph embedding, as well as the backgrounds of datasets used in this study. Section III systematically presents the proposed JDE model, and Section IV evaluates the effectiveness of JDE over state-of-the-art baselines on real datasets. Section V discusses related work. Finally, Section VI concludes this paper.

II. PRELIMINARIES AND DATASETS

In this paper, I study the MDD and IRE on passive DNS data. A passive DNS dataset can be represented as a set of DNS query records $\{(t_s, h_k, p_i, q_j) | t_s \in T, h_k \in H, p_i \in D, q_j \in I\}$, with T , H , D and I as the set of timestamps, hosts, domains, and IPs. A query record describes the behavior that (i) host h_k queries the DNS resolution of domain p_i at timestamp t_s and (ii) p_i is resolved to IP q_j .

A. Malicious Domain Detection (MDD)

The MDD task can be formulated as a binary classification problem. Suppose that there is a set of feature-label tuples $\{(\mathbf{u}_1, g_1), \dots, (\mathbf{u}_N, g_N)\}$ w.r.t. domains $\{p_1, \dots, p_N\}$, where $\mathbf{u}_i \in \mathbb{R}^K$ is p_i 's feature vector; $g_i \in \{0, 1\}$ is p_i 's label with $g_i = 0$ ($= 1$) being a benign (malicious) domain. MDD aims to learn a function $f : \{\mathbf{u}_i\} \mapsto \{r_i \in \{0, 1\}\}$ that maps features \mathbf{u}_i of each domain p_i to a predicted label r_i . Usually, f can be learned by fitting predicted labels $\{r_{l_1}, \dots, r_{l_{|D'|}}\}$ to the ground-truth $\{g_{l_1}, \dots, g_{l_{|D'|}}\}$ w.r.t. domains in the training set $\{p_{l_1}, \dots, p_{l_{|D'|}}\} = D' \subset D$. The trained f can then be applied to domains in the test set $\{p_{l'_1}, \dots, p_{l'_{|D''|}}\} = D'' = D - D'$ to predict their labels $\{r_{l'_1}, \dots, r_{l'_{|D''|}}\}$. The better correspondence between $\{r_{l''_1}, \dots, r_{l''_{|D''|}}\}$ and $\{g_{l''_1}, \dots, g_{l''_{|D''|}}\}$ indicates better MDD performance.

B. IP Reputation Evaluation (IRE)

IRE can be formulated as another binary classification problem with two reputation levels $\{\text{Normal}, \text{Poor}\}$. Suppose there is a set of feature-label tuples $\{(\mathbf{v}_1, g_1), \dots, (\mathbf{v}_M, g_M)\}$ w.r.t. IPs $\{q_1, \dots, q_M\}$. $\mathbf{v}_j \in \mathbb{R}^K$ is the feature of IP q_j . $g_j \in \{0, 1\}$ is the q_j 's label, where $g_j = 0$ ($= 1$) indicates that q_j is with normal (poor) reputation. IRE aims to learn a prediction function $h : \{\mathbf{v}_j\} \mapsto \{r_j \in \{0, 1\}\}$ that maps IP features \mathbf{v}_j to a predicted label r_j . Similar to f , h can also be optimized by minimizing the loss between predicted labels $\{r_{l_j}\}$ and ground-truth $\{g_{l_j}\}$ w.r.t. IPs in the training set $\{q_{l_1}, \dots, q_{l_{|I'|}}\} = I' \subset I$. The trained h is then applied to IPs in the test set $\{q_{l'_1}, \dots, q_{l'_{|I''|}}\} = I'' = I - I'$ to derive their predicted labels. The IRE performance can also be measured based on the correspondence between predicted labels $\{r_{l''_1}, \dots, r_{l''_{|I''|}}\}$ and ground-truth $\{g_{l''_1}, \dots, g_{l''_{|I''|}}\}$.

C. Heterogeneous Graph Embedding

In this study, I model the DNS query behavior between domains $\{p_i\}$ and IPs $\{q_j\}$ as a heterogeneous weighted graph with both $\{p_i\}$ and $\{q_j\}$ as nodes. In general, an undirected weighted graph can be described as a 2-tuple $G = \{V, E\}$, where $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_{N+M}\} = \{p_i\} \cup \{q_j\}$ is the node set; $E = \{W(v_i, v_j) | v_i, v_j \in V\}$ is the weighted edge set. Given a weighted graph G , the heterogeneous graph embedding aims to learn a function $o : \{v_i\} \mapsto \{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ to map each node v_i to a d -dimensional embedding vector \mathbf{x}_i with $d \ll (N + M)$, so that the node pair (v_i, v_j) with similar topological characteristics (e.g., in the same cluster) should have similar vector representations $(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$ with close distance in the embedding space. In this way, one can simultaneously




Fig. 1. The number of FQDNs, IPs, e2LDs and BGP Prefixes in the collected DNS log from 2018.3.1 to 2018.3.7 (7 days).

learn embeddings of all the domains $\{p_i\}$ and IPs $\{q_j\}$, which are used as the inputs of MDD and IRE.

D. Real DNS Traffic Datasets

In this study, all the analysis and evaluation is based on the real DNS traffic from a large campus edge network, which supports thousands of desktops, laptops, servers, and smartphones. There are two sources for collecting the real DNS data, which are the (i) DNS log from the edge routers and (ii) Web log from the network auditing system.

The edge routers save all the IP packets of DNS query and reply originating from or destined to all the campus DNS servers. For each DNS query packet, there are items of (i) timestamp, (ii) identification number, (iii) source IP address, (iv) queried domain name, and (v) query type (e.g., A, NS, CNAME, or MX). For each DNS reply packet, there are items of (i) timestamp, (ii) identification number, (iii) destination IP address, and (iv) response value. I collected the passive DNS log by extracting the (i) start timestamp of each DNS query, (ii) source IP of the host sending DNS query, (iii) queried domain, and (iv) resolved IP. The Web log of the auditing system records the Web access behaviors of all the users. It contains the items of (i) timestamp, (ii) user source IP, (iii) accessed URL, (iv) accessed website category (e.g., news, search engine, etc.), (v) website title, (vi) destination IP, and (vii) user device type (e.g., PC or mobile phone). I extracted the domain names from the accessed URLs and treated each destination IP as the DNS resolution result of the corresponding domain.

