

A Survey on Consumer IoT Traffic: Security and Privacy

Yan Jia, Yuxin Song, Zihou Liu, Qingyin Tan, Yang Song, Yu Zhang, Zheli Liu

Abstract—Although CIoT has improved the convenience of daily activities, it also introduces new security and privacy concerns. Network traffic analysis, a common technique employed by the security community, has been extensively utilized to investigate security and privacy concerns, and it has also been applied to CIoT. However, compared to network traffic analysis in other fields such as mobile apps and websites, CIoT presents special new characteristics, which may introduce new challenges and research opportunities. In this study, we reviewed 310 publications on traffic analysis within the CIoT security and privacy domain, covering the period from January 2018 to December 2023. Initially, we summarized the CIoT traffic analysis process, highlighting the newly identified characteristics of CIoT. Subsequently, we classified existing research according to its application objectives: device fingerprinting, user activity inference, malicious traffic detection, and measurement. Lastly, we explore emerging challenges and potential future research avenues.

Index Terms—Consumer IoT, Traffic Analysis, Security, Privacy, Survey.

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, numerous sectors related to the Internet of Things (IoT) have become part of everyday life, such as smart cities, industrial automation, smart homes, and smart healthcare [1, 2, 3, 4]. A report by IoT Analytics [5] predicts that the global IoT market will grow by 21% in 2024, reaching \$287 billion.

The Consumer Internet of Things (CIoT), a notable segment within the IoT field, involves the integration of IoT technology into consumer electronics and gadgets. Unlike Industrial IoT (IIoT) and Medical IoT (MIoT), CIoT connects with a wider audience through the extensive adoption of smart home gadgets and often collects a large amount of personal information, such as location, health status, and daily routines. However, the short production cycles and limited capabilities of CIoT devices hinder effective defense against security risks [6]. Researchers have explored CIoT security risks and

identified many vulnerabilities [7, 8, 9]. Concurrently, previous studies have examined user privacy preferences [10] and concerns [11, 12].

Network traffic analysis is an essential tool for security and privacy research. By analyzing network traffic, researchers can gain insights into user behaviors, identify network malfunctions, and uncover potential vulnerabilities. This approach is widely used for network security purposes, including real-time monitoring of malicious traffic [13] and malware detection [14, 15]. Furthermore, advanced data analysis and machine learning techniques in traffic analysis can construct website fingerprints [16, 17, 18], which help identify phishing websites. Although numerous researchers have concentrated on investigating CIoT traffic to enhance its security and privacy, CIoT, being a relatively new application compared to the traditional ones mentioned above, has special characteristics and may present new challenges.

This paper systematically surveys five years of literature on CIoT traffic analysis from security and privacy perspectives. We summarize their application goals and specifically target the following research questions:

- **RQ1:** Are there any unique characteristics of CIoT traffic analysis different from general network traffic?
- **RQ2:** Looking at the traffic, what can we learn about CIoT systems from security and privacy perspectives at present?
- **RQ3:** What new issues or challenges remain unresolved for security researchers in the field of CIoT traffic analysis?

We reviewed 310 papers from top-tier conferences and journals, using the literature retrieval method described in Section IV. According to these papers, we first summarize the general framework of CIoT traffic analysis and identify its unique characteristics (**RQ1**). Next, We categorize existing research based on their application goals: device fingerprinting, user activity inference, malicious traffic analysis, and measurement, and examine the latest advancements in each domain (**RQ2**). Finally, we outline the challenges and suggest directions for future research (**RQ3**). The contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- This is the first survey that focuses on CIoT traffic from security and privacy perspectives. We systematically reviewed 310 papers published between January 2018 and December 2023, classifying them by application goals and detailing their pros and cons. The complete list of papers is available online.¹

¹<https://github.com/Rasin-Song/CIoT-traffic-survey>

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (62102198), the National Key R&D Program of China (2022YFB3103202), and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (079-63243152). (Corresponding author: Yu Zhang).

Yan Jia, Yuxin Song, Qingyin Tan, Yu Zhang and Zheli Liu are with the Key laboratory of Data and Intelligent System Security, Ministry of Education, China (DISec), Tianjin Key Laboratory of Network and Data Security Technology (NDST), College of Cyber Science, Nankai University, Tianjin 300350, China. (e-mail: jia@nankai.edu.cn, songyx@mail.nankai.edu.cn, tanqy@mail.nankai.edu.cn, zhangyu1981@nankai.edu.cn, liuzheli@nankai.edu.cn).

Zihou Liu is with the DISec, NDST, College of Computer Science, Nankai University, Tianjin 300350, China. (e-mail: tonyliu9@mail.nankai.edu.cn).

Yang Song, School of Computer Science and Technology, Hangzhou Dianzi University, Hangzhou 310018, China. (e-mail: songy@hdu.edu.cn)




Fig. 1: The organization of paper.

- We summarized the CIoT traffic analysis process and highlighted its unique characteristics compared to general traffic analysis.
- We provide new insights into the challenges of CIoT traffic analysis relative to general network traffic and suggest promising directions for future research.

Paper Organization. The paper is organized as follows: Section II covers the basics of CIoT and traffic analysis. Section III reviews relevant surveys. In Section IV, we introduce the methodology for collecting the literature. Section V presents the CIoT traffic analysis process and its unique characteristics. Section VI discusses current works categorized by application goals. The challenges and future research directions are discussed in Section VII. The organization of our survey is shown in Figure 1.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Consumer Internet of Things

Consumer IoT (CIoT) refers to network-connected devices used personally by consumers. CIoT devices are typically controlled and monitored via mobile apps or software interfaces, enabling users to manage connected devices remotely or locally. Smart homes and smart wearables are typical examples. Users can remotely control smart devices such as lights and thermostats in a home through companion apps. Wearable devices like smartwatches and fitness trackers can monitor users' health data in real-time and provide corresponding feedback and suggestions. Given the highly sensitive nature of the data collected by these devices, ensuring security and privacy for CIoT systems is essential to protect users' personal information.

Representative CIoT scenarios are shown in Figure 2. There are three main components: device, cloud, and user. Users control devices locally or remotely via mobile Apps. Wi-Fi-enabled devices can communicate with remote users through cloud services. Devices using low-power protocols typically connect to a smart gateway, which acts as an intermediary to the Internet. Furthermore, third-party platforms can be authorized to use device control APIs. In this paper, we summarize the following five control methods: 1) *Physical Control*. Users can physically interact with devices. 2) *Multimodal Interaction*. CIoT devices, equipped with various sensors, support multimodal interactions. For example, motion sensors detect activity to control smart lights, and smart speakers like Amazon Alexa and Xiaomi XiaoAi support voice commands. 3) *Local Area Network (LAN) Control*. When the device and smartphone are on the same network, they communicate via Bluetooth or Wi-Fi for basic functions, firmware updates, and settings. 4) *Wide Area Network (WAN) Control*. When the smartphone and device are not on the same LAN, commands and status updates are relayed through the cloud. 5) *Cloud API Control*. Besides companion apps, some platforms offer cloud APIs for third-party access via authorization, enabling automation control like IFTTT².

According to previous works [19], workflow of CIoT devices typically follows four *lifecycle phases*: setup, interaction, idle and deletion. Initially, the user setups the device, including configuring the network and account binding before using it. After setup, the user interacts with the device during the interaction phase. When there is no interaction, the device

²If This Then That, a service that lets users create simple conditional statements, called "applets," to automate tasks across different web services and devices.

enters an idle state. Finally, a user can remove the device from the account, marking the deletion phase.




Fig. 2: The architecture of CIoT.

In summary, the CIoT ecosystem supports diverse control methods and features a lifecycle distinct from PC and mobile apps. These characteristics potentially affect the analysis of CIoT traffic.

B. Traffic Analysis

Traffic analysis is an important tool for network security and privacy, which extracts valuable insights from network data [20]. Its process includes four steps: traffic collection, traffic representation, analysis, and evaluation.

Traffic Collection. The traffic collected by tools such as Wireshark can be divided into different analysis units to extract features. A typical analysis unit is flow, defined as all packets sharing the same five tuples: source IP, destination IP, source port, destination port, and application protocol [21]. In addition, there are sessions, hosts, etc.

Traffic Representation. Secondly, features are extracted from the analysis unit and represented in a format suitable for the subsequently analysis. In the beginning, the focus was primarily on packet-level features. By examining the values in packet headers, researchers could gather extensive information. Deep Packet Inspection (DPI) enhances this by also analyzing the payloads of packets. However, the rapid increase in traffic volume and the rise in packet encryption necessitate the development of flow-level features. Flow analysis redirects attention from individual packets to the interactions between the source and destination. NetFlow [22] and sFlow [23] are popular tools for flow-level analysis. Statistical analysis methods were integrated into traffic analysis to combine features from multiple streams [24]. The mean and median are combined with packet or flow-level features to generate statistical features. Advancements in deep learning have made it possible to convert raw packets into images or sequences that can then be processed by deep learning models, eliminating manual feature extraction.

Analysis. Next, we explore the diverse algorithms used in traffic analysis, categorized into *machine learning (ML)* and *non-machine learning (non-ML)* approaches. ML algorithms are further divided into *traditional machine learning (TML)*, *deep learning (DL)*, and *reinforcement learning (RL)*. TML

includes algorithms that learn patterns and make predictions or decisions based on data [25, 26]. Feature selection in TML algorithms is crucial yet challenging. In contrast, DL models excel at automatically learning hierarchical features from data through various abstraction layers [27]. RL is a unique subset of ML that equips agents to observe the environment, select actions, and adjust behavior based on rewards or punishments [28], leading to optimal decision-making strategies. Despite their advantages, AI algorithms sometimes cannot explain false positives or negatives and are limited by data size [29]. To address these challenges, researchers have explored non-ML algorithms as alternatives, including model-based methods [29, 30], locality-sensitive hashing (LSH) [31, 32], and other techniques.

Evaluation. Finally, studies evaluate the performance of algorithms using various metrics. In Section V, we will summarize the CIoT traffic analysis process and explain the framework in detail, considering the unique characteristics of CIoT devices.

III. RELATED SURVEYS

Earlier studies have investigated IoT security and privacy, overall traffic analysis, and even IoT device fingerprinting, which overlaps with Section VI-A. In contrast, our paper offers the first exhaustive review of traffic analysis focusing on CIoT security and privacy aspects. Considering the sensitive role of CIoT in daily life, this survey seeks to identify the information contained in CIoT traffic and the challenges encountered in its analysis. Table I highlights the distinctions between our work and the existing literature.

A. IoT Privacy and Security

As IoT devices become increasingly prevalent, safeguarding user privacy has emerged as a key issue. Several researchers have explored various aspects of IoT privacy protection. Seliem et al. [33] reviewed existing research and solutions to privacy issues. Gupta and Ghanavati [34] conducted a systematic literature review on IoT privacy practices and technologies, providing a comprehensive summary of several issues related to privacy protection. Zavalysyn et al. [35] focused on privacy-enhancing technologies for the smart gateway. Several surveys focus on IoT security. Alrawi et al. [36] summarized the literature on IoT device security and organized a systematic evaluation method for assessing device security attributes. Abosata et al. [37] discusses the security risks caused by the implementation of industrial IoT in smart cities and intelligent manufacturing and then categorizes attacks and potential security solutions. Due to Home Automation (HA) systems being vulnerable, Wang et al. [38] studied the security of HA from the perspectives of attacks and defense and summarized relevant literature. By contrast, our research investigates user privacy and security through the perspective of network traffic, highlighting distinctions in applying traffic analysis in the field of CIoT.

B. Traffic Analysis

Several studies review the advancements in traffic analysis research, with a particular emphasis on encrypted network

TABLE I: Related survey

Literature	Application				Technologies		Amount	Years covered*
	Device Fingerprinting	User Activity Inference	Malicious Traffic Analysis	Measurement	non-ML	ML		
[33]	×	✓	×	×	✓	✓	105	-2018
[34]	×	✓	×	×	✓	✓	153	2010-2021
[35]	×	✓	×	×	✓	✓	137	2010-2021
[36]	×	×	×	×	✓	✓	108	-2018
[37]	×	×	✓	✓	✓	×	114	-2021
[38]	×	×	✓	×	✓	✓	222	-2022
[39]	×	×	✓	×	✓	✓	176	-2021
[40]	✓	×	✓	×	×	✓	108	2007-2021
[41]	×	×	✓	×	×	✓	118	-2022
[42]	✓	×	×	×	×	✓	10	-2021
[43]	×	×	✓	×	×	✓	97	-2022
[44]	✓	×	×	×	✓	✓	212	-2021
[45]	✓	×	×	×	×	✓	58	2018-2022
[46]	✓	×	×	×	×	✓	159	-2020
Ours	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	310	2018-2023

* Some surveys do not specify the quantity or time of the literature they encompass, so we summarize this information according to references.

traffic and the use of machine learning. Papadogiannaki and Ioannidis [39] investigated the techniques, applications, and countermeasures related to encrypted network traffic analysis. They summarized relevant literature from four aspects: network analysis, network security, user privacy, and middleware network functionality. Shen et al. [40] focused on the application of ML techniques in encrypted traffic analysis. This work organizes the existing literature in four directions: network asset identification, network characterization, privacy leak detection, and attack detection. Bhatia et al. [43] specifically discussed the encrypted traffic of smartphones. Furthermore, Shahraki et al. [41] highlighted the benefits of employing on-line machine learning for traffic analysis. Mathews et al. [42] examined methods to defend against website fingerprinting. Overall, these studies tend to analyze network traffic from personal computers and smartphones, rather than concentrating on the traffic generated by CIoT devices.

C. IoT Fingerprinting

Some surveys focus on traffic analysis on CIoT devices, but only cover device fingerprinting. Sánchez et al. [44] reviewed device behavior fingerprints, covering not only smart home devices but also non-IoT devices such as PCs and personal smartphones. Jmila et al. [45] summarized the application of ML in the field of device classification and highlighted key issues to consider in device classification, such as feature costs and learning quality. Tahaei et al. [46] investigated the application of network traffic classification in different fields of IoT, including common IoT devices, smart cities, and healthcare systems. Unlike other surveys, this survey consists of more application goals from the security and privacy perspectives.

IV. LITERATURE COLLECTION

To improve the quality of literature retrieval, we refer to well-known public lists of academic conferences and journals

about network security, including the recommendations of Professor Guofei Gu from Texas A&M University [47], Professor Jianying Zhou from Singapore University of Technology and Design [48], and Tsinghua University's Computer Science Discipline Group (TH-CPL) and the China Computer Federation (CCF) [49, 50]. We particularly emphasize conferences and journals in the A and B categories related to network and information security, computer networks, high-performance computing, and systems software and software engineering. Based on these sources, we categorize the journals and conferences into classes A and B by comprehensively evaluating their rankings across the above lists.




Fig. 3: The number of papers published from 2018 to 2023.

We adopted the snowball generations approach to expand the search keywords dynamically, ensuring both accuracy and breadth in our literature search. Initially, we manually retrieved CIoT traffic security-related papers from top-tier security conferences such as USENIX, S&P, NDSS, and CCS to identify search keywords. We conducted searches using the keywords “IoT traffic”, “security”, and “privacy” in all 17 A-class conferences and journals, resulting in 2,966 papers over the past decade (2018-2023). “IoT Traffic” is a core keyword that

TABLE II: The keywords used in literature search.

Rounds	Keywords
Initial	IoT traffic, security, privacy
First Round	IoT traffic, security, privacy, detection, fingerprint, vulnerable, attack, malicious, botnet, measurement
Second Round	IoT traffic, security, privacy, detection, fingerprint, identification, classification, vulnerable, attack, hack, malicious, anomalous, botnet, DDoS, measurement, smart home, intrusion

must appear in the retrieved articles. “security” and “privacy” are auxiliary keywords, meaning at least one or more of them are included in the search results. By manually reviewing the abstracts and introductions of each paper, we carefully selected a subset of 75 closely relevant papers from A-class conferences and journals as the core literature for our survey. Based on the keywords and abstracts of these core papers, we expanded the auxiliary keywords: “*security, privacy, detection, fingerprint, vulnerable, secure, attack, malicious, botnet, measurement*”. One or more of these keywords must be present in the abstract or keywords. Subsequently, we searched B-class literature from 2018 to 2023 using the expanded keywords and identified relevant literature and expanded the keywords with the same method. The search keywords we used are listed in Table II. In total, we identified 310 relevant papers. The change in the number of papers over time is shown in Figure 3.

V. PROCESS OF CIIOT TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

In this section, we summarized the process of CIIOT traffic analysis and its unique characteristics to answer RQ1. By reviewing the existing literature, we outline the basic process of CIIOT traffic analysis, which includes *traffic collection, traffic processing, analysis, and application*. This process is depicted in Figure 4.

