

SADDE: Semi-supervised Anomaly Detection with Dependable Explanations

Yachao Yuan[§]
chao910904@suda.edu.cn
Soochow University
Suzhou, Jiangsu, China

Yali Yuan^{*‡}
yaliyuan@seu.edu.cn
Southeast University
Nanjing, Jiangsu, China

Yu Huang[†]
fatmo@nuaa.edu.cn
Independent Researcher
Nanning, Guangxi, China

Jin Wang^{*§}
ustc_wangjin@hotmail.com
Soochow University
Suzhou, Jiangsu, China

Abstract

Semi-supervised learning holds a pivotal position in anomaly detection applications, yet identifying anomaly patterns with a limited number of labeled samples poses a significant challenge. Furthermore, the absence of interpretability poses major obstacles to the practical adoption of semi-supervised frameworks. The majority of existing interpretation techniques are tailored for supervised/unsupervised frameworks or non-security domains, falling short in providing dependable interpretations. In this research paper, we introduce SADDE, a general framework designed to accomplish two primary objectives: (1) to render the anomaly detection process interpretable and enhance the credibility of interpretation outcomes, and (2) to assign high-confidence pseudo labels to unlabeled samples, thereby boosting the performance of anomaly detection systems when supervised data is scarce. To achieve the first objective, we devise a cutting-edge interpretation method that utilizes both global and local interpreters to furnish trustworthy explanations. For the second objective, we conceptualize a novel two-stage semi-supervised learning framework tailored for network anomaly detection, ensuring that the model predictions of both stages align with specific constraints. We apply SADDE to two illustrative network anomaly detection tasks and conduct extensive evaluations in comparison with notable prior works. The experimental findings underscore that SADDE is capable of delivering precise detection results alongside dependable interpretations for semi-supervised network anomaly detection systems. The source code for SADDE is accessible at: <https://github.com/M-Code-Space/SADDE>.

Keywords

Dependable explanation, semi-supervised learning, anomaly detection

ACM Reference Format:

Yachao Yuan, Yu Huang, Yali Yuan, and Jin Wang*. 2024. SADDE: Semi-supervised Anomaly Detection with Dependable Explanations. In . . , 10 pages.

^{*}Yali Yuan and Jin Wang are co-corresponding authors.




Figure 1: Illustration of the divergent explanation results of different interpreters.

1 Introduction

Anomaly detection has become a fundamental task in various applications, including network intrusion detection [23], web attack detection [36], and advanced persistent threat detection [2]. Anomaly detection systems aim to identify unforeseen threats, such as zero-day attacks. To achieve this, semi-supervised learning is increasingly promising, as it requires only limited labeled data, unlike traditional supervised approaches that depend on extensive labeled samples for training.

Despite the great promise of semi-supervised network anomaly detection systems, the lack of interpretability of their predictions poses major barriers to their practical adoption. Firstly, it is challenging to build trust in the decisions made by these systems, which often provide only binary outputs (benign or malicious) without adequate justification or reliable evidence. Second, it is nearly impossible for analysts to manually interpret the decisions of these black-box machine learning models, as the volume of training data and the complexity of the learned models are beyond human understanding [11]. Third, minimizing false positives and miss-detected samples remains a critical challenge for anomaly detection systems in real-world applications. Without a clear understanding of how the models operate, it is impossible to effectively update or adjust them to reduce them. Consequently, security operators are left unable to decide whether they can trust model decisions based on excessively simple model predictions, are unwilling to use theoretical semi-supervised network anomaly detection systems in their practical applications, and feel overwhelmed by numerous meaningless false positives.




Figure 2: Overview of the proposed SADDE.