According to my preliminary analysis, the big data nature of DNS traffic makes the characterizing of DNS entities time-consuming. In fact, one can fully utilize the hierarchical structures of domain and IP address to reduce the complexity. Concretely, I extracted the effective second-level domains (e2LDs) from the fully qualified domain names (FQDNs) (e.g., extracting “google.com” from “www.google.com” and “scholar.google.com”), since e2LDs have included key information of the domain ownership or organizations. Moreover, I extracted the BGP prefix from each IP address in the DNS log (e.g., extract “47.94.0.0/15” from “47.95.49.97” and “47.95.51.238”) because the BGP prefixes also contain the organization information encoded in the original IPs. Fig. 1

illustrates the number of FQDNs, e2LDs, IPs and BGP prefixes in the collected DNS log from 2018.3.1 to 2018.3.7 (7 days). In Fig. 1, the FQDN (or IP) and e2LD (or BGP Prefix) have similar variation tendencies, while the number of e2LDs (or BGP Prefixes) is much less than that of FQDNs (or IPs). In the rest of this paper, I consider the MDD for e2LDs and the IRE for BGP prefixes.

I collected 3 datasets from different sources and with different time spans, which are denoted as $W19$, $D19$, and $D18$. $W19$ was extracted from the network auditing Web log, covering the DNS queries during 2019.11.1 (1 day). Both $D19$ and $D18$ were extracted from the DNS logs of edge routers, which include the DNS traffic (i) from 2019.4.1 to 2019.4.3 (3 days) and (ii) from 2018.3.1 to 2018.3.7 (7 days), respectively.

Following [8], [9], I used several well-known public APIs to label domains and IPs for all the datasets. Concretely, I labeled the benign and malicious domain via VirusTotal¹, ThreatBook², and TrustedSource³. Given a domain p_i , VirusTotal and ThreatBook can respectively query more than 60 and 10 authoritative credible blacklists (e.g., BitDefender⁴ and Antiy-AVL⁵) while responding the number of blacklists that determine p_i as a suspicious domain. TrustedSource is a database maintained by McAfee, which can check the categorization (e.g., pornography and phishing) and risk level (i.e., low, medium, and high risk) of a given domain p_i . During the pre-processing, I labeled p_i as a malicious domain if (i) it was determined as a suspicious domain by at least two of the blacklists of VirusTotal and ThreatBook or (ii) it’s determined as a high-risk domain by TrustedSource. For convenience, I developed a web crawler⁶ to automatically conduct the aforementioned data labeling procedure given a batch of DNS logs.

I further pruned domains based on the following criteria. First, I removed all the popular domains that (i) are included in the Alexa top-1M list⁷ or (ii) interact with over 50% of end hosts in the dataset. They can be directly identified as the well-known benign domains with high confidence, since they are widely used by most users. Second, I removed domains that (i) fail to be confirmed by VirusTotal, ThreatBook, and TrustedSource or (ii) are only determined as suspicious domains by less than two blacklists of the APIs, due to the lack of confidence to make a decision. Third, I also removed all the domains requested by less than two hosts in the dataset to avoid introducing the unexpected noise brought by these unpopular domains. Their potential risk of being malicious domains can still be captured with the accumulation of their abnormal query behaviors. Finally, the remaining domains except for those labeled as malicious ones were labeled as benign domains.

¹<https://www.virustotal.com/>

²<https://x.threatbook.cn/>

³<https://www.trustedsource.org/>

⁴<https://www.bitdefender.com/>

⁵<https://www.antiy.net/>

⁶https://github.com/KuroginQin/DNS_IP_Reputation

⁷<https://www.alexa.com/topsites>

TABLE I
DETAILS OF THE PRE-PROCESSED PASSIVE DNS DATASETS

	#Host	#Domain (B, M)	#IP (N, P)
<i>W19</i>	19,298	6,861 (6,365, 496)	4,649 (3,769, 880)
<i>D19</i>	20,601	8,947 (8,242, 705)	7,568 (6,677, 891)
<i>D18</i>	23,256	11,037 (9,475, 1,562)	7,109 (6,239, 870)

In addition, I labeled IPs with normal or poor reputation using the Cisco Talos⁸ API, which can evaluate the reputation of a given IP with three levels (i.e., *poor*, *neutral*, and *good* reputation). During the pre-processing, I queried the reputation for all the original IPs via Talos. Then, I merged those with *neutral* or *good* reputation to be the set with *normal* reputation, while removing those cannot be confirmed by the API. In this case, each remaining IP is with either *normal* or *poor* reputation. I further labeled each extracted BGP prefix q_j with *normal* (or *poor*) reputation, if more than 50% of the IPs with q_j as their common BGP prefix are with *normal* (or *poor*) reputation. My analysis also verifies that over 90% of the IPs with the common BGP prefixes have the same reputation level, indicating that the IP reputations in the same autonomous system are highly consistent.

Statistic details of the three datasets after pre-processing are demonstrated in Table I, where B, M, N and P are short for “Benign”, “Malicious”, “Normal”, and “Poor”. Note that the proportion of benign and malicious domains are highly unbalanced, where the number of malicious domains is much less than that of benign domains. Similar properties can also be observed between normal and poor IPs.

III. JOINT DNS EMBEDDING FOR MULTI-TASK DNS SECURITY ANALYSIS

I develop a novel JDE model to automatically learn the domain and IP features (i.e., embeddings), simultaneously supporting MDD and IRE. Fig. 2 illustrates an overview of JDE with three procedures, where I in sequence (i) model the DNS query behaviors via a heterogeneous graph, (ii) apply the random-walk-based graph embedding to learn heterogeneous embeddings, and (iii) use the learned embeddings to support multi-task DNS security applications.

A. Modeling DNS Behavior

Suppose that there are N domains and M IPs in the passive DNS data during a specific time window. The DNS query behavior can be described as a bipartite graph $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{N \times M}$, where \mathbf{B}_{ij} denotes the number of queries that domain p_i is resolved to IP q_j . I further introduce a *passive DNS graph* with the topology described by the following adjacency matrix \mathbf{P} :

$$\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{N \times M} & \hat{\mathbf{B}} \\ \hat{\mathbf{B}}^T & \mathbf{0}_{M \times N} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where elements in \mathbf{B} are normalized into value range $[0, 1]$ via $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{ij} = \mathbf{B}_{ij} / \mathbf{B}_{\max}$, with \mathbf{B}_{\max} as the maximum element in \mathbf{B} .

In (1), all the domains $\{p_i\}$ and IPs $\{q_j\}$ are treated as nodes in the graph, with the key properties of DNS query behaviors encoded in the weighted topology \mathbf{P} .