A. CIIOT Traffic Collection

1) *Collection Process*: The traffic collection process is the first step in CIIOT traffic analysis and differs significantly from general network traffic analysis. Firstly, CIIOT devices exhibit a wider variety, with traffic patterns varying substantially among different types of devices. Secondly, CIIOT devices demonstrate diverse interaction patterns, necessitating tailored traffic collection setups for various interaction scenarios. Thirdly, different communication techniques devices use, such as Wi-Fi and Bluetooth, require different traffic collection methods, posing challenges in constructing comprehensive CIIOT traffic datasets.

Figure 5 illustrates five methods for acquiring traffic: **1) Collection from the Router (Methods ① and ②)**: Traffic can be collected at the inside or outside interface of the Network Address Translation (NAT) router. The inside interface of the NAT router connects to the private network, allowing local IP addresses to distinguish the traffic of each device. Conversely, capturing traffic at the interface after NAT mixes the traffic of all devices within the LAN, which is also the traffic aggregation point for regular ISPs. **2) Collection through Receivers (Method ③)**: CIIOT devices use diverse

communication protocols such as Zigbee and Bluetooth, in addition to Wi-Fi. Specialized receivers can capture the link-layer packets of these protocols. **3) Generation through Simulators (Method ④)**: Due to the challenges of collecting malicious CIIOT traffic in the wild, researchers sometimes use simulators to generate special traffic patterns. For instance, Koroniotis et al. [51] utilized a tool called Node-RED to simulate devices in a virtual network. **4) Crowdsourced Collection (Method ⑤)**: “Crowdsourcing” refers to the practice of gathering information or data about network traffic through a large number of individuals, typically users or volunteers. Since acquiring devices from various brands and categories can be costly, and simulating realistic user interaction traffic is challenging, some researchers leverage crowdsourcing to gather data [52, 53].

2) *Available Datasets*: Considering that De Keersmaeker et al. [54] have conducted a comprehensive review of public datasets in the IoT field, we only summarize the most classic and frequently cited datasets applicable to the CIIOT field in Table III. Among all self-collected CIIOT datasets, the Mon dataset is the most frequently cited and contains the highest number of devices, followed by UNSW, YT, Ours, and PingPong.

By analyzing the related dataset papers and Table III, we identify several shortcomings in the current CIIOT datasets. According to the survey by De Keersmaeker et al. [54], researchers have created nearly 70 datasets. However, we observe that the number and types of CIIOT devices included in these datasets are very limited, and most of the data collection occurred before 2021, failing to reflect the current trends in CIIOT devices. Furthermore, echoing the insights from De Keersmaeker et al. [54], future datasets should encompass a broader range of protocols (such as LoRa, Sigfox, etc.) and place greater emphasis on link-layer traffic analysis.

Although De Keersmaeker et al. have comprehensively classified datasets, we observed that the article lacks insights into the geographical location of traffic collection. Devices in different regions adhere to distinct laws and regulations, leading to variations in transmitted data content. Most datasets appear to be self-collected in laboratory settings, likely due to the convenience of traffic labeling. Additionally, the majority of devices in these datasets are from America and Europe, with a notable absence of CIIOT traffic data from Asia. Furthermore, current datasets do not provide fine-grained labels regarding the lifecycle of devices. In conclusion, there is a need for a more state-of-the-art and comprehensive dataset that considers the unique characteristics and rapid development of CIIOT.

B. CIIOT Traffic Processing

Following the general traffic analysis methodology, the second step involves extracting features or information and processing the data for specific application purposes.

1) *Features Extraction*: In this part, we introduce common features extracted from CIIOT traffic.

Packet-level Feature. Packet-level features primarily involve fields from packet headers, such as IP address, port number, TTL value, payload length, and TCP initial window size.




Fig. 4: The process of CIoT traffic analysis.




Fig. 5: Traffic collection setups

Flow-level Feature. Flow features capture the overall characteristics of a flow, including the total input and output bytes, transmission byte rate, and flow duration. In 2005, Moore et al. [55] summarized 249 flow-level features.

Statistical Feature. Based on packet-level and flow-level features, statistical features of the traffic can be computed, including measures such as maximum, minimum, mean, variance, and standard deviation.

Deep Learning Feature. DL algorithms can automatically encode raw packets into sequences or images for advanced analysis.

It is worth noting that several tools facilitate the extraction of network features from raw `pcap` files, including CICFlowmeter, Zeek, and Joy. CICFlowmeter [56], an open-source Java tool, can extract over 80 dimensions of features. Zeek [57], a network traffic analysis tool, enables custom feature extraction through its own Domain Specific Language (DSL). Joy [58], which focuses on the application layer, outputs data in JSON format, thereby complementing the feature sets provided by the other tools.

2) *Traffic Representation:* For the TML algorithm, traffic is represented as a vector containing various features. Different neural networks (NNs) require distinct traffic representations for DL frameworks. For example, traffic can be viewed as time-series data and input into recurrent neural networks (RNNs). For graph neural networks (GNNs), the input can be a subgraph of network traffic, such as a communication graph. For non-ML algorithms, the traffic is typically represented as

hash value [31] or a state transition graph [29].

C. CIoT Traffic Analysis Algorithm

This section summarizes the algorithms used for analyzing CIoT traffic. We found that the algorithms employed in CIoT traffic analysis are quite similar to those used in general traffic analysis. We summarize them as follows.

1) *Machine Learning Algorithms:* ML algorithms analyze input data to identify relationships and dependencies within datasets [69]. ML algorithms can be classified into TML, DL, and RL (briefly introduced in Section II-B). Additionally, the Federated Learning (FL) algorithm is used in scenarios involving multiple computational nodes. FL algorithm ensures user privacy by training models locally at each node and sharing only model updates instead of raw data.

Traditional Machine Learning (TML). TML algorithms are advantageous due to their robustness and interpretability [70], making them valuable tools. Commonly used TML algorithms for CIoT traffic classification include decision trees (DT) [71], support vector machines (SVM) [72], random forests (RF) [73], and k -nearest neighbor (k -NN) [74].

Deep Learning (DL). DL algorithms can directly learn complex feature representations from raw data, making them particularly effective for processing large datasets and extracting valuable features from traffic. Key DL algorithms include convolutional neural networks (CNNs), which are crafted for the analysis of visual data [75]; GNNs, designed to handle graph-structured data [76]; RNNs, which model sequential data [77]; Notably, long short-term memory (LSTM) Networks are variants of RNNs that address the vanishing gradient problem and allow for the modeling of long-term dependencies in sequential data [78].

Reinforcement Learning (RL). RL [28] is a type of ML that enables an agent to learn and perform tasks by interacting with its environment, receiving feedback through rewards or penalties based on its actions. However, traditional RL is not widely used for CIoT traffic analysis due to the time-consuming process of finding optimal solutions while exploring large state-action space and the challenges of the exploration-exploitation tradeoff [79]. To address these issues, deep reinforcement

TABLE III: The summary of existing datasets

Name	Area ¹	Source ²	Categories ³	Number		Communication ⁴		Period	Size	Time	Lifecycle ⁵			
				IoT	N-IoT	Wi-Fi	Low-energy				SU	ID	IR	DE
Ours [59]	US	SC	10	8	3	✓	×	2020.3	11.5GB	11 days	×	✓	✓	×
YourThings [36]	US	SC	15	45	0	✓	✓	2018.3	233GB	13 days	×	×	✓	×
IoTDNS [60]	US	SC	28	53	12	✓	✓	2019.8	366MB	2 months	×	×	✓	×
UNSW [61]	AUS	SC	17	28	3	✓	✓	2016.10	9.72GB	6 months	×	✓	✓	×
BoT-IoT [51]	AUS	SL	5	5	0	-	-	2018.4	69.3GB	2 months	×	✓	✓	×
Mon(IoT)r [19]	US&UK	SC	15	81	0	✓	✓	2018.9	12.9GB	-	×	✓	✓	×
PingPong [62]	US	SC	12	19	3	✓	✓	2019	40.3GB	51 days	×	×	✓	×
HomeSnitch [63]	US	SC	13	57	0	✓	✓	2021.3	595MB	8 days	×	×	✓	×
IoT_Sentinel [64]	FI	SC	6	31	0	✓	✓	2016	61.4MB	-	✓	×	×	×
IoT23 [65]	CZ	SC	3	3	0	✓	×	2018	21GB	1 year	×	×	✓	×
N-BaIoT [66]	IL	SC	3	9	0	-	-	2018.3	240GB	-	×	×	✓	×
IoT Inspector [67]	-	CR	-	65000+	-	-	-	2019.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
NSL-KDD [68]	US	SL	-	-	-	-	-	1998.5	4.06MB	7 weeks	×	✓	✓	×

1 “US” is the United States, “UK” is the United Kingdom, “AUS” is Australia, “FI” is Finland, “CZ” is Czech Republic, “IL” is Israel.

2 “SC” stands for self-collection, “CR” is crowdsourcing, “SL” is devices simulation.

3 These datasets consist of a total of 58 types of devices, including IoT devices (smart speakers, TVs, doorbells, various sensors, etc.) and non-IoT devices (mobile phones, laptops, and game consoles, etc.).

4 “Wi-Fi” means the devices using WiFi protocol, “Low-energy” refers to the devices using the low-energy protocol like Bluetooth, ZigBee, and Z-Wave.

5 “SU” is setup, “ID” means idle, “IR” means interaction, “DE” is deletion.

learning (DRL) [80] algorithms utilize advanced techniques, such as artificial neural networks, to handle high-dimensional and continuous state and action spaces. For example, Deep Q-Networks (DQNs) [81] use deep neural networks as function approximators to estimate value or policy functions.

2) *Non-Machine Learning Algorithms*: Although ML algorithms have the advantage of being adaptive, they may overfit the training data when the data size is too small. Additionally, when the environment changes, the model requires retraining [32]. Consequently, some researchers opt for non-ML algorithms. Initially, basic rule-based methods [82] and signature-based methods [83] played important roles.

Subsequently, more advanced non-ML analysis methods were developed. Locality-sensitive hashing (LSH) is a technique for quickly finding similar items in a large dataset. It maps each item to a hash value and uses a family of hash functions to group items with similar hash values. This approach is particularly relevant in identifying CIoT devices, as demonstrated by Charyyev and Gunes [31] and Charyyev and Gunes [32]. Additionally, traffic can be modeled as a state machine for analysis, which has proven efficient in network intrusion detection systems (NIDS). For example, Duan et al. [29] constructed CIoT packet-level automaton to profile traffic patterns.

Finally, the algorithm should be evaluated for its performance and effectiveness in solving a particular problem or task. Several commonly used metrics are employed to measure performance, as introduced in Table IV.

D. New Characteristics in CIoT Traffic Analysis

The traffic analysis process of CIoT and other fields (e.g., PC website traffic) share moderate similarities. However, the unique features of CIoT have led to numerous attempts to

TABLE IV: Evaluation metrics

Metrics	Detail
Accuracy	$(P_t + N_t) / (P_t + N_t + P_f + N_f)$
Precision & Recall	Precision = $P_t / (P_t + P_f)$ Recall = $P_t / (P_t + N_f)$
F1 score	$2 * \text{Precision} * \text{Recall} / (\text{Precision} + \text{Recall})$
ROC & AUC	ROC curve visually plots the true positive rate against the false positive rate at various classification thresholds. AUC represents the overall performance of the model by calculating the area under the ROC curve

* P_t : True positive example; P_f : False positive example;
 N_t : True negative example; N_f : False negative example.

customize and improve the analysis process at every step to achieve specific application goals. In this subsection, we summarize the challenges faced by CIoT traffic analysis and its unique characteristics compared to network traffic, as shown in Table V).

1) *Traffic Collection*: The collection of CIoT traffic data is more complex than that of PC or mobile apps, as summarized in the following aspects. First, there are many types of CIoT devices, each differing in hardware and software design, making collecting substantial training data a significant challenge [84]. Second, CIoT devices typically have diverse interaction modes, complicating the automation of traffic collection. Third, traffic analysis must consider the features of various communication technologies (such as Wi-Fi, BLE, Zigbee, Z-Wave, LoRa, and NB-IoT) and use the appropriate receivers to capture the packets in different layers. Finally, different lifecycle phases of devices exhibit distinct traffic patterns. For example, during the setup phase, a device may engage in numerous TLS key negotiations and domain name requests, whereas, in the idle state, it typically sends only

TABLE V: Comparison of CIIoT traffic and general network traffic

Items	CIIoT Traffic	Non-IIoT Traffic
Device Type	diverse	simple
Protocol	diverse and customized	relatively diverse and standard
Interaction Mode	complex	easy
Communication Technology	various	mostly IP-based
Traffic Volume	small	large
Update Frequency	low	high
Available Datasets	relatively small	numerous

heartbeat packets to maintain connections. Each phase requires specific user configurations that are challenging to automate.

In summary, the complexity of collecting CIIoT traffic leads some researchers to prefer using public datasets rather than creating their own.

2) *Traffic Processing*: For traffic processing, the low power requirements and the diverse range of communication protocols, device types, and lifecycle phases of CIIoT bring new traffic characteristics for feature extraction. Firstly, CIIoT devices generally have simpler hardware configurations than traditional network computing devices, often resulting in smaller TCP buffer sizes [85]. This limitation directly affects packet transmission and network congestion control mechanisms. Additionally, traditional metrics used in network traffic classification, such as the user-agent field in HTTP, may not always be effective for CIIoT devices due to their limited use of online web services. Furthermore, our survey indicates that the set of DNS domains or remote IPs contacted by CIIoT devices is a popular feature used by researchers [60, 61, 86]. This is because CIIoT devices communicate with a limited number of endpoints. Significantly, many CIIoT device manufacturers develop proprietary application layer protocols and implement encryption based on these protocols. Considering common traffic features that may not behave well, it is essential to precisely capture these unique characteristics.

Secondly, traffic from CIIoT devices varies significantly depending on the type and lifecycle phase. For example, devices like plugs or lamps exchange a few packets, whereas cameras generate large volumes of video and audio data. This variability poses a challenge for statistical feature extraction. In contrast, traffic analysis in other fields, like website fingerprinting, generates many packets during short-term visits. That is, the volume of CIIoT traffic is caused by a specific event or device type. As a result, it is necessary to pay more attention to packet-level features rather than relying solely on flow-level or statistical features commonly used in general network traffic.

3) *Algorithm*: The deployment characteristics of CIIoT bring some differences in general traffic analysis algorithms. First, network traffic characteristics change rapidly, necessitating frequent retraining of models to adapt to updates. However, this dynamic is less pronounced in CIIoT devices due to their longer firmware update cycles [87]. As a result, CIIoT traffic classification models often retain their effectiveness

over extended periods. Second, the dispersed location, large number, and limited bandwidth of compromised CIIoT devices present additional challenges. Specifically, the low bandwidth DDoS attack from CIIoT botnet may pose additional difficulty for detection algorithms. Third, the low power requirements of CIIoT necessitate the use of distributed algorithm. While traditional network traffic classification models are typically executed on personal computers or servers with substantial computational resources, CIIoT scenarios often require deployment on gateways or servers. This increases the demand for distributed designs such as FL.

Takeaways: This section outlines the fundamental process of CIIoT traffic analysis and addresses RQ1. We examine the distinctions between CIIoT traffic analysis and general traffic analysis in three main aspects. Firstly, CIIoT devices have a wider variety of models and communication protocols, involve multiple interactions, and have intricate life cycles, which complicates traffic collection. Secondly, different CIIoT devices show unique behavioral patterns, necessitating customized feature extraction methods. Finally, algorithms are further challenged by the decentralized and low-power characteristics of CIIoT devices.

VI. THE APPLICATIONS IN SECURITY AND PRIVACY

Within this section, we group the current research into four primary categories according to application scenarios or objectives, addressing RQ2. These four categories include device fingerprinting, user activity inference, malicious traffic analysis, and measurement. Figure 6 displays the publication trends for these application purposes.




Fig. 6: Publication trends of different application purposes.

A. Device Fingerprinting

Different types, vendors, and behaviors of CIIoT devices generate traffic with unique characteristics, which can be used to uniquely identify devices and their behaviors, just like a fingerprint. The general process for constructing device fingerprints is shown in Figure 7. As depicted, attackers can

extract fingerprints from raw packets to predict device models and behaviors, thereby identifying hidden devices. Device fingerprinting can be further classified into three categories: device identification, device behavior identification, and hidden device detection.




Fig. 7: The basic process of device fingerprinting

1) *Device Identification*: Device identification involves using unique traffic patterns to identify devices, such as their vendors and types or categories. This information facilitates fingerprinting attacks: attackers use the information to discover vulnerable targets. On the other hand, it also can help regulators recognize these vulnerable devices. Based on the traffic analysis process outlined in Section V, we summarize the contributions made by researchers to device identification.