Recently, some research has proposed techniques for interpreting machine learning model decisions by identifying key features that significantly influence the final prediction [12, 20, 24, 28]. Predominant approaches include local/model-agnostic [10, 12, 19, 27, 29] and global [7, 14] methods that focus on interpreting individual and clusters predictions for a given black-box classifier. These interpreters either try to approximate the local decision boundary using a linear algorithm to find key features of the given input, or they perturb the current input’s feature values or permute features of a cluster and observe the model’s feedback to pinpoint the most influential ones. Security operators can use these interpreted key features to better understand model decisions [11]. Existing work like [9, 14, 26, 32, 33, 43, 44] predominantly focuses on interpreting supervised/unsupervised models in non-security domains, while some existing interpreters like [13, 17, 38, 40] are proposed for security-related applications. However, these studies cannot be directly used for semi-supervised network anomaly detection. Furthermore, studies indicate that the explanation results provided by existing interpreters lack consensus [5], leading to confusion regarding their trustworthiness. To our best knowledge, although a few studies examine the reliability of existing interpreters [3, 5, 42], they mainly focus on developing more effective evaluation metrics rather than improving the reliability of interpreters’ results. Fig. 1 illustrates the process of a classifier analyzing network traffic data and producing decisions, such as identifying whether the traffic is anomalous or benign. Various interpretability methods, including LIME, DeepLIFT, Lemna, and so on, generate different key features (e.g., "Flow Bytes/s," "Idle Max," "Fwd IAT Min"), leading to confusion for the security analyst. The inconsistency in these explanations raises uncertainty regarding the reliability of the interpretations.

Our Work. In this paper, we propose SADDE, a general semi-supervised framework for automatically learning from enormous unlabeled data and improving the reliability of interpretation results. The design goal of SADDE is to develop a novel semi-supervised learning framework for network anomaly detection applications

that meets the special requirements of security domains (such as reliable, human-understandable, stable, robust, and fast). To this end, we propose two techniques in SADDE referred to as Global-local Knowledge Association Mechanism (KAM) and Two-stage Semi-supervised Learning System (ToS). KAM helps security analysts understand the underlying reason for model predictions while ToS provides an effective pseudo-labeling process to assist the semi-supervised learning. Compared to original black-box machine learning models, security practitioners can better understand system feedback. Besides, with more reliable interpretations, system operators are more willing to adopt theoretical semi-supervised frameworks in their practical applications. We also provide prototype implementations of SADDE over two representative network anomaly detection datasets (ISCTXor2016 [15] and CIC-DoHBrw-2020 [25]). The proposed KAM and ToS are extensively evaluated compared to representative prior approaches. Experimental results demonstrate that SADDE can provide reliable explanations for semi-supervised learning frameworks while satisfying the requirements of security-related applications.

Contributions. This paper has the following contributions:

- We propose SADDE, a general framework for interpreting and improving semi-supervised network anomaly detection in security-related applications, which includes two key components: KAM provides reliable, human-understandable, stable, robust, and fast interpretations for semi-supervised systems and ToS makes it possible to automatically learn from large unlabeled datasets.
- We conduct extensive experiments to demonstrate that the proposed SADDE outperforms existing approaches regarding fidelity, stability, robustness, and efficiency.

2 Framework

2.1 Overview

The overview of SADDE is illustrated in Fig. 2 consisting of two key components: Global-local Knowledge Association Mechanism (KAM) and Two-stage Semi-supervised Learning System (ToS). ToS enables accurate semi-supervised learning via a novel two-stage pseudo-labeling process while KAM provides reliable interpretations for the semi-supervised anomaly detection system. SADDE is a general model-independent framework that formulates semi-supervised learning and decision interpretation into a unified end-to-end learning process with security-related constraints. We instantiate SADDE on the aforementioned network anomaly detection security application. With SADDE, malicious network traffic can be automatically detected without requiring large labeled datasets, meanwhile, security practitioners can better understand system behaviors and trust system decisions.