Based on the *passive DNS graph* \mathbf{P} , one can preliminarily learn the low-dimensional embeddings of all the domains and IPs. However, the sparsity of DNS query may hinder the model from exploring the high-order proximities between different DNS entities. For instance, domain p_i may still have similar properties (e.g., the same reputation) with IP q_j even though $\mathbf{P}_{i,N+j} = 0$, if (i) p_i is frequently queried by a certain host h_k and (ii) most of h_k 's queried domains are resolved to q_j . I further integrate the host-based, domain-based and IP-based similarities into the weighted topology \mathbf{P} to introduce additional characteristics beyond the *passive DNS graph*.

For all the domains $\{p_i\}$ in a specific time window, consider the host-based and IP-based similarities between each domain pair (p_i, p_j) , which can be described by a *host-based domain similarity matrix* $\mathbf{S}_{\text{DH}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ and an *IP-based domain similarity matrix* $\mathbf{S}_{\text{DI}} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$. For an arbitrary domain p_i , let H_{p_i} be the set of hosts that request the DNS resolution of p_i . Moreover, let I_{p_i} be the set of IPs that are resolved from p_i . I adopt the one-mode projection to transform the host-domain and IP-domain bipartite relations described by $\{H_{p_i}\}$ and $\{I_{p_i}\}$ into the domain-associated similarities (i.e., \mathbf{S}_{DH} and \mathbf{S}_{DI}). Concretely, I measure the Jaccard similarities between the each host set pair (H_{p_i}, H_{p_j}) and each IP set pair (I_{p_i}, I_{p_j}) , respectively. The formal definitions of \mathbf{S}_{DH} and \mathbf{S}_{DI} can be described as follow:

$$(\mathbf{S}_{\text{DH}})_{ij} = \frac{|H_{p_i} \cap H_{p_j}|}{|H_{p_i} \cup H_{p_j}|}, (\mathbf{S}_{\text{DI}})_{ij} = \frac{|I_{p_i} \cap I_{p_j}|}{|I_{p_i} \cup I_{p_j}|}. \quad (2)$$

The intuition of introducing domain-associated similarities is that if two domains (p_i, p_j) are (i) queried by a common set of hosts or (ii) resolved to a common set of IPs, they should have highly correlated semantic (e.g., with the same type of risks). Previous studies have revealed that hosts infected with the same malware family tend to query a similar set of malware domains [10]. Furthermore, if two malicious domains are resolved to the same IP, they are more likely to be associated with the same cyber criminals [11].

Similarly, for all the IPs $\{q_j\}$ in a time window, I define the host-based and domain-based similarity, which are described by a *host-based IP similarity matrix* $\mathbf{S}_{\text{IH}} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$ and a *domain-based IP similarity matrix* $\mathbf{S}_{\text{ID}} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$, respectively. For an arbitrary IP q_j , let H_{q_j} and D_{q_j} denote the (i) set of hosts with the DNS resolution result of q_j and (ii) set of domains resolved to q_j . The IP-associated similarities \mathbf{S}_{IH} and \mathbf{S}_{ID} are derived via the following one-mode projections:

$$(\mathbf{S}_{\text{IH}})_{ij} = \frac{|H_{q_i} \cap H_{q_j}|}{|H_{q_i} \cup H_{q_j}|}, (\mathbf{S}_{\text{ID}})_{ij} = \frac{|D_{q_i} \cap D_{q_j}|}{|D_{q_i} \cup D_{q_j}|}. \quad (3)$$

The primary intuition of introducing IP-associated similarities $\{\mathbf{S}_{\text{IH}}, \mathbf{S}_{\text{ID}}\}$ is similar to that of $\{\mathbf{S}_{\text{DH}}, \mathbf{S}_{\text{DI}}\}$. Particularly, if two IPs are the resolution result (i) of a common set of malicious domains or (ii) for a common set of infected edge hosts, they are more likely to be with poor reputation.

⁸<https://talosintelligence.com/>




Fig. 2. An overview of the proposed JDE model for MDD and IRE.

Finally, I combine the similarities $\{\mathbf{S}_{DH}, \mathbf{S}_{DI}, \mathbf{S}_{IH}, \mathbf{S}_{ID}\}$ and *passive DNS graph* \mathbf{P} to construct a *similarity-enhanced heterogeneous graph*, with the weighted topology described by the following adjacency matrix \mathbf{S} :

$$\mathbf{S} = \begin{bmatrix} (\mathbf{S}_{DH} + \mathbf{S}_{DI})/2 & \hat{\mathbf{B}} \\ \hat{\mathbf{B}}^T & (\mathbf{S}_{IH} + \mathbf{S}_{ID})/2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

where all the elements in \mathbf{S} are within the value range $[0, 1]$.

B. Basic Unsupervised Joint DNS Embedding

The K -order ($K \geq 1$) proximity of a node v_i is usually defined as the topological similarity between v_i and its K -hop neighbors $N_K(v_i)$ reached via K -step random walk (RW), which can be used to explore the latent community structures of a graph [12]–[17]. To explore both homogeneous and heterogeneous high-order proximities between domains and IPs, I apply the RW-based graph embedding to the heterogeneous weighted graph \mathbf{S} , where I follow [18] to adopt the matrix factorization (MF) objective of DeepWalk [19]. Let $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{S}$ be the adjacency matrix of the heterogeneous graph. The DeepWalk objective aims to factorize the following matrix \mathbf{M} :

$$\mathbf{M} = \log(w(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^k \mathbf{D}^{-1}) - \log b, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(\text{deg}(v_1), \dots, \text{deg}(v_{N+M}))$ is the degree diagonal matrix, with $\text{deg}(v_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{N+M} \mathbf{A}_{ij}$ as the degree of node v_i ; $w = \sum_{i=1}^{N+M} \text{deg}(v_i)$ is the graph volume; K and b are pre-set proximity order (i.e., maximum RW length) and number of negative samples.

In particular, the RW on heterogeneous graph \mathbf{S} can sample both (i) homogeneous sequences with the same type of entities and (ii) heterogeneous sequences with different types of entities, from which the homogeneous and heterogeneous high-order proximities between domains and IPs can be jointly explored. The low-dimensional embedding can then be optimized by fitting the RW transition probabilities to the sampled

sequences, which is equivalent to the following objective according to [18]:

$$\arg \min_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}} \text{O}_{\text{GE}}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = \|\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{X}\mathbf{Y}^T\|_F^2, \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+M) \times d}$ and $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+M) \times d}$ are low-dimensional matrices to be optimized. The singular value decomposition (SVD) can be used to get the optimal solution of (6), where $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T$ with $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \text{diag}(\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{N+M})$ as the diagonal matrix of singular values in descending order (i.e., $\theta_1 \geq \theta_2 \geq \dots \geq \theta_{N+M}$). To derive the d -dimensional heterogeneous embeddings, I use the top- d singular values to reconstruct \mathbf{M} . Hence, one can get the solution $\{\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{Y}^*\}$ via

$$\mathbf{X}^* = \mathbf{U}_{:,1:d} \sqrt{\mathbf{\Sigma}_{1:d}}, \mathbf{Y}^* = \mathbf{V}_{:,1:d} \sqrt{\mathbf{\Sigma}_{1:d}}. \quad (7)$$

Finally, I adopt \mathbf{X}^* as the derived heterogeneous embeddings, with $\mathbf{X}_{1:N,:}^*$ and $\mathbf{X}_{(N+1):(N+M),:}^*$ as the domain embeddings $\{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N\}$ and IP embeddings $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_M\}$.