Traffic Collection. For the traffic collection step, some work in the device identification field enriches the dataset. Specifically, they consider the devices that use low-energy protocols, certain kinds of devices (smart TVs or smartwatches), and the number of devices in the dataset.

Certain research [101, 110, 111] endeavors to tackle these issues and integrate devices that use low-energy protocols into their studies. Babun et al. [101] asserted themselves as the pioneering work that investigates the Zigbee and Z-Wave device fingerprinting framework. They constructed a density distribution based on inter-arrival time (IAT) by capturing packets at the link layer, which is divided into 300 equal intervals to build the signature. They conducted tests on 39 popular Zigbee and Z-Wave devices, resulting in accuracy rates of 91.2% for Zigbee and 93.6% for Z-Wave, respectively. Considering the asymmetry of learning and testing by ISPs during device identification, Ma et al. [110] monitored inbound and outbound packets and extracted Spatial-Temporal features to identify these devices that share a common IP (behind a NAT) from the ISP’s perspective. The protocols used by the devices include Bluetooth, Zigbee, or LoRa. Kostas et al. [111] used the entropy of the payload as the feature, which also allows them to identify devices with non-IP and low-power protocols.

Some researchers [107, 108] focused on edge IoT devices such as smart wearables and smart TVs. Aksu et al. [107] focused on fingerprints of wearable devices using the Bluetooth protocol based on Bluetooth packet characteristics. The algorithm utilizes the inter-arrival time of packets as a feature and can automatically select the optimal solution from over 20 classifiers. In light of the advertising tracking and data

leakage issues associated with smart TVs, Varmarken et al. [108] extracted application fingerprints based on domains, data packets, and TLS information. The process relies only on a few packets, making their method lightweight and applicable to encrypted traffic.

Ahmed et al. [59] unprecedentedly considered a remarkable number of 188 devices. The experiment integrated six public datasets along with a self-collected dataset (the “Ours” dataset). They innovatively considered five different fingerprinting granularities: device instances; devices have unique make and model; devices have the same manufacturer and type; devices have the same manufacturer; devices have the same device category. Employing RF as the classifier, its accuracy surpasses 97% in all five cases.

Moreover, Bremler-Barr et al. [85] expanded the dataset to non-IoT devices. They designed a multi-stage classifier to distinguish IoT and non-IoT devices. This offers insights for extracting background traffic (i.e., traffic from non-IoT devices like smartphones and PCs) in CIoT traffic analysis.

Traffic Processing. Part of the works [90, 99] adopted personalized feature processing methods. Sivanathan et al. [90] made the first systematic study on smart device identification. They collected three-week traffic from 20 CIoT devices and extracted 11 distinct features by observing device activity patterns. They divided the values of each feature into 5 ranges called cluster bins to distinguish different devices. This method achieved a 95% accuracy. However, as the number of devices increases, only 11 features with 5 gradations become insufficient. Marchal et al. [99] divided network traffic into multiple time-series “flows”, which are defined as a collection of packets using a given MAC address and protocol. They then computed 33 periodic features obtained from the Discrete Fourier Transform (DFT) of traffic and employed the k -NN algorithm for device classification.

Some researchers [60, 91, 105] believe that the backend infrastructure for device connections has unique information. Guo and Heidemann [91] utilized unique communication server domain names to label CIoT devices; it can detect devices behind Network Address Translation (NAT) from aggregated traffic. However, distinguishing devices of the same type from the same manufacturer remains challenging. Similarly, Saidi et al. [105] identified devices by analyzing the domains and the backend infrastructure IPs and ports they communicate with. Likewise, Perdisci et al. [60] found that DNS domain names and their corresponding frequencies show significant discrepancies across various devices, providing a basis for using the DNS feature. However, DNS depends on device services; for instance, a TV of one brand equipped with voice services from another can lead to confusion and reduce accuracy.

In addition, researchers [64, 102, 110] emphasize the importance of considering device lifecycle, protocol, and time information should also be considered. Miettinen et al. [64] innovatively considered the setup traffic. They selected 23 features from the first 12 packets during the setup stage to identify the types of new devices and further restricted their communication capabilities based on security levels. Analysis

TABLE VI: Summary of device identification literature

Name	Year	Contributions			Feature	Algorithm		Datasets Source		Communication		Collection Location ²
		Algorithm	Feature	Dataset		Type ¹	Name	Public Datasets	Self-collection	Wi-Fi	Low-energy	
[88]	2017	✓			Flow	TML	GBM, RF, XGBoost		✓	✓		①
[89]	2017		✓		Packet	TML	DT, RF, SVM		✓	✓		③
[64]	2017		✓	✓	Packet	TML	RF		✓	✓		①
[90]	2017		✓		Statistics	TML	RF		✓			①
[91]	2018		✓		Packet	NML	-	✓		✓	✓	④
[92]	2018	✓			DL	DL	LSTM	✓		✓		①
[93]	2018		✓		Statistics	TML	RF	✓		✓		①
[84]	2018	✓			-	NML	Apriori	✓	✓			①
[94]	2019	✓			DL	DL	LSTM	✓		✓		①
[95]	2019	✓			Packet, Statistics	TML	RF, Extra-Trees, AdaBoost	✓		✓		①
[96]	2019	✓			Statistics	TML	<i>k</i> -NN, RF, DT, SVM, Majority Voting	✓	✓	✓	✓	①
[97]	2019	✓			Packet, Flow, Statistics	TML	<i>k</i> -means		✓	✓	✓	②
[61]	2019	✓		✓	Packet, Flow	TML	RF, Naive Bayes	✓		✓	✓	①
[98]	2019		✓		Packet	TML	J48 DT, OneR, PART	✓		✓	✓	①
[99]	2019		✓		Flow, Statistics	TML	<i>k</i> -NN	✓		✓	✓	①
[32]	2020	✓			-	NML	LSH		✓	✓		①
[100]	2020	✓	✓		DL	DL	LSTM		✓	✓		①
[101]	2020			✓	Packet	TML	Bayes Net		✓		✓	③
[102]	2020	✓	✓		DL	DL	Self-designed		✓	✓	✓	①④
[85]	2020			✓	Statistics	TML	DT, Logistic Regression	✓	✓	✓	✓	①
[103]	2020			✓	Packet	NML	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	①④
[104]	2020	✓			Packet, Flow	TML	RF	✓	✓	✓		①
[105]	2020		✓		Packet	NML	-		✓	✓		②④
[60]	2020	✓	✓		Packet	NML	TF-IDF		✓	✓		①④
[106]	2021		✓		Packet, Flow, Statistics	TML	DT	✓		✓	✓	②
[31]	2021	✓			Flow	NML	LSH	✓	✓	✓	✓	①
[107]	2021			✓	Packet	TML	RF		✓		✓	①
[108]	2022			✓	Packet	ML	Agglomerative clustering		✓	✓		①
[109]	2022		✓		Packet, Statistics	TML	RF, Extra-Trees	✓		✓	✓	①
[59]	2022			✓	Statistics	TML	RF	✓	✓	✓	✓	①
[110]	2022		✓	✓	Packet	DL	CNN	✓	✓	✓	✓	①④
[111]	2022		✓	✓	Packet	TML	DT	✓		✓	✓	①
[112]	2022		✓		Packet, Statistics	TML	RF	✓		✓	✓	②

1 “TML” means traditional machine learning, “DL” means deep learning, “NML” means traditional analysis.

2 “① – ⑤” corresponds to the five methods to acquire traffic in section V-A.

in fewer packets makes their method more lightweight. Yu et al. [102] employed BC/MC (Broadcast/Multicast) packet features to identify devices. The features primarily fall into three categories: identifiers that uniquely identify the device model, main protocol fields from BC/MC packets, and auxiliary features acquired by active detection. To enhance the distinctiveness of features, Ma et al. [110] devised an efficient and scalable system using spatial-temporal traffic fingerprinting. They integrated both the temporal sequence of packets and their spatial correlations across the network, which provides a more comprehensive and accurate depiction of traffic.

In addition to the feature of the network layer and above,

some works [89, 100] considered link or physical layer features. Dong et al. [100] incorporated frame length and epoch time in the physical layer as features. Maiti et al. [89] categorized the devices used into 10 classes, with features including but not limited to frame type, size, arrival time, and rate. The findings revealed instances of confusion between cameras and non-IoT devices like PCs. This indicates that there still are great challenges in utilizing link layer frames as the optimal distinguishing features.

To save classification costs, some researchers have added feature reduction technologies. We found that Genetic Algorithms (GA) are the most common [98, 111]. In the work by Aksoy and Gunes [98], 30 chromosomes correspond to

the number of feature subsets. Each chromosome comprises a string of 0/1 representing feature selection. The chromosomes are initially filled with 0/1 and then run a fitness function to ascertain the robustness of these features, resulting in an optimal feature subset. Kostas *et al.* [111] first employed the feature-importance-based voting method to eliminate unnecessary features from the initial set. Then, GA is applied to select the most suitable feature subset from the remaining 52 features. In addition to GA, Santos *et al.* [93] incorporated the CfsSubsetEval algorithm, which selects subsets from the original feature set with a high correlation with the target variable but a low correlation between features to reduce computational complexity. Wanode *et al.* [112] compared three distinct feature reduction techniques: SVD, PCA, and MI. In the case of classifying 16 CIoT devices, MI performs significantly better than SCD and PCA. Another part of works designed their own feature reduction algorithm [106, 109]. Chakraborty *et al.* [106] emphasize the varying costs associated with different features during the extraction process. As a result, they devised a cross-entropy-based algorithm to tackle this concern. Similarly, Du *et al.* [109] built upon NSGA-III, introduced concepts like symmetric uncertainty and correlation coefficient. They propose multiple objective functions that reduce feature dimensions and filter effective features.

Algorithm. Early studies tended to favor TML algorithms. Gradually, researchers began considering constructing more complex identification frameworks based on basic classification models (e.g., SVM, k -NN, RF) or even neural networks. Meanwhile, with the development of edge computing, researchers began to consider distributed models. Apart from these approaches, a few studies employ non-ML methods that effectively shorten the calculation time and are very suitable for scenarios with high real-time requirements.

Early studies tended to favor TML algorithms [61, 64, 88, 90, 93, 96, 104]. In 2017, Meidan *et al.* [88] trained a multi-stage meta classifier. The first stage differentiates IoT from non-IoT devices, and the second stage identifies specific device categories. However, the granularity of this approach only reaches device types (such as TVs, printers, motion sensors, etc.). Similarly, Pinheiro *et al.* [96] demonstrated that using only packet statistics features, the RF algorithm outperforms k -NN, DT, SVM, and Majority Voting, achieving an accuracy of 96% in device identification. To handle the frequent addition of new devices, Ammar *et al.* [104] constructed a binary RF classifier for each device. This approach eliminates the need to retrain the entire model whenever new devices are added.

Gradually, some studies have considered constructing more complex algorithms based on basic models [61, 95]. Msadek *et al.* [95] emphasized the reduction of training data and the elimination of manual tuning. This is achieved by introducing a novel sliding window technique that dynamically segments traffic. As the activity of relevant traffic varies, the window automatically expands; otherwise, it contracts to discard irrelevant packets. To achieve higher accuracy, Sivanathan *et al.* [61] collected traffic from 28 CIoT devices and constructed a multi-stage classifier. The first stage employed a Naive Bayes Multinomial classifier, taking the bag of remote port numbers,

domain names, and cipher suites as input. The bag comprises values and their corresponding frequencies in a matrix format. Then, class and confidence for the bag, flow volume, and flow rate were used as inputs for the second stage. The third stage further leveraged an RF classifier to determine categories and confidence scores. This architecture achieved an impressive device recognition accuracy of 99%.

Subsequently, there were studies using DL algorithms [92, 94, 102]. Bai *et al.* [92] constructed an LSTM-CNN cascade model to classify 4 device categories (hubs, Electronics, Cameras, Switches & Triggers). However, while the algorithm performed well in binary classification, its accuracy dropped to 74.8% in the four-class problem. Ortiz *et al.* [94] employed autoencoders to automatically learn features from traffic and probabilistically model devices as distributions of traffic classes. Yu *et al.* [102] innovatively developed a novel multi-view wide and deep learning (MvWDL) framework. The six views constructed in the experiments are derived from the devices' BC/MC protocols. Meanwhile, they devised a hybrid-fusion multi-view artificial NN to achieve view fusion.

Although the above approaches achieve high accuracy in their designated scenarios, deploying the aforementioned algorithms at one network node presents challenges in scalability. Thangavelu *et al.* [97] developed a Distributed Device Fingerprinting Technique (DEFT) to tackle this challenge. By using SDN technology, the DEFT controller maintains information while gateways perform classification. While robust and manageable, DEFT is not lightweight, necessitating the collaboration of multiple distinct gateways to maximize system efficacy.

The above ML methods consume massive computing resources in practical implementation. Therefore, a novel approach based on LSH was proposed by Charyyev and Gune [31, 32]. This approach eliminates the need for feature extraction and doesn't require frequent model updates. The algorithm employs LSH functions to compute hash values of traffic for device identification, which are stored in a database. Perdisci *et al.* [60] analogized the Term Frequency-Inverse Document Frequency (TF-IDF) algorithm from document retrieval to device identification. When employing a set composed of DNS request frequencies as recognition features, devices, and the requested domain names are treated as documents and their entries to create TF-IDF vectors. Finally, target device recognition relies on cosine similarity between vectors.

In addition to passive traffic capture and analysis methods, researchers have also adopted active probing techniques. Feng *et al.* [84] have proposed an innovative method for automatic discovery and annotation of IoT devices, known as ARE. The ARE focuses on the response information of the application layer and establishes a mapping between IoT devices and their official description websites by extracting banner information (usually containing details like device type and model). Compared to traditional network scanning tools like Nmap, ARE has shown superior capabilities in searching for IoT devices. Especially when new devices are connected to the network, ARE can dynamically and quickly learn and update the fingerprint information of new devices.

Summary: We have summarized relevant papers in Table VI. Most researchers have focused on improving their algorithms and feature extraction techniques, reaching a relatively high accuracy within their datasets. However, practical application scenarios still face a significant issue: traffic characteristics may be confused between devices of the same type but different models [59]. Meanwhile, only a small part of the literature focuses on devices using low-energy protocols. Identifying devices that support various protocols (including Zigbee and Bluetooth) will be challenging. We also observed that most studies assume that attackers can infiltrate the home router. If traffic is obtained after NAT (traffic collection method ②), the effective classification of devices needs more attention from the perspective of ISPs.

2) *Device Behavior Identification:* Different device behaviors could generate different traffic patterns. The triggering of device behaviors involves physical control, LAN/WAN control, multimodal interaction, and cloud API control (for more details, refer to Section II-A).

Early works used statistical features to identify device behavior [96, 113, 115, 121, 122]. Apthorpe et al. [121, 122] were among the early explorers who investigated the impact of diverse user behaviors on traffic patterns. They observed that user interactions can trigger abrupt changes in traffic behavior. Subsequently, Pinheiro et al. [96] found that devices show different packet length patterns in response to external commands. However, their scope of tested event types remained limited and couldn't distinguish similar behaviors among devices of the same model, such as opening/closing a speaker. Therefore, OConnor et al. [113] embraced a broader spectrum of device behaviors. They employed 13 features at the transport layer to characterize triplets. Similarly, Charyyev and Gunes [115] also used statistical features. Their contribution lies in evaluating and comparing the performance of 10 ML algorithms in classifying 128 device events stemming from 39 distinct devices.

Compared to previous work, Trimananda et al. [62] innovatively used packet-level features for the first time. They employ packet-pair sets between devices and servers to distinguish device behaviors. However, it only works with TCP protocol. Nonetheless, this method inspired subsequent investigations. Some researchers draw inspiration from PingPong and address its limitations [117, 118]. Duan et al. [117] resolved the constraint of being limited to TCP. Devices employing the UDP protocol can successfully extract signatures. Another advantage is that their signatures encompass more encoded information, making the impact of lost packet pairs minimal. Wan et al. [118] introduced a novel time-sensitive subsequence matching technique that generates more comprehensive signatures.

In addition to research on the behaviors of Wi-Fi devices, there is a growing body of work on studying the behaviors of devices using low-energy protocols [114, 116, 119]. Acar et al. [114] proposed a "multi-stage privacy attack" that encompasses the recognition of Wi-Fi, BLE, and Zigbee devices. The traffic is represented as a triplet, including timestamp, direction, and packet length, from which statistical features are extracted. Gu et al. [116] built a vulnerability detection

framework called IoTGaze. It constructed wireless context by extracting the packet-level features of the device and identifying dependencies between events. This context is then used to detect anomalies by comparing it with the expected context. IoTGaze has an 98% accuracy in anomaly detection for 5 types of Zigbee devices. Shafqat et al. [119] leveraged the low-power characteristics of the Zigbee protocol that message lengths are matched during encryption. It allows inference of application layer (APL) commands from encrypted traffic. Moreover, they found Zigbee devices periodically report attributes like battery levels and temperature. This enables attackers to infer device events from payload lengths and reporting patterns.