Working Process. The working process of the proposed SADDE is as follows. Before starting, we assume that there is a small labeled dataset that can be utilized to pre-train the local and global machine learning models. Such assumption is reasonable, as semi-supervised learning necessitates the model to continuously assign pseudo-labels to unlabeled samples, and pre-training the model using a small labeled dataset saves data labeling costs while ensuring the effectiveness of the subsequent "data-labeling" process. Similar assumptions can be found in [1, 16, 41]. Given an instance (or a batch of instances), we fed it into the pre-trained local model to extract its feature embedding and predict its label. The extracted feature embedding is then clustered by the global model into several clusters, where samples from the same cluster share similar characteristics. Feature representations from a cluster are treated as global representations while the feature embedding from an instance is defined as a local representation. We group the input instance into one of the clusters by comparing the distance between the embedding of the instance and the clusters. Then, the predictions of the global and local models are interpreted by the global and local interpreters, and the reliability of the interpretation results is further improved by comparing the global and local interpretations. The underlying reason behind it is that global and local interpreters are heterogeneous interpreters. It has a higher probability of improving its trustworthiness by matching global and local interpretations instead of two local interpreters. For instance, in scenarios where individual samples contain noise or have been maliciously altered, the interpretation results at the local level may be wrong, however, due to the fact that the global and local interpreters are heterogeneous, there is a probability that the interpretation results at the global level is correct. In this way, the interpretations' reliability could be improved. If the interpreted global and local key features match (the similarity score is higher than a given threshold), we consider the key features interpreted by the interpreters to be credible. Conversely, if they do not match, the samples will be discarded. These samples will not be utilized for model re-training to avoid possible model performance deterioration. Finally, labels predicted by the global and local models are aligned to find the most credible pseudo-labels for the next round's semi-supervised training. More details about SADDE are presented in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1: SADDE

Input : Samples $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$, local model M_1 and global model M_2 , local interpreter L , and global interpreter G

Output: Final predictions and interpreted key features of each sample and each class. Samples with high-confidence pseudo labels. Well-trained M_1 and M_2 .

% Step 0: Model Pre-training
Train M_1 and M_2 on the labeled pre-training set

while True do

for Each sample (or batch of samples) in X **do**

% Step 1: Feature Extraction
Extract features of x_i and predict its local pseudo label \hat{y}_1 by M_1
Group the feature embedding into a cluster by M_2 using
$$c^{(i)} = \arg \min_j \|v_i - \mu_j\|^2.$$

Assign the label of the j -th cluster $c^{(i)}$ to the unlabeled data x_i , i.e., the global pseudo label \hat{y}_2 .

% Step 2: Double Verification
//First Verification: KAM//
Interpret key features of the cluster by G
Interpret key features of the instance by L
Calculate a similarity score sim between the interpreted global and local key features by
$$sim(int_x(m), int_y(m'), k) = 2 * \frac{int_x^k(m) \cap int_y^k(m')}{|int_x^k(m)| + |int_y^k(m')|}.$$

if The $sim > T$ **then**
 //Second Verification: ToS//
 Check the predictions of M_1 and M_2
 if $\hat{y}_1 == \hat{y}_2$ **then**
 Treat them as samples with reliable pseudo-labels and use them in the next round of model training
 end
 Final output

end

end
Retrain M_1 and M_2 on the pseudo-labeled data

end

2.2 Global-local Knowledge Association Mechanism (KAM)

The global-local Knowledge Association Mechanism (KAM) takes advantage of both the local and global interpreters to provide more reliable interpretations of model predictions. It uses a local (or model-agnostic) interpreter L to interpret the prediction of the local model M_1 . The interpretation results indicate which features influence the model's prediction the most. Meanwhile, it adopts a global interpreter G to explain the prediction of the global model M_2 , and the interpreted key features represent the most important features of the cluster that the current instance belongs to.