Note that (6) only formulates a basic unsupervised version of JDE. The learned heterogeneous embeddings can be used as the input of several downstream classifiers to support MDD and IRE. I adopt two logistic regression (LR) classifiers (denoted as C_{MDD} and C_{IRE}) to derive the analysis results of MDD and IRE.

Let $R = \{r_{l_1}, \dots, r_{l_T}\}$ and $G = \{g_{l_1}, \dots, g_{l_T}\}$ be the classification result given by C_{MDD} (or C_{IRE}) and ground-truth from the domain (or IP) training set, respectively. The LR classifier can then be optimized by minimizing the following cross-entropy loss:

$$\text{O}_{\text{C}}(G, R) = - \sum_{i=l_1}^{l_T} (g_i \log(r_i) + (1 - g_i) \log(1 - r_i)). \quad (8)$$

C. Advanced Semi-Supervised Joint DNS Embedding

Note that the JDE objective (6) is unsupervised, but MDD and IRE are typical supervised classification tasks as defined in Section II. The supervised label information of training data can be fully utilized to further enhanced the learned

embeddings. I introduce a semi-supervised version of JDE based on (i) the graph regularization technique and (ii) an auxiliary end-to-end classifier.

1) **Graph Regularization:** First, I apply graph regularization to integrate complementary supervised information from training data. A constraint matrix $\mathbf{C} \in \{0, 1\}^{(N+M) \times (N+M)}$ is introduced to encode such supervised information, where I define the “must-link” and “cannot-link” constraints based on the following premises.

- The domains (or IPs) with the same label, i.e., malicious/benign domains (or poor/normal IPs), should have similar features with close embedding distances.
- The domains (or IPs) with different labels should have distinct features with relatively far embedding distances.

For a domain pair (p_i, p_j) in the training set, if (p_i, p_j) are both labeled as malicious (or benign) domains, I define the “must-link” constraint by setting $\mathbf{C}_{ij} = \mathbf{C}_{ji} = 1$. On the other hand, if (p_i, p_j) are with different labels, I define the “cannot-link” constraint by setting that $\mathbf{C}_{ij} = \mathbf{C}_{ji} = 0$. Similarly, for an IP pair (q_i, q_j) in the training set, I set $\mathbf{C}_{(N+i), (N+j)} = \mathbf{C}_{(N+j), (N+i)} = 1$ when (p_i, p_j) are with the same reputation level, and set $\mathbf{C}_{(N+i), (N+j)} = \mathbf{C}_{(N+j), (N+i)} = 0$ if they are with different reputation levels.

The “must-link” and “cannot-link” can be extended to regularize the embeddings of heterogeneous entities based on the following assumption.

- The malicious (or benign) domains are more likely to be resolved to the IPs with poor (or normal) reputation, so that they should have similar features.

For an arbitrary domain p_i and IP q_j in the training sets, if p_i is a benign (or malicious) domain and q_j is with normal (or poor) reputation, I introduce the “must-link” constraint by setting $\mathbf{C}_{i, (N+j)} = \mathbf{C}_{(N+j), i} = 1$. When p_i is a benign (or malicious) domain but q_j is with poor (or normal) reputation, I define the “cannot-link” constraint as $\mathbf{C}_{i, (N+j)} = \mathbf{C}_{(N+j), i} = 0$.

Finally, I set $\mathbf{C}_{i, \cdot} = \mathbf{C}_{\cdot, i} = 0.5$ (or $\mathbf{C}_{(i+N), \cdot} = \mathbf{C}_{\cdot, (i+N)} = 0.5$) for an arbitrary domain p_i (or IP q_j) in the test set whose label information is unavailable. The graph regularization term (based on \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{C}) can be formulated as follow:

$$O_R(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{C}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \mathbf{C}_{ij} \|\mathbf{X}_{i,:} - \mathbf{X}_{j,:}\|_2^2 = \text{tr}(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{L} \mathbf{X}), \quad (9)$$

where $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{D}_C - \mathbf{C}$ is the Laplacian matrix of \mathbf{C} , with $\mathbf{D}_C = \text{diag}(\sum_j \mathbf{C}_{1j}, \dots, \sum_j \mathbf{C}_{(N+M)j})$ as the degree diagonal matrix. Particularly, (9) can be considered as the penalty on embeddings \mathbf{X} given by \mathbf{C} . The “must-link” constraint regularizes $\mathbf{X}_{i,:}$ and $\mathbf{X}_{j,:}$ to be close in terms of l_2 -norm with the penalty $\mathbf{C}_{ij} = 1$, while the “cannot-link” constraint ensures $\mathbf{X}_{i,:}$ and $\mathbf{X}_{j,:}$ to be distinct with $\mathbf{C}_{ij} = 0$. $\mathbf{C}_{ij} = 0.5$ gives a moderate penalty between the “must-link” and “cannot-link” constraints on embeddings in the test set.

2) **Auxiliary Classifier:** In addition to graph regularization, I also develop an end-to-end auxiliary LR classifier, which is an another strategy to integrate the complementary supervised information. Let $\{\mathbf{x}_i\} = \{\mathbf{X}_{i,:} = \mathbf{u}_i\} \cup \{\mathbf{X}_{N+i,:} = \mathbf{v}_i\}$ to be the set of all the domain and IP embeddings. The auxiliary LR

classifier take each embedding \mathbf{x}_i as input and derives a corresponding classification result $r_i = \sigma(\mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{b})$, with $\{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{b}\}$ as the parameters to be optimized. Let $R = \{r_1, \dots, r_{N+M}\}$ and $G = \{g_1, \dots, g_{N+M}\}$ be the classification result and ground-truth w.r.t. DNS entities $\{p_1, \dots, p_N, q_1, \dots, q_M\}$. The cross-entropy between G and R can be used as the loss function:

$$O_{AC}(G, R) = -\sum_i m_i (g_i \log r_i + (1 - g_i) \log(1 - r_i)), \quad (10)$$

In (10), a mask variable m_i is introduced to distinguish entities in the training set from those in the test set, where I set $m_i = 1$ if entity v_i is in the training set and $m_i = 0$, otherwise. In this setting, only the embeddings in the training set can result in loss to the optimization algorithm.