Summary: We summarized the papers about device behavior identification in Table VII. The table shows that packet-level features are evidently more suitable than flow-level features in device behavior identification. Many researchers draw inspiration from the work by Trimananda et al. [62], employing patterns concealed within request-reply packet pairs to achieve this goal. Notably, DL techniques are rarely used in the context of device behavior identification, which may be related to the dimensions of the sample.

3) *Hidden Device Detection:* While CIoT devices bring convenience for users, unexpected deployment of the device poses a threat to personal privacy. There have even been instances in which guests have found hidden cameras in Airbnb rental [123]. Therefore, some researchers have begun investigating ways to detect hidden IoT devices in unfamiliar environments. Existing approaches relying on radio frequency receivers are not entirely dependable, as they are susceptible to interference from other legitimate RF devices such as smartphones and PCs [124]. This situation offers an opportunity for hidden device detection based on network traffic. Taking cameras as an example, visual scenes trigger differences between adjacent frames [125], which can be used to confirm the potential cameras that are operational effectively. This part presents relevant research that utilizes passive traffic to detect hidden devices in unfamiliar environments.

Due to concerns regarding unauthorized video recording, some works [126, 127] focus on hiding cameras. Cheng et al. [126] proposed DeWiCam. It automatically analyzes physical and MAC layer data within interested rooms. By exploiting camera compression and fragmentation techniques, DeWiCam can employ differences in data transmission during both transient and stable states as features. However, this method heavily relies on common transmission modes, which may not be generic across different manufacturers and may change with camera firmware updates. Wu and Lagesse [127] have designed a solution for dynamically detecting the presence of uploading cameras. However, it relies on comparing the similarity between user videos and videos uploaded by hidden cameras. The difficulty of detection increases if a camera does not engage in uploading behavior.

Some studies [128, 129] have extended the scope of detectable devices. Singh et al. [128] leveraged the concept of "human motion" from Wu and Lagesse [127], which involves activating trustworthy sensor values and observing whether there exist similar traffic patterns from other devices.

TABLE VII: Summary of device behavior fingerprinting literature

Paper	Year	Contribution			Feature	Algorithm		Data Source		Communication		Collection Location ²
		Algorithm	Feature	Dataset		Type ¹	Name	Public Datasets	Self-collection	Wi-Fi	Low-energy	
[85]	2019	✓			Packet	TML	k -NN,RF, DT,SVM, Majority Voting	✓	✓	✓	✓	①
[113]	2019	✓			Flow, Statistics	TML	RF	✓	✓	✓	✓	①④
[114]	2020	✓	✓		Packet, Statistics	TML	RF		✓	✓	✓	①②③
[62]	2020	✓	✓		Packet	TML	DBSCAN	✓	✓	✓	✓	②③
[115]	2020	✓		✓	Statistics	ML	-	✓		✓	✓	①
[116]	2020	✓			Packet	TML	RF		✓		✓	③
[117]	2021	✓	✓		Packet	NML	-	✓		✓	✓	②③
[118]	2022	✓	✓		Packet	NML	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	①
[119]	2022			✓	Packet	NML	-	✓	✓		✓	①③
[120]	2023		✓	✓	Flow	TML	RF		✓	✓	✓	②

1 “TML” means traditional machine learning, “NML” means traditional analysis.

2 “① – ⑤” corresponds to the five methods to acquire traffic in section V-A.

Furthermore, they introduced an innovative sensor coverage technique to locate the detected sensors. Sharma et al. [129] addressed device diversity by extracting device-specific attributes using multiple time scales. They also improved upon previous spectrum sensing methods [130], utilizing learned approximate transmission patterns over time to acquire device data transmission timing and channels. Their device fingerprint module computed features through an XGBoost classifier. The channel-aware module identified subsets of active channels through cyclic channel hopping. Lastly, a rough device positioning was achieved through RSSI-VIO.

Summary: Compared to regular device traffic analysis, the existing literature primarily focuses on the link layer 802.11 protocol, resulting in a limited set of features from traffic. Meanwhile, these methods often have limited usability, requiring additional user assistance or being tailored to specific operating systems and usage scenarios. More importantly, the generalizability of the algorithm needs to be improved.

B. User Activity Inference

The leakage of user privacy has remained a prominent topic in network traffic analysis, such as user web browsing history [131] or user interactions in mobile Apps [132, 133]. Attackers who understand user behavior can learn about the living habits and further commit crimes [8].

Some researchers infer user activity from CIoT traffic, who use fingerprints of devices and their behaviors to establish a mapping relationship between traffic patterns and user activities, including devices using Wi-Fi protocol [114, 125, 134] and low-energy protocol [135].

Li et al. [125] discovered that differential coding in surveillance cameras could inadvertently leak side-channel information. Distinct body movements by users can lead to significant inter-frame differences between packets. Consequently, they used frames and applied k -NN and DBSCAN for activity recognition. In addition to cameras, Acar et al. [114] have considered scenarios with more device types. They modeled user activities through multiple stages. The first three stages identified the device type, whether it is active, and its specific state. Then, they modeled user activities using Hidden

Markov Model (HMM) in the final stage. However, this model only achieved a coarse-grained user behavior representation, identifying aspects such as whether a user remotely controlled a device or moved between locations. Gu et al. [135] innovatively focused on 5 Zigbee devices on the SmartThings platform. combined with the idea of dynamic programming, they revealed the user activity dependency, which can be used to infer the user’s living habits and routines. However, they did not evaluate their methods on Wi-Fi devices where their communications are more complex. Based on the previous works, Wan et al. [134] considered the presence of missing or unordered device events and develops an approximate user activity signature matching algorithm. Additionally, they design a heuristic trimming step to address multiple matches involving overlapping CIoT device events.

Different from the above work, Subahi and Theodorakopoulos [136] studied the traffic behavior and privacy leakage problems on the App side, including the interactions between users and CIoT devices and the exposure of sensitive Personally Identifiable Information (PII) and its type. They employ three random forest classifiers to achieve this goal. However, this study doesn’t provide a solution for companion Apps using fixed certificates.

Summary: The core challenge of inferring user privacy from CIoT traffic lies in identifying dependencies between device events and user activities. In the future, there is an opportunity for a refined exploration of diverse events, particularly in multi-user scenarios, where different household members trigger devices at distinct time intervals, just like Wan et al. [134] did.

C. Malicious Traffic Analysis

Like device fingerprinting, malicious traffic analysis is another popular direction in CIoT traffic research. In this subsection, we introduce the malicious traffic analysis papers from two perspectives: detecting attacks on IoT and CIoT botnet detection.

1) *Detecting Attacks on CIoT:* Due to low hardware configuration and long update cycles, CIoT devices are vulnerable

TABLE VIII: Summary of attacks on CIoT detection literature

Literature	Year	Contribution			Feature	Algorithm		Data Source		Communication		Collection Location ²
		Algorithm	Feature	Dataset		Type ¹	Name	Public Datasets	Self-collection	Wi-Fi	Low-energy	
[137]	2021	✓		✓	Statistics	TML+RL	RF, iForest, MAB-RL		✓	✓	✓	③
[138]	2019		✓	✓	Flow, Packet	TML	DT		✓	✓	✓	①
[139]	2020	✓	✓		Flow, Packet, Statistics	TML	RF, PCA		✓	✓	✓	①
[140]	2021	✓		✓	Packet, Statistics	TML	iForest, DT		✓		✓	①
[141]	2022		✓	✓	Statistics	TML	SVM		✓	✓		②
[142]	2018	✓		✓	-	NML	DFA		✓		✓	①
[143]	2020	✓			-	NML	LSH	✓			✓	①
[144]	2020	✓	✓		Flow, Packet, Physical	NML	-		✓		✓	③

¹ “TML” means traditional machine learning, “NML” means traditional analysis, “RL” means reinforcement learning.

² “① – ⑤” corresponds to the five methods to acquire traffic in section V-A.

to various attacks, including Scanning attacks, Brute Force attacks, DoS attacks, and Cryptojacking [145]. Therefore, many researchers devoted themselves to detecting attack traffic targeting CIoT devices [137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144]. Most of these work provided the ability to detect several general attacks [138, 139, 141, 143], as is represented by DDoS and Scanning attacks. In 2019, Anthi et al. [138] presented a NIDS with 3 layers to detect 12 attacks (e.g., DDoS, MITM, Scanning) in a CIoT network environment. In 2020, Charyyev and Gunes [143] proposed LSAD, based on LSH, to detect various attacks such as ARP Spoofing and DDoS attacks. Unlike ML-based algorithms, their method does not need to extract features from data. Similarly, aiming at specific attacks, in 2022, Tekiner et al. [141] presented a lightweight traffic-feature-based method to detect CIoT Cryptojacking. They trained with an SVM classifier and proved that their algorithm can obtain 99% accuracy with one hour’s training data. Meanwhile, special attacks targeting IoT devices are also detected. To solve the IoT security sensor tampering issue, Pathak et al. [140] developed two algorithms to detect sensor tampering attacks: an unsupervised learning algorithm using iForest and a supervised learning algorithm CART based on C4.5 DT.

Additionally, aiming at the attacks on low-energy CIoT devices, researchers also came up with solutions [142, 144]. SmartApp, proposed by SmartThings, is a type of program

running on the cloud (as shown in Figure 8). Targeting the issues of over-privileged permissions and spoofing attacks within the application layer of SmartApp, in 2018, Zhang et al. [142] conducted a notable study centered around identifying malicious SmartApps via traffic analysis. They first derived Deterministic Finite Automata (DFA) from textual descriptions and user interfaces, to model each App. By monitoring encrypted traffic captured from wireless channels, they compare the observed state transitions associated with a behavior to the predefined DFA. If a match fails, it suggests the possibility of a malicious App. Notably, this research targeted Zigbee and Z-Wave devices on the SmartThings platform. However, the scalability of this approach when dealing with more complex functionalities and a greater number of states in Wi-Fi devices remains the problem for further consideration.

When facing unknown attacks, researchers put forward algorithms based on unsupervised learning [137, 139] and RL [137] algorithms. In 2020, Wan et al. [139] introduced a security monitoring system IoTArgos, which detects attacks such as Scanning and Brute-force at the system, network, and application layers of Smart Home IoT system by a supervised learning algorithm RF, and integrated an unsupervised learning algorithm principal component analysis (PCA) to detect zero-day or unknown attacks. Through the evaluation, IoTArgos can detect anomalous activities that target Smart Home IoT devices with high precision & recall. In 2021, Heartfield et al. [137] presented MAGPIE, which is able to autonomously adjust the function of its underlying anomaly classification models to a smart home’s changing conditions (such as newly-added devices, new automation rules, and human interaction) to detect both known and unknown threat in Smart Home IoT network. Researchers applied a probabilistic cluster-based reward mechanism to RL and combined them with supervised learning classifier RF and unsupervised learning model iForest to classify traffic. Evaluation experiments in a real-home smart home environment containing Wi-Fi and Zigbee devices showed that MAGPIE provides high accuracy.

Summary: Researchers have designed specific algorithms to detect various attacks aiming at CIoT devices, as is shown in




Fig. 8: Architecture of SmartThings platform [142].

Table VIII. The intrusion detection research is mostly based on non-ML and TML algorithms. Meanwhile, researchers combine unsupervised learning algorithms into their research to detect unknown threats. Nevertheless, due to potential limitations in storage or data, DL-based detection methods have not yet been investigated in the CIoT domain.

2) *CIoT Botnet Detection*: DDoS attacks, primarily launched by botnets consisting of compromised CIoT devices like Mirai, Satori, and BASHLITE, have posed a significant threat and resulted in substantial damage to the network infrastructure. Among them, the infamous Mirai botnet caused widespread network disruptions [146]. According to the research methodologies, we have categorized them into four types as outlined below.

Traditional ML-based Detection Methods. Among our survey, many researchers use DT and RF algorithms to detect CIoT botnet traffic in the research of CIoT botnet attack detection based on TML [147, 148, 149]. In 2020, OKUR and DENER [147] compared two different ML algorithms in detecting normal traffic and the attack traffic from botnet. In their evaluation, the supervised learning algorithm (J48 DT) behaved better than the unsupervised learning algorithm (Expectation Maximization).

Furthermore, some researchers [148, 149] concentrate on the feature selection of the CIoT botnet traffic. In 2019, Dwyer *et al.* [148] developed an analysis method based on DNS to detect CIoT botnet. They put forward a DNS feature set and evaluated a variety of TML classifiers, including RF, k -NN, and Naïve Bayes. RF classifier behaved the best among them (shows 99% accuracy) and indicated that the feature-set based on DNS can significantly reduce the time of botnet detection.

In addition to the centralized approach, researchers have also proposed distributed DDoS detection. In 2021, Doshi *et al.* [150] proposed a novel NIDS based on a modified version of the Online Discrepancy Test (ODIT) to timely detect and mitigate Mongolian DDoS attacks characterized by widely distributed attack sources and small attack scales. The researchers used a k -NN-based algorithm to calculate the abnormal traffic conditions at each node. They then used a cooperative detector to aggregate the local statistical data of each node and obtain the global statistical data to determine whether an attack had occurred. This approach was validated using the N-BaIoT dataset, IoT testbeds, and simulations, proving its effectiveness against various DDoS scenarios.

Based on the detection of CIoT botnet, researchers have made deeper discussion in some campaigns of CIoT botnet [151]. In 2022, Torabi *et al.* [151] proposed a system to detect and analyze scanning campaigns of CIoT botnet. The author extracted the traffic from CIoT devices using the Shodan search engine and over 6TB network from the Dark web and detected compromised devices by examining whether they emitted unsolicited scanning. In their discussion, they pointed out that their work may be affected by the dataset, which was collected too early in August 2017. Some of these compromised devices may have already been removed from the Internet. Meanwhile, the researchers also detected and classified the scanning campaigns in compromised CIoT

devices based on DBSCAN. Then, they grouped CIoT devices with similar scanning behavior and showed the campaign feature of CIoT botnet.

DL-based Detection Methods. Till now, as one of the most popular types of ML algorithms, DL has plenty of applications in botnet detection [152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165]. Among them, most use NNs to detect the CIoT botnet. In 2019, Hwang *et al.* [152] proposed a DL-based IoT malicious traffic detection mechanism. Researchers extracted flow features with the help of CNN and classified traffic with AE. The authors evaluated the mechanism with the traffic dataset collected from their Mirai network and USTC-TFC 2016 dataset and pointed out that the mechanism can achieve nearly 100% accuracy. To solve the problem that only known botnets can be detected offline by existing technology, in 2020, Kim *et al.* [154] proposed a new botnet detection method based on the Recurrent Variational Autoencoder (RVAE). By testing in scenarios (including botnets not used for training), they demonstrated the robustness of the method in detecting unknown botnets.

Till now, most of researchers that use DL to detect CIoT botnets focused on the effect of their methods without conducting comparative tests or only comparing their methods with TML methods to show their advantages. Only a few researchers compared their methods with other DL methods in their evaluation; however, some of these methods did not train with datasets collected from CIoT devices.

In addition, the weak computing power and low storage of devices in the CIoT network challenge the deployment of DL models. To solve this problem, researchers tried to combine FL with DL [155, 156, 157]. In 2022, Nishio *et al.* [156] trained an anomaly detection FL model based on AE to detect botnet traffic to detect easily infected software. When assessed using their datasets collected from CIoT devices and simulating malware traffic, their method demonstrated enhanced efficiency in detecting malware under reasonable conditions. They got a more efficient detection model than AE and iForest models.

Based on the above algorithms, researchers conducted further research to solve the problems of privacy leakage and deployment difficulty. In 2022, Zhao *et al.* [157] pointed out that FL-based NIDS may cause privacy breaches because the transmitted model data may be used to recover private data. Meanwhile, not independent and identically distributed (non-IID) private data can affect FL in training effect, especially the distil-based FL. The typically large models are difficult to deploy. To solve these problems, they proposed a Semi-supervised FL (SSFL) NIDS scheme, based on knowledge distillation of unlabeled data and used CNN as a classifier and discriminator network to build the model. They evaluated SSFL with the N-BaIoT dataset and showed SSFL has the advantage in classifying performance and communication overhead compared with common algorithms such as FL-based algorithms and LSTM-based algorithms.

RL-based Detection Method. Some researchers have proved that RL-based algorithms are effective in general traffic analysis [167]. Baby *et al.* [167] designed an RL-based NIDS.