3) **Semi-Supervised JDE Objective:** One can construct the semi-supervised loss function of JDE by combining objectives of unsupervised graph embedding (5), graph regularization (9), and auxiliary classifier (10):

$$\arg \min_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}} O(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = (O_{GE} + \alpha O_{AC} + \beta O_R), \quad (11)$$

where α and β are parameters to adjust the contributions of auxiliary classifier and graph regularization. To obtain the solution of (11), I first initialize parameters $\{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{b}\}$ via the Xavier approach [20] and then apply gradient descent to iteratively update their values until convergence.

For the solution of (11) (notated as $\{\mathbf{X}'^*, \mathbf{Y}'^*\}$), I use \mathbf{X}'^* as the final semi-supervised embeddings. The classification results of MDD and IRE can be directly derived via the end-to-end classifier integrated in JDE without introducing additional downstream classifiers.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, I first quantitatively evaluate the MDD and IRE performance for JDE, and then qualitatively analyze the semantics of the heterogeneous embeddings learned by JDE.

A. Performance Evaluation

1) **Baseline Methods:** I compared JDE with four state-of-the-art embedding-based methods, which are *DNS2Vec* [6], *CBOW* [5], *SKIP* [5], and *MalShoot* [4]. In particular, *DNS2Vec*, *CBOW*, and *SKIP* use the popular embedding techniques in NLP to derive the domain embeddings, where the query sequence of each end host is considered as a document, with each domain in the sequence treated as a word. *DNS2Vec* adopts the word co-occurrence probability to extract domain embeddings, while *CBOW* and *SKIP* learn embeddings by applying two variants of word2vec [21] (i.e., continuous bag-of-words (CBOW) and Skip-gram) to DNS logs. In contrast, *MalShoot* formulates DNS query behaviors as a bipartite graph and applies a classic graph embedding method (i.e., LINE [22]) to learn domain embeddings for MDD.

In addition to the aforementioned approaches, I also introduced another two baselines (denoted as *P-DW* and *D/I-DW*) to validate the superiority of JDE regarding the (i) similarity-enhanced graph and (ii) heterogeneous graph embeddings. Concretely, *P-DW* applies the MF-based DeepWalk

objective (6) to the *passive DNS graph* (1) (i.e., by letting $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}$) to simultaneously learn domain and IP embeddings. By comparing *P-DW* with JDE, one can verify whether the heterogeneous similarities $\{\mathbf{S}_{DH}, \mathbf{S}_{DI}, \mathbf{S}_{IH}, \mathbf{S}_{ID}\}$ can enhance the learned embeddings. Moreover, *D-DW* and *I-DW* apply the MF-based DeepWalk (6) to the *domain-associated similarity graph* $(\mathbf{S}_{DH} + \mathbf{S}_{DI})/2$ and *IP-associated similarity graph* $(\mathbf{S}_{IH} + \mathbf{S}_{ID})/2$ to learn domain and IP embeddings, respectively. They are used to validate whether the joint optimization of domain and IP embeddings in JDE can result in better performance for the downstream applications than that only considering one type of entities.

For the proposed JDE method, I evaluated the performances of both unsupervised and semi-supervised versions, which are notated as JDE(U) and JDE(S), respectively.

2) **Experiment Settings:** For the evaluation of MDD, I uniformly set the embedding dimension $d = 128$ for all the methods, except for *DNS2Vec* whose dimensional is defined to be the number of domains N according to [6].

Note that *DNS2Vec*, *CBOW*, and *SKIP* can only derive the domain embeddings, since they were originally designed for domain analysis tasks (e.g., MMD). As demonstrated in [6], the learned domain embeddings can still be applied to other tasks not directly associated with domains (e.g., host classification and IRE). For *DNS2Vec*, *CBOW*, and *SKIP*, I further derived the corresponding IP embeddings by concatenating the associated domain embeddings for each IP q_j . Since the average numbers of domains resolved to an IP for *W19*, *D19* and *D18* are 3.93, 3.27 and 4.11, I selected the five most popular domains with the highest number of queries (i.e., popularity) for each IP to concatenate the domain embeddings from left to right according to their popularities. If there are less than five domains resolved to an IP, I padded the rest dimensions with zeros. In this case, the dimensionality of the IP embeddings of *CBOW* and *SKIP* is $5d$, while the dimensionality of *DNS2Vec* is $5N$ according to its definition. In contrast, *MalShoot*, *P-DW*, JDE(U), and JDE(S) can simultaneously derive domain and IP embeddings.

For each method except for JDE(S), I used their learned domain (or IP) embeddings to train a downstream LR classifier for MDD (or IRE). Furthermore, I directly used the classification results given by the end-to-end auxiliary LR classifier integrated in JDE(S) as the final results for MDD and IRE.

I adopted the experiment settings close to real applications with the following two steps. First, I sorted the domains (or IPs) according to the time they first appeared in the dataset. Then, I utilized the first 90% of domains (or IPs) to train the classifier with the remaining domains (or IPs) as the test set for MDD (or IRE).

To fully explore the potential of all the methods, I adjusted their hyper-parameters to report the best performance metrics. Especially for JDE(U), I varied its high-order proximity K in an integer value range (e.g., $[1, 10]$). For JDE(S), I used the same setting of K with JDE(U) and fine-tuned $\{\alpha, \beta\}$.

3) **Evaluation Results:** For both MDD and IRE, I adopted the ROC curve [23] and its corresponding Area under the ROC

TABLE II
EVALUATION RESULTS OF MDD AND IRE IN TERMS OF AUC

	MDD			IRE		
	W19	D19	D18	W19	D19	D18
<i>DNS2Vec</i>	0.6316	0.6425	0.6920	0.7738	<u>0.6874</u>	0.7155
<i>CBOW</i>	0.6746	0.6158	0.6285	0.7818	0.5888	0.6938
<i>SKIP</i>	0.6737	0.6565	0.6438	0.7365	0.6135	0.7317
<i>MalShoot</i>	0.6429	0.6980	0.6374	0.6701	0.6548	0.7169
<i>D/I-DW</i>	0.7936	0.7205	0.7274	0.8182	0.6624	0.7670
<i>P-DW</i>	0.7264	0.7081	0.6716	0.8005	0.6655	0.7324
JDE(U)	<u>0.8120</u>	<u>0.7317</u>	<u>0.7594</u>	<u>0.8216</u>	0.6714	<u>0.7738</u>
JDE(S)	0.8502	0.7710	0.7945	0.8701	0.7300	0.7842




Fig. 3. Evaluation results of (i) MDD on (a) *W19*, (b) *D19* and (c) *D18*, as well as (ii) IRE on (d) *W19*, (e) *D19* and (f) *D18* in terms of ROC curve.