TABLE IX: Summary of the CIoT botnet detection literature

Literature	Year	Contribution			Feature	Algorithm		Data Source		Communication		Collection Location ²
		Algorithm	Feature	Dataset		Type ¹	Name	Public Datasets	Self-collection	Wi-Fi	Low-energy	
[166]	2021	✓			Packet	NML	-		✓			①
[167]	2023	✓			DL	DL+RL	CNN	✓		✓	✓	④
[155]	2019	✓	✓		Flow, Packet, Statistics	DL+FL	RNN		✓	✓	✓	②⑤
[160]	2022	✓	✓		DL	DL+FL	DNN		✓	✓	✓	①
[156]	2022	✓			Statistics	DL+FL	AE	✓		✓	✓	①
[157]	2022	✓			DL	DL+FL	CNN	✓		✓	✓	①
[159]	2023	✓			DL	DL+FL	AE	✓		✓	✓	①
[152]	2019	✓			DL	DL	AE, CNN	✓	✓	✓		①
[154]	2020	✓	✓		Flow, Statistics	DL	VAE, RNN	✓		✓	✓	⑤
[162]	2020	✓			DL	DL	AE	✓		✓	✓	①②
[163]	2020	✓			Statistics	DL	GAN, AE	✓		✓	✓	①
[164]	2020		✓		DL	DL	AE, LSTM	✓		✓	✓	①
[153]	2021	✓	✓		Statistics	DL	RNN	✓		✓	✓	①
[165]	2022	✓			DL	DL	AE	✓		✓	✓	④
[161]	2022		✓		DL	DL	Transformer	✓		✓	✓	①
[158]	2023		✓		DL	DL	CNN	✓		✓	✓	④
[168]	2022	✓	✓		Statistics	ML	ELM	✓		✓	✓	②
[169]	2019	✓			Flow, Packet, Statistics	TML	RF, Bagging, AdaBoost, Voting	✓		✓	✓	④
[148]	2019	✓	✓	✓	Packet, Statistics, Application	TML	RF		✓	✓	✓	①
[170]	2020	✓		✓	Statistics	TML	FCM		✓	✓	✓	①
[147]	2020	✓	✓		Statistics	TML	DT	✓		✓	✓	①
[171]	2021	✓			Statistics	TML+FL	k -NN	✓		✓	✓	①
[150]	2021	✓		✓	Packet	TML	k -NN	✓		✓	✓	①④
[149]	2021	✓	✓		Statistics	TML	DT, RF			✓	✓	①
[172]	2022	✓			Flow	TML	Metric Learning	✓		✓	✓	①
[151]	2022	✓		✓	Flow	TML	DBSCAN		✓	✓	✓	⑤

¹ “TML” means traditional machine learning, “DL” means deep learning, “RL” means reinforcement learning, “ML” means machine learning, “FL” means federated learning and “NML” means non-machine learning.

² “①-⑤” corresponds to the five methods to acquire traffic, see section V-A.

They adapt DRL algorithms to detect malicious DoS and DDoS traffic raised by CIoT botnets. In their evaluation, researchers tested DRL models in different attacking and defending situations with three datasets, NSL-KDD, IoT23, and N-BaIoT, which are constructed mainly by botnets formed by compromised CIoT devices and pointed out that DRL algorithms are much more successful than TML and DL algorithms.

Non-ML-based Detection Methods. In recent years, ML-based botnet detection methods have become popular among researchers; however, nonML-based methods are an important complement of ML-based methods. In 2021, Reed et al. [166] proposed a lightweight framework that detects “Slow DoS” attacks (attacks that can only provide low bandwidth and limited device resources) in resource-constrained IoT networks. Their method is shown in Figure 9. They analyze real-time IoT packets by two steps based on a set of only four attributes and classify them into three types: legitimate nodes (LN), genuine nodes with slow-to-intermittent connections (SN) and malicious nodes (MN). This lightweight NIDS framework can classify genuine nodes experiencing slow or intermittent network connections and malicious nodes effectively.

Summary: As shown in Table IX, to date, researchers have proposed various ML algorithms to detect CIoT botnet. In the TML domain, DT and RF are predominantly employed, while




Fig. 9: Real-Time Slow DoS Detection Framework [166].

NNs are utilized in the DL domain. In addition, researchers are adopting distribution strategies to address the issue of ML model deployment. However, much of the research lacks comparative experiments as their models are not evaluated on the same datasets.

D. Measurement

Researchers did measurement studies on CIoT traffic in order to gain insights into CIoT security and privacy status. IoT backends, vendors, communication protocols (especially TLS), IoT botnet, traffic destination, and private data exposure are considered in the studies, summarized in Table X. We

review current research in measurement from two perspectives: security and privacy.

1) *Security Perspective*: Kumar et al. [173], Paracha et al. [175] and Saidi et al. [177] discussed the security of CIoT from different perspectives, including secure deployment, TLS security, and backend. First, the general deployment and security status of CIoT devices is studied. Kumar et al. [173] collaborated with Avast Software, an antivirus company, and conducted empirical analysis on traffic of 83 million devices across 16 million homes. This study reveals the significant regional variations in device types and manufacturers of CIoT devices. Open services, weak default credentials, and susceptibility to known attacks are also explored. As TLS is a prominent security protocol used in CIoT, Paracha et al. [175] analyzed two years of TLS traffic and assessed the security of TLS connections established by IoT devices and how these connections changed over time. They revealed that TLS 1.2 was the most widely used version, while TLS 1.3 was less frequently adopted. Additionally, approximately 1/3 of devices were found to be vulnerable to interception attacks during TLS practices, potentially exposing sensitive data. Similarly, Huang et al. [67] expanded the dataset through crowdsourcing. They developed a tool called “IoT Inspector” to collect the traffic of 44,956 smart devices worldwide. By analyzing the data, researchers found that many device vendors used outdated TLS versions and that third-party advertising and tracking services on TV were prevalent. Saidi et al. [177] emphasized that the security and functionality of IoT devices often rely on the IoT backend, the server on which the device downloads resources or the cloud-hosted for computing. By analyzing ISP’s passive traffic data, they constructed a detailed map of IoT backend servers and revealed the relationships among these backend providers.

Some researchers [174, 176, 178] focused on the compromised ones, especially the IoT botnet. Noroozian et al. [176] evaluated the impact of two ISP security policies on Mirai. By analyzing four years of dark web data, the research revealed that the strategy of closing ports to reduce the attack surface had no significant effect. In contrast, improving overall network health and remediation efforts significantly reduced the infection rate of Mirai. Almazarqi et al. [178] investigated the impact of AS structural properties on the spread of Mirai-like IoT botnets. They pointed out that commonly and widely used IP blacklist databases are incapable of tracking concentrated botnets. At the same time, they found that if the degree of an AS, that is, the number of direct connections between this AS and other ASes, is low, then the AS is more likely to become a host for malware downloaders. Herwig et al. [174] investigated the Hajime botnet. Through active scanning and passive DNS backscatter traffic collection, the study reveals that there is a higher number of compromised IoT devices than previously reported. These devices use a variety of CPU architectures, and their popularity varies widely between countries.

Summary: CIoT traffic security measurement provides valuable insights and guidance for building a more secure CIoT ecosystem. Firstly, the user data used for measurements should be legally authorized and thoroughly desensitized to ensure

user data privacy. Secondly, current research (such as [174, 176, 178]) primarily focuses on a few malicious software families, such as the Mirai botnet. Future research should pay attention to various types of malicious software families.

2) *Privacy Perspective*: In addition to security measurements, researchers are also working to measure the leakage of private information by devices from the traffic perspective.

“Mon(IoT)r Research Group” from Northeastern University has done a series of work related to CIoT privacy measurement [19, 179, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185]. Ren et al. [19] are the first to study cross-regional data privacy on a large scale. By capturing traffic from 81 CIoT devices distributed across laboratories in the UK and the US, they delved into aspects like the destination of traffic, encryption status, distribution of plaintext and ciphertext content, and the possible exposure of device information. Next year, Dubois et al. [179] focused on the privacy risk of speaker misactivations. By playing different TV shows on Netflix around seven speakers for 134 hours, they found that smart speakers have a 95% possibility of misactivations with unintentional and listed the wake words that caused misactivations for the specific speaker. Similarly, Iqbal et al. [182] focused on how the smart speaker ecosystem, especially Amazon Echo. They exposed that Alexa Echo smart speakers collect user data and are used to target ads and track users’ interests, which may raise concerns about privacy. Mandalari et al. [181] extracted the non-essential destinations of the device. The study found that 52% of devices communicated with non-essential destinations. Among them, smart TVs and cameras contacted numerous non-essential destinations. Different from the above studies, Girish et al. [183] measured possible privacy leakage of local network interactions of CIoT devices. The authors identified uncontrolled dissemination of sensitive information and revealed that the companion apps and third-party SDKs could potentially abuse user-space discovery protocols to access local network information, resulting in privacy infringements.

Another group of researchers [180] conducted a large-scale empirical measurement focusing on Home Security Cameras (HSCs) in China. They identified three main behaviors that can leak user privacy: A sudden increase in traffic indicates that video uploading is in progress; the regularity change in traffic can be used to infer whether users are active and specific activities; and the traffic rate change can reflect changes in user activities.

Summary: The results of privacy measurements indicate that users’ private information may be exposed through CIoT devices. Various measurement studies have confirmed that devices frequently connect to third-party servers, which can lead to violations of local regulations such as GDPR. Therefore, regulators must ensure that the statements about third-party organizations in privacy policies are accurate and that devices properly enforce these statements. Furthermore, firmware updates on CIoT devices can alter existing behaviors, necessitating evaluations of the impact of time on measurement results. Additionally, many studies focus on devices in the EU and the US but neglect other regions, such as Asia.

TABLE X: Summary of CIoT traffic measurement literature in security and privacy

Topic	Paper	Year	Measurement Description
Security	[173]	2019	Evaluating the deployment of CIoT devices in different regions and security issues that include open services and weak default credentials.
	[174]	2019	Investigating the Hajime botnet.
	[67]	2020	Measuring insecure TLS implementations and the phenomena of third-party advertising and tracking services.
	[175]	2021	Assessing the security of TLS connections established by IoT devices and how these connections changed over time.
	[176]	2021	Evaluating the impact of two ISP security policies on Mirai: closing propagation ports of malicious software and strengthening regulatory efforts.
	[177]	2022	Constructing a detailed map of IoT backend servers and revealing the relationships among these backend providers.
Privacy	[178]	2022	Investigating the impact of AS structural properties on the spread of Mirai-like IoT botnets.
	[19]	2019	The first group to study cross-regional data privacy on a large scale, which includes the destination of traffic, encryption status, distribution of plaintext and ciphertext content, as well as the possible exposure of device information.
	[179]	2020	The privacy risk about speaker misactivations.
	[180]	2020	A large-scale empirical measurement focusing on Home Security Cameras (HSCs) in China and identifying three major behaviors that may leak user privacy: traffic surge, traffic regularity, and traffic rate change.
	[181]	2021	Extracting the non-essential destinations of the device.
	[182]	2023	Focusing on how the smart speaker ecosystem, especially Amazon Echo, collects, uses, and shares data.
	[183]	2023	Measuring the privacy leakage of local network interactions of IoT devices.

Takeaways: This section categorizes the papers based on their application goals, i.e. device fingerprinting, user activity inference, malicious traffic analysis, and measurement, to answer RQ2. Based on CIoT traffic, researchers are able to fingerprint devices, detect malicious behaviors, infer specific user privacy, and monitor security situations. Device fingerprinting and malicious traffic detection have been extensively researched, achieving high accuracy in lab environment. User activity inference has various solutions in single-user scenarios, but there is remains a need for research on distinguishing the activities of different users. In measurement, existing works have evaluated CIoT security and privacy practices from multiple perspectives. However, some aspects need improvement, such as expanding the variety of malware families and assessing behaviors of CIoT devices across different regions.

VII. CHALLENGES AND FUTURE RESEARCH

In this section, we answer RQ3 by summarizing the challenges and future research directions of CIoT traffic analysis in security and privacy based on the analysis process and application goals.

A. Traffic Collection

Compared to PC and mobile apps, CIoT devices exhibit many special characteristics (many types, lifecycle, low-energy communication techniques, etc.), which influence the traffic collection process, as discussed in Section V-D1. In the following part, we summarize potential future research directions regarding CIoT traffic collection.

1) *More Comprehensive Datasets:* Firstly, compared with general network analysis like website or application fingerprinting, establishing a physical CIoT environment or testbed is more time-consuming and costly, especially considering numerous CIoT vendors, types, and models. Secondly, as outlined in Section V-A2, despite researchers proposing several datasets independently and even Huang et al. [67] collected

traffic of thousands of devices by crowdsourcing, an up-to-date, unified, and large-scale CIoT traffic dataset available for researchers is still important. Considering the distinctive traits of CIoT devices, the dataset ought to span the entire CIoT lifecycle and be labeled with fine granularity, thereby fulfilling diverse future application objectives. Lastly, as shown in Table III, almost all commonly used CIoT datasets are self-collected in laboratory settings. Therefore, how to construct an open real-world dataset that does not expose any users' privacy to support evaluations of various methods in practice is a valuable topic.

2) *Cost-minimal CIoT Traffic Collection Methods:* As discussed above, building a comprehensive CIoT traffic dataset is essential but remains time-consuming and costly. This complexity is due to the diverse interaction modes among device types, such as physical control and automation rules, as discussed in Section II-A. Ren et al. [19] to some extent automated the collection process by *Monkey Application Exerciser* included in Android Studio. However, not all interaction modes can be fully simulated in an automated way, e.g., the device binding process. Therefore, automating the traffic collection process to minimize human labor is a promising future direction. Meanwhile, traffic simulation generation can effectively reduce economic costs, particularly for network evaluation and the construction of datasets that contain malicious traffic [186, 187]. However, constructing data sets through virtual environments remains uncommon in the CIoT domain, possibly due to various modes of user interaction and device types. Consequently, simulating realistic CIoT scenarios and generating realistic traffic remains an unresolved challenge.

3) *Non-IP Traffic:* Most works focus on analyzing the TCP/IP network layer traffic and above. However, as for non-IP (Zigbee, Z-Wave, and Bluetooth) devices, existing works [90, 96, 98, 99] often use a smart hub and collect traffic at the router, which only captures IP packets. In scenarios where the attacker is near the victim's home, significant information about the user and devices can be inferred from link-layer packets. For instance, Gu et al. [135] successfully inferred user behaviors through Zigbee packets. Thus, there

is a pressing need for a comprehensive CIoT traffic dataset containing various communication protocols and techniques, including Zigbee, Z-wave, Bluetooth, and 4G/5G. This will enable future works to analyze and infer information across different scenarios.

4) *Malicious CIoT Traffic*: Catillo et al. [188] show that the malicious traffic datasets have certain limitations. The origins of the CIoT botnet attack are widespread, and the device count is substantial, making the creation of an up-to-date dataset difficult. Meanwhile, most researchers rely on popular third-party datasets, such as BotIoT, N-BaIoT, and IoT23, to evaluate their methods. Therefore, it remains uncertain if their methods can reliably identify attack traffic from previously unidentified botnets.

B. Traffic Processing

1) *Local Traffic*: In Section V-D, we analyze the differences in traffic between CIoT devices and traditional computing devices. Researchers should consider these distinct characteristics when designing and implementing traffic analysis methods. We observed that most research focuses on analyzing the communication traffic between CIoT devices and the cloud. Compared to other studies, there is a scarcity of research on local communication traffic analysis between CIoT devices and companion apps, but local communication could also show a lot of information (as Girish et al. [183] did). Therefore, effectively analyzing local communications is an intriguing and valuable research topic.

2) *Vendor Proprietary Protocols*: Most works learn information about devices by standard protocols [60, 102, 105]. However, due to security and real-time communication requirements, many manufacturers opt for proprietary or private encryption protocols based on UDP. These protocols often render standardized monitoring tools ineffective. Consequently, developing new techniques with protocol reverse engineering ability becomes essential for analyzing these protocols.

3) *Feature Optimization*: Cutting-edge research on network traffic has proposed many methods of traffic representation. For instance, Xie et al. [189] employed more robust TLS features. Bronzino et al. [190] presented a framework and system that evaluates the system-level costs of various traffic representation methods. The work by Zola et al. [191] employed a graph-based approach that addresses class imbalance issues and enhances the supervised node behavior classification. Holland et al. [192] automated various aspects of traffic analysis and introduced the tool nPrint for generating unified packet representations. In addition to these cutting-edge approaches in network traffic, a variety of feature selection optimization methods in ML could be employed, including tree-based feature importance evaluation algorithms, recursive feature elimination (RFE), LASSO, GA, etc.

C. Algorithm

1) *Open-world Problem*: Most studies we reviewed evaluate their algorithms based on lab crafted traffic datasets. However, the types and models of CIoT devices are numerous. The dataset for training the model possibly cannot cover all

CIoT devices worldwide. Thus, the model's ability to identify devices in an open world needs to be effectively verified in the future.