(AUC) value [23] as quality metrics. The ROC curves of MDD and IRE are illustrated in Fig. 3, with their AUC values shown in Table II, where the best and second-best metric are in **bold** and underlined. According to Fig. 3 and Table II, one can reach the following conclusions.

First, both JDE(U) and JDE(S) outperform *D-DW* and *I-DW* for MDD and IRE on all the datasets, indicating that the joint optimization of domain and IP embeddings can result in better performance than only considering one source.

Second, JDE(U) and JDE(S) outperform *P-DW* and *Mal-*




Fig. 4. Parameter and convergence analysis of JDE on *W19*.

Shoot for both the applications on all the datasets. It validates the effectiveness of the high-order homogeneous and heterogeneous proximities between domains and IPs in improving the performance of MDD and IRE.

Third, JDE(S) significantly outperforms JDE(U) for both MDD and IRE, which implies that the supervised label information can further enhance the learned embeddings.

Fourth, JDE performs the best in all the cases, with the average improvement of 7.8% and 4.94% for MDD and IRE compared with the second-best baselines. Hence, the joint optimization of heterogeneous embeddings with the integration of high-order proximities can potentially lead to better performance than only optimizing one entity embedding with the observable low-order proximities.

4) **Parameter Analysis:** I adjusted the hyper-parameters of JDE on all the datasets. For JDE(U), I varied the proximity order $L \in \{1, 2, \dots, 10\}$. As an example, I present the AUCs of JED(U) w.r.t. different settings of L on *W19* in Fig. 4 (a). According to Fig. 4 (a), both the results of MDD and IRE have similar variation tendencies. With the increase of L , there are obvious performance drops for both MDD and IRE when $L < 4$, while their performances significantly increase when $L = 4$ and keep stable when $L > 4$. In summary, I recommend fine-tuning $L \in \{4, \dots, 10\}$.

By using the same setting of L with JED(U), I further determined that the proper ranges of $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ for JDE(S) are $\alpha \in \{1, 10, 20, \dots, 100\}$ and $\beta \in \{0.1, 0.2, \dots, 1.0\}$. The recommended settings of (L, α, β) for *W19*, *D19*, and *D18* are $(5, 60, 1)$, $(4, 100, 1)$ and $(4, 10, 0.1)$. Moreover, I also analyzed the effect of learning rate η and number of iterations n of gradient descent, where I set $(\eta, n) = (0.5, 100)$ for all the datasets.

In addition, I also tested the convergence of the optimization of JDE(S) on *W19*. Fig. 4 (b) and (c) illustrate the convergence curves of (i) loss function (11) and (ii) AUCs for MDD and IRE in the first 20 iterations. In Fig. 4, the loss function significantly increase in the first 3 iterations and converges fast in rest iterations. The AUCs of both applications constantly increase, which validates the effectiveness of gradient descent.

B. Case Studies

In addition to the quantitative evaluation, I also qualitatively analyzed some key properties encoded in the domain and IP embeddings for both JDE(U) and JDE(S).

1) **Embedding Visualization:** I compared the embedding quality of JDE(U) and JDE(S) with *DNS2Vec*, *CBOW*, *SKIP*, and *MalShoot*. For the convenience of visualization, I randomly sampled 50% domains and IPs in *W19*. Since *MalShoot*, JDE(U), and JDE(S) can simultaneously learn domain and IP embeddings, I used *t-SNE* [24] to map their heterogeneous embeddings w.r.t. the sampled domains and IPs into a 2D space. Because *DNS2Vec*, *CBOW*, and *SKIP* can only learn domain embeddings, I separately visualized their domain embeddings and concatenated IP embeddings via *t-SNE*. The visualization results are shown in Fig. 5, where one can have the following observations.

First, compared with *DNS2Vec*, *CBOW*, and *SKIP*, both JDE(U) and JDE(S) can simultaneously learn domain and IP embeddings in a common latent space, where the key properties (e.g., topological similarities) between heterogeneous entities can be preserved in terms of relative distances. For instance, malicious domains are expected to have close embedding distances to their resolved IPs with poor reputation.

Second, although *MalShoot* can also simultaneously learn domain and IP embeddings, JDE(U) and JDE(S) can capture more distinct group structures, in which entities with similar properties tend to form a small group distinguishable from others. Hence, JDE with high-order proximities can better capture the hidden properties of DNS query than those with the observable low-order proximities (e.g., *MalShoot*).

Third, compared with JDE(U), JDE(S) can distinguish malicious domains (or poor IPs) from benign domains (or normal IPs) more clearly, where most malicious domains and poor IPs are mapped into the bottom-right corner of Fig. 5 (i). It further validates the effectiveness of integrating the label information.

2) **Semantic Analysis:** I also analyzed the fine-grained semantics learned by JDE(U) and JDE(S). For each domain p_i (or IP q_j), I first calculated its Euclidean distances to all the other entities based on their embeddings. Then, I ranked the distances in an ascending order to select the top-5 entities with closest distances. Some examples of JDE(U) and JDE(S) are presented in Table III, which present strongly related semantics with clear topics (e.g., pornography).

For instance, all the domains in the first example of JDE(U) are about IoT, just as “iotcloud” indicates. The keywords “samsung”, “roaming”, and “positioning” further enhance the topic related to Samsung IoT applications. “aibixby” refers to AI Bixby, which is an embedded AI application of Samsung

TABLE III
EXAMPLES OF SEMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS LEARNED BY JDE(U) AND JDE(S)