2) *New Types of Device*: Edge CIoT devices and multi-functional devices have not received the attention it deserves. Smart TVs, as typical edge CIoT devices, mostly feature Android-based operating systems, which could cause their traffic characteristics to be confused with the background traffic of devices such as smartphones. This overlap may obscure the intrinsic features of smart TVs. Moreover, as smart TVs add functions like voice assistants, their traffic becomes more like that of smart speakers, deepening the confusion. Therefore, analyzing the traffic of multifunctional devices, like smart TVs with voice assistance and sweeping robots that combine cameras, brings new challenges to existing algorithms focusing on single-function devices.

3) *Unified Standard Evaluation*: Our survey noted that the majority of studies lack comparative evaluations within a unified standard test environment (both dataset and algorithm), as outlined in VII-A. Unfortunately, the fragmented CIoT ecosystem results in haphazard evaluations. We recommend establishing a unified standard evaluation framework for algorithms addressing the same objective, which will significantly enhance future research.

4) *Applying New AI Techniques*: Since 2023, the success of large language models (LLM) [193], particularly ChatGPT, has attracted researchers to apply them in solving issues across various computer science domains. As AI technology rapidly advances, future researchers may seek to deploy more AI tools for diverse CIoT traffic analysis applications in the open world.

D. New Applications

CIoT is a system that involves multiple components working collaboratively. In addition to the application goals introduced in Section VI, traffic analysis could possibly provide more insight into the CIoT ecosystem. Currently, utilizing companion applications to understand CIoT devices is becoming increasingly common. Security testing and research on the device encounter limitations due to firmware not being public [194]. Therefore, certain studies have resorted to static analysis of companion applications to identify potential risks related to user data exposure [195, 196], while others employ these applications as proxies for fuzz testing [197]. We believe that the traffic of CIoT companion apps is a valuable research area for understanding the CIoT ecosystem, e.g., the supply chain ecosystem. Furthermore, existing research indicates that CIoT traffic exposes much private information. Besides the existing goals (fingerprinting device and user behaviors), the traffic could possibly be used to fingerprint more CIoT applications that expose user privacy, such as interactions with smart voice assistants and automation rules [198] (e.g., IFTTT). Studies have shown that IFTTT is vulnerable to malware streams [198, 199]. Therefore, the security of third parties who have the authority to control the device also needs to be studied urgently. Finally, traffic analysis can also help identify vulnerabilities in CIoT, as some researchers demonstrated [30, 200]. Given that recent studies have highlighted numerous security

concerns, traffic analysis of the CIoT could possibly provide more significant information to discover vulnerabilities.

Takeaways: There are several unresolved challenges and promising future directions within the four steps of the CIoT traffic analysis. The unique characteristics of the CIoT ecosystem make the traffic analysis process more complicated than that for PCs or mobile apps, while also introducing new application scenarios. Specifically, the diversity of CIoT devices and communication methods creates challenges in constructing quality datasets and processing traffic, which may cause difficulties for traffic analysis algorithms to be applied in the real world. Complex CIoT components (such as devices, apps, back-end clouds, and third-party automation services) expand the potential applications for traffic analysis, which may inspire more interesting future works in CIoT security and privacy.

VIII. CONCLUSION

We surveyed 310 papers on traffic analysis in the field of CIoT security and privacy from 52 conferences and journals of high reputation. We reviewed the literature following three research questions and answered them in the takeaways. First, we summarize the process of CIoT traffic analysis in four steps and identify new characteristics of CIoT traffic, especially the complexity of traffic collection and processing. Next, we looked at the four application goals of current studies and concluded their contributions and deficiencies based on the CIoT traffic analysis process. Finally, we summarized the challenges and pointed out future directions. Compared to general traffic analysis, heterogeneous CIoT network architectures, application scenarios, and device types present new challenges in traffic analysis. We hope to inspire more researchers to analyze the security and privacy issues of CIoT from a traffic perspective.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abdullah I. A. Alzahrani, Sajjad Hussain Chauhdary, and Abdulrahman A. Alshdadi. Internet of things (iot)-based wastewater management in smart cities. *Electronics*, 12(12), 2023.
- [2] B. Sakthi Kumar, S. Ramalingam, V. Divya, S. Amruthavarshini, and S. Dhivyashree. Lora - iot based industrial automation motor speed control monitoring system. In *2023 International Conference on Intelligent Data Communication Technologies and Internet of Things (IDCIoT)*, pages 11–15, 2023.
- [3] Youcef Guenfaf and Youcef Zafoune. An iot ml-based system for energy efficiency in smart homes. In *2023 IEEE World AI IoT Congress (AIIoT)*, pages 198–203, 2023.
- [4] Kapil Mehta, Shivang Gaur, Shubham Maheshwari, Himani Chugh, and M anibhushan Kumar. Big data analytics cloud based smart iot healthcare network. In *2023 7th International Conference on Trends in Electronics and Informatics (ICOEI)*, pages 437–443, 2023.
- [5] Philipp Wegner. Iot market size. <http://iot-analytics.com/iot-market-size/>.
- [6] Lo'ai Tawalbeh, Fadi Muheidat, Mais Tawalbeh, and Muhannad Quwaider. Iot privacy and security: Challenges and solutions. *Applied Sciences*, 10(12):4102, 2020.
- [7] Yan Jia, Bin Yuan, Luyi Xing, Dongfang Zhao, Yifan Zhang, XiaoFeng Wang, Yijing Liu, Kaimin Zheng, Peyton Crnjak, Yuqing Zhang, et al. Who's in control? on security risks of disjointed iot device management channels. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1289–1305, 2021.
- [8] Yan Jia, Luyi Xing, Yuhang Mao, Dongfang Zhao, XiaoFeng Wang, Shangru Zhao, and Yuqing Zhang. Burglars' IoT paradise: Understanding and mitigating security risks of general messaging protocols on IoT clouds. In *2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 465–481. IEEE, 2020.
- [9] Qinying Wang, Shouling Ji, Yuan Tian, Xuhong Zhang, Binbin Zhao, Yuhong Kan, Zhaowei Lin, Changting Lin, Shuiguang Deng, Alex X Liu, et al. MPInspector: A systematic and automatic approach for evaluating the security of IoT messaging protocols. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pages 4205–4222, 2021.
- [10] Pardis Emami Naeini, Sruti Bhagavatula, Hana Habib, Martin Degeling, Lujo Bauer, Lorrie Faith Cranor, and Norman Sadeh. Privacy expectations and preferences in an IoT world. In *Thirteenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS 2017)*, pages 399–412, July 2017.
- [11] Eric Zeng, Shrirang Mare, and Franziska Roesner. End user security & privacy concerns with smart homes. page 65–80, 2017.
- [12] Sunyup Park, Anna Lenhart, Michael Zimmer, and Jessica Vitak. "nobody's happy": Design insights from Privacy-Conscious smart home power users on enhancing data transparency, visibility, and control. In *Nineteenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS 2023)*, pages 543–558, August 2023.
- [13] Marco Caselli, Emmanuele Zambon, Johanna Amann, Robin Sommer, and Frank Kargl. Specification mining for intrusion detection in networked control systems. In *25th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 16)*, pages 791–806, Austin, TX, August 2016.
- [14] Arash Habibi Lashkari, Andi Fitriah A.Kadir, Hugo Gonzalez, Kenneth Fon Mbah, and Ali A. Ghorbani. Towards a network-based framework for android malware detection and characterization. In *2017 15th Annual Conference on Privacy, Security and Trust (PST)*, pages 233–23309, 2017.
- [15] Shanshan Wang, Zhenxiang Chen, Qiben Yan, Bo Yang, Lizhi Peng, and Zhongtian Jia. A mobile malware detection method using behavior features in network traffic. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, 133:15–25, 2019.
- [16] Meng Shen, Yiting Liu, Liehuang Zhu, Xiaojiang Du, and Jiankun Hu. Fine-grained webpage fingerprinting using only packet length information of encrypted traffic. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 16:2046–2059, 2021.
- [17] Meng Shen, Yiting Liu, Siqu Chen, Liehuang Zhu, and Yuchao Zhang. Webpage fingerprinting using only packet length information. In *ICC 2019 - 2019 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, pages 1–6, 2019.
- [18] Payap Sirinam, Mohsen Imani, Marc Juarez, and Matthew Wright. Deep fingerprinting: Undermining website fingerprinting defenses with deep learning. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1928–1943, 2018.
- [19] Jingjing Ren, Daniel J. Dubois, David Choffnes, Anna Maria Mandalari, Roman Kolcun, and Hamed Haddadi. Information exposure from consumer iot devices: A multidimensional, network-informed measurement approach. In *Proceedings of the Internet Measurement Conference*, page 267–279. Association for Computing Machinery, 2019.
- [20] Zhiyuan Tan, Aruna Jamdagni, Xiangjian He, Priyadarsi Nanda, and Ren Ping Liu. A system for denial-of-service attack detection based on multivariate correlation analysis. *IEEE transactions on parallel and distributed systems*, 25(2):447–456, 2013.
- [21] Cristian Estan and George Varghese. New directions in traffic measurement and accounting: Focusing on the elephants, ignoring the mice. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems (TOCS)*, 21(3):270–313, 2003.
- [22] Netflow, Wikipedia. <https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=NetFlow&oldid=1162816911>, 2023.
- [23] Sflow, Wikipedia. <https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=SFlow&oldid=1146666807>, 2023.
- [24] Luca Deri and Daniele Sartiano. Using dpi and statistical analysis in encrypted network traffic monitoring. *International Journal for Information Security Research*, 10:932–943, 12 2020.
- [25] Jafar Alzubi, Anand Nayyar, and Akshi Kumar. Machine learning from theory to algorithms: an overview. In *Journal of physics: conference series*, volume 1142, page 012012, 2018.
- [26] Arthur L Samuel. Some studies in machine learning using the game of checkers. *IBM Journal of research and development*, 3(3):210–229, 1959.
- [27] Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey Hinton. Deep learning. *nature*, 521(7553):436–444, 2015.
- [28] Christopher John Cornish Hellaby Watkins. Learning from delayed

- rewards. 1989.
- [29] Chenxin Duan, Sainan Li, Hai Lin, Wenqi Chen, Guanglei Song, Chenglong Li, Jiahai Yang, and Zhiliang Wang. Iota: Fine-grained traffic monitoring for iot devices via fully packet-level models. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 2023.
 - [30] Fathima James, Indrajit Ray, and Deep Medhi. Worst attack vulnerability and fortification for iot security management: An approach and an illustration for smart home iot. In *NOMS 2023-2023 IEEE/IFIP Network Operations and Management Symposium*, pages 1–6, 2023.
 - [31] Batyr Charyyev and Mehmet Hadi Gunes. Locality-sensitive iot network traffic fingerprinting for device identification. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 8(3):1272–1281, 2021.
 - [32] Batyr Charyyev and Mehmet Hadi Gunes. Iot traffic flow identification using locality sensitive hashes. In *ICC 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, pages 1–6, 2020.
 - [33] Mohamed Seliem, Khalid Elgazzar, and Kasem Khalil. Towards privacy preserving iot environments: a survey. *Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing*, 2018:1–15, 2018.
 - [34] Sanonda Gupta and Sepideh Ghanavati. Privacy in the internet of things: Where do we stand? a systematic literature review. 2022.
 - [35] Igor Zavalysyn, Axel Legay, Annanda Rath, and Etienne Rivière. Sok: Privacy-enhancing smart home hubs. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, 4:24–43, 2022.
 - [36] Omar Alrawi, Chaz Lever, Manos Antonakakis, and Fabian Monrose. Sok: Security evaluation of home-based iot deployments. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1362–1380, 2019.
 - [37] Nasr Abosata, Saba Al-Rubaye, Gokhan Inalhan, and Christos Emmanouilidis. Internet of things for system integrity: A comprehensive survey on security, attacks and countermeasures for industrial applications. *Sensors*, 21(11):3654, 2021.
 - [38] Zhibo Wang, Defang Liu, Yunan Sun, Xiaoyi Pang, Peng Sun, Feng Lin, John CS Lui, and Kui Ren. A survey on iot-enabled home automation systems: Attacks and defenses. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 2022.
 - [39] Eva Papadogiannaki and Sotiris Ioannidis. A survey on encrypted network traffic analysis applications, techniques, and countermeasures. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 54(6):1–35, 2021.
 - [40] Meng Shen, Ke Ye, Xingtong Liu, Liehuang Zhu, Jiawen Kang, Shui Yu, Qi Li, and Ke Xu. Machine learning-powered encrypted network traffic analysis: a comprehensive survey. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 2022.
 - [41] Amin Shahraki, Mahmood Abbasi, Amir Taherkordi, and Anca Delia Jurcut. A comparative study on online machine learning techniques for network traffic streams analysis. *Computer Networks*, 207:108836, 2022.
 - [42] Nate Mathews, James K Holland, Se Eun Oh, Mohammad Saidur Rahman, Nicholas Hopper, and Matthew Wright. Sok: A critical evaluation of efficient website fingerprinting defenses. In *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 969–986, 2023.
 - [43] Ashutosh Bhatia, Ankit Agrawala, Ayush Bahuguna, Kamlesh Tiwaria, K Haribabua, and Deepak Vishwakarmab. A survey on analyzing encrypted network traffic of mobile devices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.12352*, 2020.
 - [44] Pedro Miguel Sánchez Sánchez, Jose Maria Jorquera Valero, Alberto Huertas Celdrán, Jérôme Bovet, Manuel Gil Pérez, and Gregorio Martínez Pérez. A survey on device behavior fingerprinting: Data sources, techniques, application scenarios, and datasets. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 23(2):1048–1077, 2021.
 - [45] Houda Jmila, Gregory Blanc, Mustafizur R Shahid, and Marwan Lazrag. A survey of smart home iot device classification using machine learning-based network traffic analysis. *IEEE Access*, 10:97117–97141, 2022.
 - [46] Hamid Tahaei, Firdaus Afifi, Adeleh Asemi, Faiz Zaki, and Nor Badrul Anuar. The rise of traffic classification in iot networks: A survey. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, 154:102538, 2020.
 - [47] Guofei Gu. Computer security conference ranking and statistic. https://people.engr.tamu.edu/guofei/sec_conf_stat.htm.
 - [48] Jianying Zhou. Top cyber security conferences ranking. <http://jianying.space/conference-ranking.html>.
 - [49] TH-CPL, Tsinghua university computer science group recommended academic conferences and journals list. <http://numbda.cs.tsinghua.edu.cn/~yuwj/TH-CPL.pdf>, 2019.
 - [50] Directory of international academic conferences and journals recommended by the China Computer Federation. http://www.ccf.org.cn/Academic_Evaluation/By_category/, 2023.
 - [51] Nickolaos Koroniotis, Nour Moustafa, Elena Sitnikova, and Benjamin Turnbull. Towards the development of realistic botnet dataset in the internet of things for network forensic analytics: Bot-iot dataset. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 100:779–796, 2019.
 - [52] Keyi Zhang and Alan Marchiori. Crowdsourcing low-power wide-area iot networks. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Pervasive Computing and Communications (PerCom)*, pages 41–49, 2017.
 - [53] Xiaoying Gan, Yuqing Li, Yixuan Huang, Luoyi Fu, and Xinbing Wang. When crowdsourcing meets social iot: An efficient privacy-preserving incentive mechanism. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 6(6):9707–9721, 2019.
 - [54] François De Keersmaecker, Yanan Cao, Gorby Kabasele Ndonda, and Ramin Sadre. A survey of public iot datasets for network security research. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 25(3):1808–1840, 2023.
 - [55] Andrew Moore, Denis Zuev, and Michael Crogan. Discriminators for use in flow-based classification. Technical report, 2013.
 - [56] Cicflowmeter. <http://github.com/ahlashkari/CICFlowMeter>.
 - [57] Zeek. <http://docs.zeek.org/en/its/>, 2024.
 - [58] Joy. <http://github.com/cisco/joy>.
 - [59] Dilawer Ahmed, Anupam Das, and Fareed Zaffar. Analyzing the feasibility and generalizability of fingerprinting internet of things devices. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, 2022(2).
 - [60] Roberto Perdisci, Thomas Papastogiou, Omar Alrawi, and Manos Antonakakis. Iotfinder: Efficient large-scale identification of iot devices via passive dns traffic analysis. In *2020 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*, pages 474–489, 2020.
 - [61] Arunan Sivanathan, Hassan Habibi Gharakheili, Franco Loi, Adam Radford, Chamith Wijenayake, Arun Vishwanath, and Vijay Sivaraman. Classifying iot devices in smart environments using network traffic characteristics. *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, 18(8):1745–1759, 2019.
 - [62] Rahmadi Trimananda, Janus Varmarken, Athina Markopoulou, and Brian Demsky. Packet-level signatures for smart home devices. In *Network and Distributed Systems Security (NDSS) Symposium*, volume 2020, 2020.
 - [63] Daniel Campos and TJ OConnor. Towards labeling on-demand iot traffic. In *Cyber Security Experimentation and Test Workshop*, pages 49–57, 2021.
 - [64] Markus Miettinen, Samuel Marchal, Ibbad Hafeez, N Asokan, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, and Sasu Tarkoma. Iot sentinel: Automated device-type identification for security enforcement in iot. In *2017 IEEE 37th international conference on distributed computing systems (ICDCS)*, pages 2177–2184, 2017.
 - [65] Guru Bhandari, Andreas Lyth, Andrii Shalaginov, and Tor-Morten Grønli. Distributed deep neural-network-based middleware for cyber-attacks detection in smart iot ecosystem: A novel framework and performance evaluation approach. *Electronics*, 12(2):298, 2023.
 - [66] Yair Meidan, Michael Bohadana, Yael Mathov, Yisroel Mirsky, Asaf Shabtai, Dominik Breitenbacher, and Yuval Elovici. N-baiot—network-based detection of iot botnet attacks using deep autoencoders. *IEEE Pervasive Computing*, 17(3):12–22, 2018.
 - [67] Danny Yuxing Huang, Noah Aporthe, Frank Li, Gunes Acar, and Nick Feamster. Iot inspector: Crowdsourcing labeled network traffic from smart home devices at scale. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies*, 4(2):1–21, 2020.
 - [68] Mahbod Tavallaee, Ebrahim Bagheri, Wei Lu, and Ali A Ghorbani. A detailed analysis of the kdd cup 99 data set. In *2009 IEEE symposium on computational intelligence for security and defense applications*, pages 1–6, 2009.
 - [69] Iqbal H Sarker. Machine learning: Algorithms, real-world applications and research directions. *SN computer science*, 2(3):160, 2021.
 - [70] Diogo V Carvalho, Eduardo M Pereira, and Jaime S Cardoso. Machine learning interpretability: A survey on methods and metrics. *Electronics*, 8(8):832, 2019.
 - [71] S.R. Safavian and D. Landgrebe. A survey of decision tree classifier methodology. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, 21(3):660–674, 1991.
 - [72] Corinna Cortes and Vladimir Vapnik. Support-vector networks. *Machine learning*, 20:273–297, 1995.
 - [73] Leo Breiman. Random forests. *Machine learning*, 45:5–32, 2001.
 - [74] Thomas Cover and Peter Hart. Nearest neighbor pattern classification. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 13(1):21–27, 1967.
 - [75] Kunihiko Fukushima. Neocognitron: A self-organizing neural network model for a mechanism of pattern recognition unaffected by shift in position. *Biological cybernetics*, 36(4):193–202, 1980.
 - [76] Franco Scarselli, Marco Gori, Ah Chung Tsoi, Markus Hagenbuchner, and Gabriele Monfardini. The graph neural network model. *IEEE transactions on neural networks*, 20(1):61–80, 2008.