	Entities	Top-5 Cloest Entities (Entity, Distance)					Topics
JDE(U)	samsung.com.cn	aibixby.com.cn, 0.9449	reyun.com, 1.3179	samsungroaming.com, 1.388	samsungiotcloud.cn, 1.3987	samsungpositioning.com.cn, 1.4055	IoT
	asian-teen-sex.com	18asiantube.com, 0.5888	asianpornvideo.xxx, 0.7566	freshgayporno.com, 2.7549	smutboytube.com, 2.7549	xxxgaymovs.com, 2.8032	Pornograph
	76886.com	tkp2.me, 2.1673	jx82qp.com, 2.4574	zhangduqy.cn, 2.5723	twst7.com, 2.8929	c966aj.com, 2.9150	Gambling
	apple-cloudkit.com	17.248.158.0/24, 0.5398	17.248.159.0/24, 0.5632	17.248.160.0/24, 0.5855	icloud.com.cn, 1.0370	17.248.161.0/24, 2.0199	Cloud Service
JDE(S)	springermaterials.com	cashl.edu.cn, 0.0001	socolar.com, 0.0001	informaworld.com, 0.0047	isihighlycited.com, 0.0047	zentralblatt-math.org, 0.0382	Academic
	asian-teen-sex.com	asianpornvideo.xxx, 0.7258	18asiantube.com, 0.7691	freshgayporno.com, 1.3573	smutboytube.com, 1.3573	xxxgaymovs.com, 1.3689	Pornograph
	993dy.com	bilibilijj.com, 0.6569	4btbt.com, 0.7604	ed2000.com, 0.8081	meijutt.com, 0.8311	thznn.com, 1.0111	Illegal Download
	cloudflaressl.com	104.16.224.0/20, 0.1372	104.31.80.0/20, 0.1428	104.25.0.0/20, 0.1555	104.27.160.0/20, 0.1760	104.18.80.0/20, 0.1936	Cloud Service

smartphone, while “reyun.com” is the domain of a data analysis platform for various mobile applications.

In addition, both the last examples of JDE(U) and JDE(S) illustrate the semantics across heterogeneous entities about cloud service. For JDE(U), “apple”, “cloud”, and “icloud” indicate the topic regarding Apple cloud service, while all the BGP prefixes are with the same network owner Apple according to Cisco Talos⁸. For JDE(S), “cloudflaressl.com” is the domain of the cloud service provider CloudFlare, and all the BGP prefixes have the same network owner CloudFlare according to Cisco Talos⁸.

For all the examples in Table III, the average distance JDE(S) w.r.t. the top-5 entities is much less than that of JDE(U), implying that the integrated label information can further enhance the semantic relationships between embeddings.

V. RELATED WORK

In the past few decades, various MDD methods have been proposed. Some comprehensive overviews can be found in [9], [25]–[27]. Conventional MDD approaches are mostly based on the labor-intensive feature engineering, which lacks enough robustness. These methods rely on the domain knowledge from security experts to extract the relevant statistic features (e.g., TTL and string length). A binary classifier (e.g., decision tree) is then trained on a set of labeled data in terms of the extracted features to distinguish the malicious domains from benign ones. Antonakakis et al. [2] developed the *Notos* system. They identified a range of network-based, zone-based, and evidence-based features to build a domain reputation engine, which evaluates the propensity not to be a malicious domain for each domain input. Bilge et al. [3] proposed *Exposure* that extracts four sets of features from the passive DNS log (i.e., time-based, DNS answer-based, TTL-based, and domain-lexical features) to train a decision tree.

The popularity of word embedding in NLP and graph embedding in network analysis gives a new inspiration for several state-of-the-art methods. These approaches aim to automatically learn domain features from passive DNS traffic with strong robustness and high performance beyond feature-

engineering techniques. Le et al. [6] and López et al. applied the word co-occurrence features and word2vec [21] in NLP to passive DNS logs, where the domain query sequence of each end host was treated as a document with each unique domain as a unique word. Peng et al. [4] modeled DNS query behaviors as a bipartite graph and applied LINE [22] to learn the domain embeddings.

Conventional IRE techniques are usually treated as auxiliary procedures to support several downstream security tasks (e.g., spam detection) based on pre-defined blacklists. Esquivel et al. [28] developed a spam filtering method by building custom IP reputation lists. Sinha et al. [29] analyzed the effectiveness of several well-known reputation-based blacklists and found that a great amount of potential security risks cannot be captured by existing static reputation lists due to the high dynamics of network traffic. Some state-of-the-art IRE approaches have tried to evaluate the IP reputation in a dynamic real-time manner, but they are still based on conventional feature engineering techniques. For instance, Bartoš et al. [30] measured the reputation of an IP by extracting a set of pre-defined features (e.g., the country and autonomous system it belongs to and NAT).

To the best of my knowledge, using embedding techniques for IRE is still a novel idea. Although Peng et al. [4] introduced the *MalShoot*, which can learn both domain and IP embeddings, they only utilized domain embeddings to support MDD without considering IP embeddings for IRE. The intrinsic correlations between MDD and IRE are also not fully explored by existing DNS security methods. In contrast, this study tries to utilize heterogeneous graph embedding to simultaneously handle more than one DNS security analysis tasks.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, I proposed a novel JDE method to (i) automatically learn the domain and IP embeddings by jointly exploring the homogeneous and heterogeneous high-order proximities between two types of DNS entities, and (ii) simultaneously support MDD and IRE. Extensive experiments on real DNS datasets demonstrated that the heterogeneous




Fig. 5. Visualization of the (i) domain embeddings of (a) *DNS2Vec*, (b) *CBOW*, and (c) *SKIP*, (ii) concatenated IP embeddings of (d) *DNS2Vec*, (e) *CBOW*, and (f) *SKIP*, as well as (iii) heterogeneous embeddings of (g) *MalShoot*, (h) *JDE(U)*, and (i) *JDE(S)* on the sampled *W19*.

embeddings learned by JDE can not only better support multi-task downstream applications but also preserve fine-grained semantics of DNS query behaviors. To the best of my knowledge, this paper is the first effort to utilize high-order heterogeneous graph embedding for multi-task DNS security analysis, where the joint optimization of multiple tasks can potentially result in better performance for all the tasks than respectively optimizing each single one.

In my future work, I intend to consider the joint optimization of other DNS entities and their associated applications (e.g., device type classification of end hosts). Moreover, to further explore the dynamic natures of DNS query behaviors via existing embedding techniques for dynamic graphs [31]–[34] is also my next research focus.