- [77] Zachary C Lipton, John Berkowitz, and Charles Elkan. A critical review of recurrent neural networks for sequence learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.00019*, 2015.
- [78] Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 9(8):1735–1780, 1997.
- [79] Hao Sun, Lei Han, Rui Yang, Xiaoteng Ma, Jian Guo, and Bolei Zhou. Exploit reward shifting in value-based deep-rl: Optimistic curiosity-based exploration and conservative exploitation via linear reward shaping. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:37719–37734, 2022.
- [80] Kai Arulkumaran, Marc Peter Deisenroth, Miles Brundage, and Anil Anthony Bharath. A brief survey of deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.05866*, 2017.
- [81] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Alex Graves, Ioannis Antonoglou, Daan Wierstra, and Martin Riedmiller. Playing atari with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.5602*, 2013.
- [82] Martin Roesch et al. Snort: Lightweight intrusion detection for networks. In *Lisa*, volume 99, pages 229–238, 1999.
- [83] Vinod Kumar and Om Prakash Sangwan. Signature based intrusion detection system using snort. *International Journal of Computer Applications & Information Technology*, 1(3):35–41, 2012.
- [84] Xuan Feng, Qiang Li, Haining Wang, and Limin Sun. Acquisitional rule-based engine for discovering Internet-of-Things devices. In *27th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 18)*, pages 327–341, August 2018.
- [85] Anat Bremner-Barr, Haim Levy, and Zohar Yakhini. Iot or not: Identifying iot devices in a short time scale. In *NOMS 2020 - 2020 IEEE/IFIP Network Operations and Management Symposium*, pages 1–9, 2020.
- [86] Franck Le, Jorge Ortiz, Dinesh Verma, and Dilip Kandlur. Policy-based identification of iot devices' vendor and type by dns traffic analysis. *Policy-Based Autonomic Data Governance*, pages 180–201, 2019.
- [87] Vijay Prakash, Sicheng Xie, and Danny Yuxing Huang. Inferring software update practices on smart home iot devices through user agent analysis. page 93–103. Association for Computing Machinery, 2022.
- [88] Yair Meidan, Michael Bohadana, Asaf Shabtai, Juan David Guarnizo, Martín Ochoa, Nils Ole Tippenhauer, and Yuval Elovici. Profiliot: A machine learning approach for iot device identification based on network traffic analysis. In *Proceedings of the Symposium on Applied Computing*, page 506–509, 2017.
- [89] Rajib Ranjan Maiti, Sandra Siby, Ragav Sridharan, and Nils Ole Tippenhauer. Link-layer device type classification on encrypted wireless traffic with cots radios. In Simon N. Foley, Dieter Gollmann, and Einar Snekkenes, editors, *Computer Security – ESORICS 2017*, pages 247–264, 2017.
- [90] Arunan Sivanathan, Daniel Sherratt, Hassan Habibi Gharakheili, Adam Radford, Chamith Wijenayake, Arun Vishwanath, and Vijay Sivaraman. Characterizing and classifying iot traffic in smart cities and campuses. In *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Communications Workshops (INFOCOM WKSHPS)*, pages 559–564, 2017.
- [91] Hang Guo and John Heidemann. Ip-based iot device detection. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Workshop on IoT Security and Privacy*, page 36–42. Association for Computing Machinery, 2018.
- [92] Lei Bai, Lina Yao, Salil S. Kanhere, Xianzhi Wang, and Zheng Yang. Automatic device classification from network traffic streams of internet of things. In *2018 IEEE 43rd Conference on Local Computer Networks (LCN)*, pages 1–9, 2018.
- [93] Matias R. P. Santos, Rossana M. C. Andrade, Danielo G. Gomes, and Arthur C. Callado. An efficient approach for device identification and traffic classification in iot ecosystems. In *2018 IEEE Symposium on Computers and Communications (ISCC)*, pages 304–309, 2018.
- [94] Jorge Ortiz, Catherine Crawford, and Franck Le. Devicemien: Network device behavior modeling for identifying unknown iot devices. page 106–117, 2019.
- [95] Nizar Msadek, Ridha Soua, and Thomas Engel. Iot device fingerprinting: Machine learning based encrypted traffic analysis. In *2019 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC)*, pages 1–8, 2019.
- [96] Antônio J. Pinheiro, Jeandro de M. Bezerra, Caio A.P. Burgardt, and Divanilson R. Campelo. Identifying iot devices and events based on packet length from encrypted traffic. *Computer Communications*, 144: 8–17, 2019.
- [97] Vijayanand Thangavelu, Dinil Mon Divakaran, Rishi Sairam, Suman Sankar Bhunia, and Mohan Gurusamy. Deft: A distributed iot fingerprinting technique. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 6(1): 940–952, 2019.
- [98] Ahmet Aksoy and Mehmet Hadi Gunes. Automated iot device identification using network traffic. In *ICC 2019 - 2019 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, pages 1–7, 2019.
- [99] Samuel Marchal, Markus Miettinen, Thien Duc Nguyen, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, and N. Asokan. Audi: Toward autonomous iot device-type identification using periodic communication. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 37(6):1402–1412, 2019.
- [100] Shuaik Dong, Zhou Li, Di Tang, Jiongyi Chen, Menghan Sun, and Kehuan Zhang. Your smart home can't keep a secret: Towards automated fingerprinting of iot traffic. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, page 47–59. Association for Computing Machinery, 2020.
- [101] Leonardo Babun, Hidayet Aksu, Lucas Ryan, Kemal Akkaya, Elizabeth S. Bentley, and A. Selcuk Uluagac. Z-iot: Passive device-class fingerprinting of zigbee and z-wave iot devices. In *ICC 2020 - 2020 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, pages 1–7, 2020.
- [102] Lingying Yu, Bo Luo, Jun Ma, Zhaoyu Zhou, and Qingyun Liu. You are what you broadcast: Identification of mobile and IoT devices from (public) WiFi. In *29th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 20)*, pages 55–72, August 2020.
- [103] Hang Guo and John Heidemann. Detecting iot devices in the internet. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 28(5):2323–2336, 2020.
- [104] Nesrine Ammar, Ludovic Noirie, and Sebastien Tixeul. Autonomous identification of iot device types based on a supervised classification. In *ICC 2020 - 2020 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, pages 1–6, 2020.
- [105] Said Jawad Saidi, Anna Maria Mandalari, Roman Kolcun, Hamed Haddadi, Daniel J. Dubois, David Choffnes, Georgios Smaragdakis, and Anja Feldmann. A haystack full of needles: Scalable detection of iot devices in the wild. In *Proceedings of the ACM Internet Measurement Conference*, page 87–100. Association for Computing Machinery, 2020.
- [106] Biswadeep Chakraborty, Dinil Mon Divakaran, Ido Nevat, Gareth W Peters, and Mohan Gurusamy. Cost-aware feature selection for iot device classification. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 8(14):11052–11064, 2021.
- [107] Hidayet Aksu, A. Selcuk Uluagac, and Elizabeth S. Bentley. Identification of wearable devices with bluetooth. *IEEE Transactions on Sustainable Computing*, 6(2):221–230, 2021.
- [108] Janus Varmarken, Jad Al Aaraj, Rahmadi Trimnanda, and Athina Markopoulou. Fingerprinttv: Fingerprinting smart tv apps. In *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies (PoPETs)*, volume 2022, pages 606–629, 2022.
- [109] Ruizhong Du, Jingze Wang, and Shuang Li. A lightweight flow feature-based iot device identification scheme. *Security and Communication Networks*, 2022:1–10, 2022.
- [110] Xiaobo Ma, Jian Qu, Jianfeng Li, John C. S. Lui, Zhenhua Li, Wenmao Liu, and Xiaohong Guan. Inferring hidden iot devices and user interactions via spatial-temporal traffic fingerprinting. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 30(1):394–408, 2022.
- [111] Kahraman Kostas, Mike Just, and Michael A. Lones. Iotdevid: A behavior-based device identification method for the iot. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 9(23):23741–23749, 2022.
- [112] Sarvesh Sanjay Wanode, Milind Anand, and Barsha Mitra. Optimal feature set selection for iot device fingerprinting on edge infrastructure using machine intelligence. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2022-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications Workshops (INFOCOM WKSHPS)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2022.
- [113] TJ OConnor, Reham Mohamed, Markus Miettinen, William Enck, Bradley Reeves, and Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi. Homesnitch: Behavior transparency and control for smart home iot devices. In *Proceedings of the 12th conference on security and privacy in wireless and mobile networks*, pages 128–138, 2019.
- [114] Abbas Acar, Hossein Fereidooni, Tigist Abera, Amit Kumar Sikder, Markus Miettinen, Hidayet Aksu, Mauro Conti, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, and Selcuk Uluagac. Peek-a-boo: I see your smart home activities, even encrypted! In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Conference on Security and Privacy in Wireless and Mobile Networks*, pages 207–218, 2020.
- [115] Batyr Charyyev and Mehmet Hadi Gunes. Iot event classification based on network traffic. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2020-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications Workshops (INFOCOM WKSHPS)*, pages 854–859, 2020.
- [116] Tianbo Gu, Zheng Fang, Allaukik Abhishek, Hao Fu, Pengfei Hu, and Prasant Mohapatra. Iotgaze: Iot security enforcement via wireless context analysis. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2020-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, pages 884–893, 2020.

- [117] Chenxin Duan, Shize Zhang, Jiahai Yang, Zhiliang Wang, Yang Yang, and Jia Li. Pinball: Universal and robust signature extraction for smart home devices. In *2021 IFIP/IEEE International Symposium on Integrated Network Management (IM)*, pages 1–9, 2021.
- [118] Yinxi Wan, Kuai Xu, Feng Wang, and Guoliang Xue. Totathena: Unveiling iot device activities from network traffic. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 21(1):651–664, 2021.
- [119] Narmeen Shafiq, Daniel J Dubois, David Choffnes, Aaron Schulman, Dinesh Bharadia, and Aanjan Ranganathan. Zleaks: Passive inference attacks on zigbee based smart homes. In *International Conference on Applied Cryptography and Network Security*, pages 105–125, 2022.
- [120] Dilawer Ahmed, Afaq Sabir, and Anupam Das. Spying through your voice assistants: Realistic voice command fingerprinting. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*, pages 2419–2436, August 2023.
- [121] Noah Aporthe, Dillon Reisman, Srikanth Sundaresan, Arvind Narayanan, and Nick Feamster. Spying on the smart home: Privacy attacks and defenses on encrypted iot traffic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.05044*, 2017.
- [122] Noah Aporthe, Dillon Reisman, and Nick Feamster. A smart home is no castle: Privacy vulnerabilities of encrypted iot traffic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.06805*, 2017.
- [123] Parents horrified they were spied on 377 times through security camera. <http://www.insideedition.com/media/videos/parents-horrified-they-were-spied-on-377-times-through-security-camera-62055>.
- [124] Akash Deep Singh, Luis Garcia, Joseph Noor, and Mani Srivastava. I always feel like somebody’s sensing me! a framework to detect, identify, and localize clandestine wireless sensors. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pages 1829–1846. USENIX Association, August 2021.
- [125] Hong Li, Yunhua He, Limin Sun, Xiuzhen Cheng, and Jiguo Yu. Side-channel information leakage of encrypted video stream in video surveillance systems. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2016-The 35th Annual IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications*, pages 1–9, 2016.
- [126] Yushi Cheng, Xiaoyu Ji, Tianyang Lu, and Wenyan Xu. Dewicam: Detecting hidden wireless cameras via smartphones. In *Proceedings of the 2018 on Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1–13, 2018.
- [127] Kevin Wu and Brent Lagesse. Do you see what i see? detecting hidden streaming cameras through similarity of simultaneous observation. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Pervasive Computing and Communications (PerCom)*, pages 1–10, 2019.
- [128] Akash Deep Singh, Luis Garcia, Joseph Noor, and Mani Srivastava. I always feel like somebody’s sensing me! a framework to detect, identify, and localize clandestine wireless sensors. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pages 1829–1846, 2021.
- [129] Rahul Anand Sharma, Elahe Soltanaghahi, Anthony Rowe, and Vyas Sekar. Lumos: Identifying and localizing diverse hidden {IoT} devices in an unfamiliar environment. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, pages 1095–1112, 2022.
- [130] Lixin Shi, Paramvir Bahl, and Dina Katabi. Beyond sensing: {Multi-GHz} real-time spectrum analytics. In *12th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 15)*, pages 159–172, 2015.
- [131] Edward W Felten and Michael A Schneider. Timing attacks on web privacy. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 25–32, 2000.
- [132] Mauro Conti, Luigi Vincenzo Mancini, Riccardo Spolaor, and Nino Vincenzo Verde. Analyzing android encrypted network traffic to identify user actions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 11(1):114–125, 2015.
- [133] Madushi Hasara Pathmaperuma, Yogachandran Rahulamathavan, Safak Dogan, and Ahmet M. Kondo. User mobile app encrypted activity detection. In *The 2nd European Symposium on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 7–13, 2021.
- [134] Yinxi Wan, Kuai Xu, Feng Wang, and Guoliang Xue. Iotmosaic: Inferring user activities from iot network traffic in smart homes. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2022-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, pages 370–379, 2022.
- [135] Tianbo Gu, Zheng Fang, Allaukik Abhishek, and Prasant Mohapatra. Iotspy: Uncovering human privacy leakage in iot networks via mining wireless context. In *2020 IEEE 31st Annual International Symposium on Personal, Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications*, pages 1–7, 2020.
- [136] Alanoud Subahi and George Theodorakopoulos. Detecting iot user behavior and sensitive information in encrypted iot-app traffic. *Sensors*, 19(21):4777, 2019.
- [137] Ryan Heartfield, George Loukas, Anatolij Bezemskij, and Emmanouil Panaousis. Self-configurable cyber-physical intrusion detection for smart homes using reinforcement learning. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 16:1720–1735, 2020.
- [138] Eirini Anthei, Lowri Williams, Małgorzata Słowińska, George Theodorakopoulos, and Pete Burnap. A supervised intrusion detection system for smart home iot devices. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 6(5): 9042–9053, 2019.
- [139] Yinxi Wan, Kuai Xu, Guoliang Xue, and Feng Wang. Iotargos: A multi-layer security monitoring system for internet-of-things in smart homes. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2020 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, pages 874–883, 2020.
- [140] Aditya Kumar Pathak, Saguna Saguna, Karan Mitra, and Christer Åhlund. Anomaly detection using machine learning to discover sensor tampering in iot systems. In *ICC 2021 - IEEE International Conference on Communications*, pages 1–6, 2021.
- [141] Ege Tekiner, Abbas Acar, and A Selcuk Uluagac. A lightweight iot cryptojacking detection mechanism in heterogeneous smart home networks. In *Proc. of the ISOC Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS)*, 2022.
- [142] Wei Zhang, Yan Meng, Yugeng Liu, Xiaokuan Zhang, Yinqian Zhang, and Haojin Zhu. Homonit: Monitoring smart home apps from encrypted traffic. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1074–1088, 2018.
- [143] Batyr Charyyev and Mehmet Hadi Gunes. Detecting anomalous iot traffic flow with locality sensitive hashes. In *GLOBECOM 2020-2020 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, pages 1–6, 2020.
- [144] Jianliang Wu, Yuhong Nan, Vireshwar Kumar, Mathias Payer, and Dongyan Xu. BlueShield: Detecting spoofing attacks in bluetooth low energy networks. In *23rd International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses (RAID 2020)*, pages 397–411, San Sebastian, October 2020.
- [145] Ramjee Prasad, Vandana Rohokale, Ramjee Prasad, and Vandana Rohokale. Cyber threats and attack overview. *Cyber Security: The Lifeline of Information and Communication Technology*, pages 15–31, 2020.
- [146] Manos Antonakakis, Tim April, Michael Bailey, Matt Bernhard, Elie Bursztein, Jaime Cochran, Zakir Durumeric, J Alex Halderman, Luca Invernizzi, Michalis Kallitsis, et al. Understanding the mirai botnet. In *26th USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 17)*, pages 1093–1110, 2017.
- [147] Celil OKUR and Murat DENER. Detecting iot botnet attacks using machine learning methods. In *2020 International Conference on Information Security and Cryptology (ISCTURKEY)*, pages 31–37, 2020.
- [148] Owen P. Dwyer, Angelos K. Marnierides, Vasileios Giotsas, and Troy Mursch. Profiling iot-based botnet traffic using dns. In *2019 IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM)*, pages 1–6, 2019.
- [149] Muhammad Shafiq, Zhihong Tian, Ali Kashif Bashir, Xiaojiang Du, and Mohsen Guizani. Corrauc: A malicious bot-iot traffic detection method in iot network using machine-learning techniques. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 8(5):3242–3254, 2021.
- [150] Keval Doshi, Yasin Yilmaz, and Suleyman Uludag. Timely detection and mitigation of stealthy ddos attacks via iot networks. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 18(5):2164–2176, 2021.
- [151] Sadegh Torabi, Elias Bou-Harb, Chadi Assi, ElMouatez Billah Karbab, Amine Boukhtouta, and Mourad Debbabi. Inferring and investigating iot-generated scanning campaigns targeting a large network telescope. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 19(1):402–418, 2022.
- [152] Ren-Hung Hwang, Min-Chun Peng, and Chien-Wei Huang. Detecting iot malicious traffic based on autoencoder and convolutional neural network. In *2019 IEEE Globecom Workshops (GC Wkshps)*, pages 1–6, 2019.
- [153] Mert Nakip and Erol Gelenbe. Mirai botnet attack detection with auto-associative dense random neural network. In *2021 IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM)*, pages 1–6, 2021.
- [154] Jeeyung Kim, Alex Sim, Jinoh Kim, and Kesheng Wu. Botnet detection using recurrent variational autoencoder. In *GLOBECOM 2020 - 2020 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, pages 1–6, 2020.
- [155] Thien Duc Nguyen, Samuel Marchal, Markus Miettinen, Hossein Fereidooni, N Asokan, and Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi. Diot: A federated self-learning anomaly detection system for iot. In *2019 IEEE 39th International conference on distributed computing systems (ICDCS)*, pages 756–767, 2019.

- [156] Takayuki Nishio, Masataka Nakahara, Norihiro Okui, Ayumu Kubota, Yasuaki Kobayashi, Keizo Sugiyama, and Ryoichi Shinkuma. Anomaly traffic detection with federated learning toward network-based malware detection in iot. In *GLOBECOM 2022 - 2022 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, pages 299–304, 2022.
- [157] Ruijie Zhao, Linbo Yang, Yijun Wang, Zhi Xue, Guan Gui, and Tomoaki Ohtsuki. A semi-supervised federated learning scheme via knowledge distillation for intrusion detection. In *ICC 2022 - IEEE International Conference on Communications*, pages 2688–2693, 2022.
- [158] Omar Elghalhoud, Kshirasagar Naik, Marzia Zaman, and Ricardo Manzano S. Data balancing and cnn based network intrusion detection system. In *2023 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC)*, pages 1–6, 2023.
- [159] Jiulun Zhang, Shicong Liang, Feng Ye, Rose Qingyang Hu, and Yi Qian. Towards detection of zero-day botnet attack in iot networks using federated learning. In *ICC 2023-IEEE International Conference on Communications*, pages 7–12, 2023.
- [160] Segun I. Popoola, Ruth Ande, Bamidele Adebisi, Guan Gui, Mohammad Hammoudeh, and Olamide Jogunola. Federated deep learning for zero-day botnet attack detection in iot-edge devices. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 9(5):3930–3944, 2022.
- [161] Yantian Luo, Xu Chen, Ning Ge, Wei Feng, and Jianhua Lu. Transformer-based malicious traffic detection for internet of things. In *ICC 2022 - IEEE International Conference on Communications*, pages 4187–4192, 2022.
- [162] Giampaolo Bovenzi, Giuseppe Aceto, Domenico Ciuonzo, Valerio Persico, and Antonio Pescapé. A hierarchical hybrid intrusion detection approach in iot scenarios. In *GLOBECOM 2020-2020 IEEE global communications conference*, pages 1–7, 2020.
- [163] Tian Zixu, Kushan Sudheera Kalupahana Liyanage, and Mohan Gurusamy. Generative adversarial network and auto encoder based anomaly detection in distributed iot networks. In *GLOBECOM 2020-2020 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, pages 1–7, 2020.
- [164] Segun I Popoola, Bamidele Adebisi, Mohammad Hammoudeh, Guan Gui, and Haris Gacanin. Hybrid deep learning for botnet attack detection in the internet-of-things networks. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 8(6):4944–4956, 2020.
- [165] Phai Vu Dinh, Nguyen Quang Uy, Diep N Nguyen, Dinh Thai Hoang, Son Pham Bao, and Eryk Dutkiewicz. Twin variational auto-encoder for representation learning in iot intrusion detection. In *2022 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC)*, pages 848–853, 2022.
- [166] Andy Reed, Laurence S Dooley, and Soraya Kouadri Mostefaoui. A reliable real-time slow dos detection framework for resource-constrained iot networks. In *2021 IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM)*, pages 1–6, 2021.
- [167] Roshan Baby, Zahra Pooranian, Mohammad Shojafar, and Rahim Tafazzoli. A heterogenous iot attack detection through deep reinforcement learning: A dynamic ml approach. In *ICC 2023 - IEEE International Conference on Communications*, pages 479–484, 2023.
- [168] Nasimul Hasan, Zhenxiang Chen, Chuan Zhao, Yuhui Zhu, and Cong Liu. Iot botnet detection framework from network behavior based on extreme learning machine. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2022 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications Workshops (INFOCOM WKSHPS)*, pages 1–6, 2022.
- [169] Poulmanogo Illy, Georges Kaddoum, Christian Miranda Moreira, Kuljeet Kaur, and Sahil Garg. Securing fog-to-things environment using intrusion detection system based on ensemble learning. In *2019 IEEE wireless communications and networking conference (WCNC)*, pages 1–7, 2019.
- [170] Ibbad Hafeez, Markku Antikainen, Aaron Yi Ding, and Sasu Tarkoma. Iot-keeper: Detecting malicious iot network activity using online traffic analysis at the edge. *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, 17(1):45–59, 2020.
- [171] Han Wang, Luis Muñoz-González, David Eklund, and Shahid Raza. Non-iid data re-balancing at iot edge with peer-to-peer federated learning for anomaly detection. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM Conference on Security and Privacy in Wireless and Mobile Networks*, pages 153–163, 2021.
- [172] Ke Zhou, Xi Lin, Jun Wu, Ali Kashif Bashir, Jianhua Li, and Muhammad Imran. Metric learning-based few-shot malicious node detection for iot backhaul/fronthaul networks. In *GLOBECOM 2022-2022 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, pages 5777–5782, 2022.
- [173] Deepak Kumar, Kelly Shen, Benton Case, Deepali Garg, Galina Alperovich, Dmitry Kuznetsov, Rajarshi Gupta, and Zakir Durumeric. All things considered: An analysis of iot devices on home networks. In *28th USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 19)*, pages 1169–1185, 2019.
- [174] Stephen Herwig, Katura Harvey, George Hughey, Richard Roberts, and Dave Levin. Measurement and analysis of hajime, a peer-to-peer iot botnet. In *Network and Distributed Systems Security (NDSS) Symposium*, 2019.
- [175] Muhammad Talha Paracha, Daniel J Dubois, Narseo Vallina-Rodriguez, and David Choffnes. Iotls: understanding tls usage in consumer iot devices. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Internet Measurement Conference*, pages 165–178, 2021.
- [176] Arman Noroozian, Elsa Turcios Rodriguez, Elmer Lastdrager, Takahiro Kasama, Michel Van Eeten, and Carlos H Gañán. Can isps help mitigate iot malware? a longitudinal study of broadband isp security efforts. In *2021 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*, pages 337–352. IEEE, 2021.
- [177] Said Jawad Saidi, Srdjan Matic, Oliver Gasser, Georgios Smaragdakis, and Anja Feldmann. Deep dive into the iot backend ecosystem. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM internet measurement conference*, pages 488–503, 2022.
- [178] Hatem A Almazraqi, Mathew Woodyard, Troy Mursch, Dimitrios Pezaros, and Angelos K Marnerides. Macroscopic analysis of iot botnets. In *GLOBECOM 2022-2022 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, pages 2674–2679, 2022.
- [179] Daniel J. Dubois, Roman Kolcun, Anna Maria Mandalari, Muhammad Talha Paracha, David Choffnes, and Hamed Haddadi. When Speakers Are All Ears: Characterizing Misactivations of IoT Smart Speakers. In *Proc. of the Privacy Enhancing Technologies Symposium (PETS)*, 2020.
- [180] Jinyang Li, Zhenyu Li, Gareth Tyson, and Gaogang Xie. Your privilege gives your privacy away: An analysis of a home security camera service. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2020-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, pages 387–396, 2020.
- [181] Anna Maria Mandalari, Daniel J. Dubois, Roman Kolcun, Muhammad Talha Paracha, Hamed Haddadi, and David Choffnes. Blocking without Breaking: Identification and Mitigation of Non-Essential IoT Traffic. In *Proc. of the Privacy Enhancing Technologies Symposium (PETS)*, 2021.
- [182] Umar Iqbal, Pouneh Nikkhal Bahrami, Rahmadi Trimnanda, Hao Cui, Alexander Gamero-Garrido, Daniel J. Dubois, David Choffnes, Athina Markopoulou, Franziska Roesner, and Zubair Shafiq. Tracking, profiling, and ad targeting in the alexa echo smart speaker ecosystem. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM on Internet Measurement Conference*, page 569–583. Association for Computing Machinery, 2023.
- [183] Aniketh Girish, Tianrui Hu, Vijay Prakash, Daniel J. Dubois, Srdjan Matic, Danny Yuxing Huang, Serge Egelman, Joel Reardon, Juan Tapiador, David Choffnes, and Narseo Vallina-Rodriguez. In the Room Where It Happens: Characterizing Local Communication and Threats in Smart Homes. In *Proc. of the Internet Measurement Conference (IMC'23)*, 2023.
- [184] Monica Kowalczyk, Johanna Gunawan, David Choffnes, Daniel Dubois, Woodrow Hartzog, and Christo Wilson. Understanding Dark Patterns in Home IoT Devices. In *Proceedings of ACM Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI 2023)*, Hamburg, Germany, April 2023.
- [185] Anna Maria Mandalari, Hamed Haddadi, Daniel J. Dubois, and David Choffnes. Protected or Porous: A Comparative Analysis of Threat Detection Capability of IoT Safeguards. In *Proc. of the 44th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (Oakland 2023)*, 2023.
- [186] Esraa Alomari, Selvakumar Manickam, BB Gupta, Parminder Singh, and Mohammed Anbar. Design, deployment and use of http-based botnet (hbb) testbed. In *16th International Conference on Advanced Communication Technology*, pages 1265–1269, 2014.
- [187] Chunghan Lee, Hirotake Abe, Toshio Hirotsu, and Kyoji Umemura. Traffic anomaly analysis and characteristics on a virtualized network testbed. *IEICE TRANSACTIONS on Information and Systems*, 94(12): 2353–2361, 2011.
- [188] Marta Catillo, Antonio Pecchia, and Umberto Villano. Machine learning on public intrusion datasets: Academic hype or concrete advances in nids? In *2023 53rd Annual IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks-Supplemental Volume (DSN-S)*, pages 132–136, 2023.
- [189] Renjie Xie, Yixiao Wang, Jiahao Cao, Enhuan Dong, Mingwei Xu, Kun Sun, Qi Li, Licheng Shen, and Menghao Zhang. Rosetta: Enabling robust tls encrypted traffic classification in diverse network environments with tcp-aware traffic augmentation. In *Proceedings of the ACM Turing Award Celebration Conference-China 2023*, pages 131–132, 2023.
- [190] Francesco Bronzino, Paul Schmitt, Sara Ayoubi, Hyojoon Kim, Renata Teixeira, and Nick Feamster. Traffic refinery: Cost-aware data repre-

- sentation for machine learning on network traffic. *Proceedings of the ACM on Measurement and Analysis of Computing Systems*, 5(3):1–24, 2021.
- [191] Francesco Zola, Lander Seguro-Gil, Jan Lukas Bruse, Mikel Galar, and Raúl Orduna-Urrutia. Network traffic analysis through node behaviour classification: a graph-based approach with temporal dissection and data-level preprocessing. *Computers & Security*, 115:102632, 2022.
- [192] Jordan Holland, Paul Schmitt, Nick Feamster, and Prateek Mittal. New directions in automated traffic analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 3366–3383, 2021.
- [193] Jean Kaddour, Joshua Harris, Maximilian Mozes, Herbie Bradley, Roberta Raileanu, and Robert McHardy. Challenges and applications of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.10169*, 2023.
- [194] Binbin Zhao, Shouling Ji, Jiacheng Xu, Yuan Tian, Qiuyang Wei, Qinying Wang, Chenyang Lyu, Xuhong Zhang, Changting Lin, Jingzheng Wu, et al. A large-scale empirical analysis of the vulnerabilities introduced by third-party components in iot firmware. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*, pages 442–454, 2022.
- [195] David Schmidt, Carlotta Tagliaro, Kevin Borgolte, and Martina Lindorfer. Iotflow: Inferring iot device behavior at scale through static mobile companion app analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 681–695, 2023.
- [196] Yuhong Nan, Xueqiang Wang, Luyi Xing, Xiaojing Liao, Ruoyu Wu, Jianliang Wu, Yifan Zhang, and XiaoFeng Wang. Are you spying on me? Large-Scale analysis on IoT data exposure through companion apps. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*, pages 6665–6682, August 2023.
- [197] Jiongyi Chen, Wenrui Diao, Qingchuan Zhao, Chaoshun Zuo, Zhiqiang Lin, XiaoFeng Wang, Wing Cheong Lau, Menghan Sun, Ronghai Yang, and Kehuan Zhang. Iotfuzzer: Discovering memory corruptions in iot through app-based fuzzing. In *NDSS*, 2018.
- [198] Camille Cobb, Milijana Surbatovich, Anna Kawakami, Mahmood Sharif, Lujo Bauer, Anupam Das, and Limin Jia. How risky are real users’ ifttt applets? In *Sixteenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS 2020)*, pages 505–529, 2020.
- [199] Iulia Bastys, Musard Balliu, and Andrei Sabelfeld. If this then what? controlling flows in iot apps. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, page 1102–1119, 2018.
- [200] Yizhen Jia, Yin hao Xiao, Jiguo Yu, Xiuzhen Cheng, Zhenkai Liang, and Zhiguo Wan. A novel graph-based mechanism for identifying traffic vulnerabilities in smart home iot. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2018 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, pages 1493–1501, 2018.