REFERENCES

- [1] I. Mishsky, N. Gal-Oz, and E. Gudes, “A topology based flow model for computing domain reputation,” in *Proceedings of the 2015 IFIP Annual Conference on Data and Applications Security and Privacy (DBSec)*, 2015.
- [2] M. Antonakakis, R. Perdisci, D. Dagon, W. Lee, and N. Feamster, “Building a dynamic reputation system for dns,” in *Proceedings of the 2010 USENIX Security Symposium*, 2010.
- [3] L. Bilge, S. Sen, D. Balzarotti, E. Kirida, and C. Kruegel, “Exposure: A passive dns analysis service to detect and report malicious domains,” *ACM Transactions on Information and System Security (TISSEC)*, vol. 16, no. 4, p. 14, 2014.
- [4] C. Peng, X. Yun, Y. Zhang, and S. Li, “Malshoot: Shooting malicious domains through graph embedding on passive dns data,” in *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Collaborative Computing: Networking, Applications and Worksharing (CollaborateCom)*, 2018.
- [5] W. López, J. Merlino, and P. Rodriguez-Bocca, “Vector representation of internet domain names using a word embedding technique,” in *Proceedings of the 43rd IEEE Latin American Computer Conference (CLEI)*, 2017.
- [6] F. Le, M. Srivatsa, and D. Verma, “Unearthing and exploiting latent semantics behind dns domains for deep network traffic analysis,” in *Proceedings of 2019 IJCAI Workshop on AI for Internet of Things (AI4IoT)*, 2019.
- [7] Y. Zhang and Q. Yang, “A survey on multi-task learning,” *arXiv preprint:1707.08114*, 2017.
- [8] H. Le, Q. Pham, D. Sahoo, and S. C. Hoi, “Urlnet: learning a url representation with deep learning for malicious url detection,” *arXiv preprint:1802.03162*, 2018.
- [9] Y. Zhauniarovich, I. Khalil, T. Yu, and M. Dacier, “A survey on malicious domains detection through dns data analysis,” *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 51, no. 4, p. 67, 2018.
- [10] B. Rahbarinia, R. Perdisci, and M. Antonakakis, “Efficient and accurate behavior-based tracking of malware-control domains in large isp networks,” *ACM Transactions on Privacy and Security (TOPS)*, vol. 19, no. 2, p. 4, 2016.
- [11] I. Khalil, T. Yu, and B. Guan, “Discovering malicious domains through passive dns data graph analysis,” in *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security (ASIACCS)*, 2016.
- [12] M. Qin, D. Jin, K. Lei, B. Gabrys, and K. Musial-Gabrys, “Adaptive community detection incorporating topology and content in social networks,” *Knowledge-Based Systems*, vol. 161, pp. 342–356, 2018.
- [13] M. Qin, K. Lei, B. Bai, and G. Zhang, “Towards a profiling view for unsupervised traffic classification by exploring the statistic features and link patterns,” in *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGCOMM Workshop on Network Meets AI & ML*, 2019, pp. 50–56.
- [14] W. Li, M. Qin, and K. Lei, “Identifying interpretable link communities with user interactions and messages in social networks,” in *Proceedings of the 2019 IEEE International Conference on Parallel & Distributed Processing with Applications, Big Data & Cloud Computing, Sustainable Computing & Communications, Social Computing & Networking (ISPA/BDCloud/SocialCom/SustainCom)*, 2019, pp. 271–278.

- [15] M. Qin and K. Lei, "Dual-channel hybrid community detection in attributed networks," *Information Sciences*, vol. 551, pp. 146–167, 2021.
- [16] M. Qin, C. Zhang, B. Bai, G. Zhang, and D.-Y. Yeung, "Towards a better trade-off between quality and efficiency of community detection: An inductive embedding method across graphs," *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, vol. 17, no. 9, pp. 127:1–127:34, 2023.
- [17] Y. Gao, M. Qin, Y. Ding, L. Zeng, C. Zhang, W. Zhang, W. Han, R. Zhao, and B. Bai, "Raftgp: Random fast graph partitioning," in *2023 IEEE High Performance Extreme Computing Conference (HPEC)*, 2023, pp. 1–7.
- [18] J. Qiu, Y. Dong, H. Ma, J. Li, K. Wang, and J. Tang, "Network embedding as matrix factorization: Unifying deepwalk, line, pte, and node2vec," in *Proceedings of the 11th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining (WSDM)*, 2018.
- [19] B. Perozzi, R. Al-Rfou, and S. Skiena, "Deepwalk: Online learning of social representations," in *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (SIGKDD)*, 2014.
- [20] X. Glorot and Y. Bengio, "Understanding the difficulty of training deep feedforward neural networks," in *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, 2010.
- [21] T. Mikolov, K. Chen, G. Corrado, and J. Dean, "Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space," *arXiv preprint:1301.3781*, 2013.
- [22] J. Tang, M. Qu, M. Wang, M. Zhang, J. Yan, and Q. Mei, "Line: Large-scale information network embedding," in *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW)*, 2015.
- [23] T. Fawcett, "An introduction to roc analysis," *Pattern Recognition Letters*, vol. 27, no. 8, pp. 861–874, 2006.
- [24] L. v. d. Maaten and G. Hinton, "Visualizing data using t-sne," *Journal of Machine Learning Research (JMLR)*, vol. 9, no. 11, pp. 2579–2605, 2008.
- [25] F. Zou, S. Zhang, B. Pei, L. Pan, L. Li, and J. Li, "Survey on domain name system security," in *Proceedings of the 1st IEEE International Conference on Data Science in Cyberspace (DSC)*, 2016, pp. 602–607.
- [26] D. S. Berman, A. L. Buczak, J. S. Chavis, and C. L. Corbett, "A survey of deep learning methods for cyber security," *Information*, vol. 10, no. 4, p. 122, 2019.
- [27] A. Khormali, J. Park, H. Alasmay, A. Anwar, and D. Mohaisen, "Domain name system security and privacy: A contemporary survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.15277*, 2020.
- [28] H. Esquivel, A. Akella, and T. Mori, "On the effectiveness of ip reputation for spam filtering," in *Proceedings of the 2nd IEEE International Conference on Communication Systems and Networks (COMSNETS)*, 2010.
- [29] S. Sinha, M. Bailey, and F. Jahanian, "Shades of grey: On the effectiveness of reputation-based "blacklists"," in *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Malicious and Unwanted Software (MALWARE)*, 2008.
- [30] V. Bartoš and J. Kořenek, "Evaluating reputation of internet entities," in *Proceedings of the 2016 IFIP International Conference on Autonomous Infrastructure, Management and Security (AIMS)*, 2016.
- [31] K. Lei, M. Qin, B. Bai, and G. Zhang, "Adaptive multiple non-negative matrix factorization for temporal link prediction in dynamic networks," in *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGCOMM Workshop on Network Meets AI & ML*, 2018, pp. 28–34.
- [32] K. Lei, M. Qin, B. Bai, G. Zhang, and M. Yang, "Gcn-gan: A non-linear temporal link prediction model for weighted dynamic networks," in *Proceedings of the 2019 IEEE Conference on Computer Communications (INFOCOM)*, 2019, pp. 388–396.
- [33] M. Qin and D.-Y. Yeung, "Temporal link prediction: A unified framework, taxonomy, and review," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 1–40, 2023.
- [34] M. Qin, C. Zhang, B. Bai, G. Zhang, and D.-Y. Yeung, "High-quality temporal link prediction for weighted dynamic graphs via inductive embedding aggregation," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge & Data Engineering (TKDE)*, vol. 35, no. 9, pp. 9378–9393, 2023.