Based on the results obtained by the global interpreter G and local interpreter L , a feature similarity calculation method (as defined in Eq.(1)) is used to further verify the reliability of the interpretation results. Inspired by [5], the similarity score is defined as follows. Different from [5], it measures the similarity between the locally interpreted key feature set of an instance and the globally interpreted key feature set of a cluster that the instance belongs to.

$$\text{sim}(\text{int}_x(m), \text{int}_y(m'), k) = 2 * \frac{\text{int}_x^k(m) \cap \text{int}_y^k(m')}{|\text{int}_x^k(m)| + |\text{int}_y^k(m')|}, \quad (1)$$

where $\text{int}_x(m)$ is the interpretation result of the x -th sample generated by the interpreter m , and k represents the interpreted top- k key features of the x -th sample generated by the interpreter m . The $\text{int}_y(m')$ has a similar meaning where m' is another interpreter. Similarly, $\text{int}_x^k(m)$ represents the number of top- k interpretation results of the x -th sample interpreted by interpreter m .

The local interpretations of an instance are considered highly reliable when the feature similarity of the local and global interpretations is higher than a given Threshold. In our case study, we utilize the DeepLift [33] as our local interpreter and PFIE [7] as our global interpreter as an example. Other local/model-agnostic or global interpreters can also be used as the local and global interpreters in KAM. Note that different from existing interpreters such as [13, 17, 40], which only interpret anomalous samples or outliers, SADDE interprets both normal and anomalous samples for that both normal and anomalous samples can potentially be used to update the model in SADDE, thereby influencing the entire learning and decision-making process of anomaly detection. Besides, in security applications, a transparent decision-making process is crucial for system operators of security applications to adopt theoretical algorithms in practice.

2.3 Two-stage Semi-supervised Learning (ToS)

We develop a two-stage semi-supervised learning framework named ToS to effectively assign high-confidence pseudo labels to the unlabeled samples (as illustrated in Fig. 2).

Typically, for semi-supervised learning, pseudo labels are created by a pre-trained machine learning model. In contrast with most existing semi-supervised learning methods that explore pseudo labels by only once predictions, ToS executes this process twice and the confidence of these virtual labels is improved by comparing predictions of both stages. For anomaly detection systems in security domains that only have limited labeled data, ToS repeatedly adds highly confident pseudo-labeled data for re-training the model, which significantly improves the model performance. The key idea of ToS lies in the selection of high-confidence pseudo-labeled samples and thus guarantees the subsequent process of model re-training.

As shown in Fig. 2, ToS contains a local machine learning model M_1 and a global model M_2 . During the pertaining phase, M_1 and M_2 are pre-trained on a smaller labeled set, making them capable of providing virtual labels to unlabeled data. During the re-training phase, firstly, M_1 extracts features of given instances and makes predictions. Secondly, M_2 clusters the feature embedding into several

clusters according to feature distances (see Eq.(2)).

$$c^{(i)} = \arg \min_j \|v_i - \mu_j\|^2 \quad (2)$$

where v_i denotes feature embedding of an unlabeled instance x_i , and μ_j represents centroids of class j in labeled data. $c^{(i)}$ is the cluster that has the closest distance from v_i among all cluster centroids in the labeled data.

Double Verification Mechanism. The goal of the double verify mechanism is to further reduce false positive and miss-detection rates and improve detection accuracy through a two-layer verification process that incorporates both the similar feature verification in KAM and the global and local prediction check in ToS. For the first-layer verification, as aforementioned in Section 2.2, it compares the calculated similarity score (see Eq.(1)), denoted as sim , with a predefined threshold T . We consider the interpretations to be reliable if $\text{sim} > T$. To some extent, it indicates that the sample has not been modified or attacked and could be used for the next round of re-training. For the second-layer verification, we consider the generated pseudo labels to be confident when the local model's prediction \hat{y}_l matches the global model's prediction \hat{y}_g . The selected reliable samples and their pseudo-labels are used to retrain both the global and clustering models. The model then waits for new network flow data to arrive for further processing.

In our case study, we use the Multilayer Perceptron Network (MLP) [30] and DBSCAN [4] as our local and global models respectively as an example for evaluating the effectiveness of the proposed ToS. Other machine learning models can also be chosen accordingly for specific tasks.

3 Evaluation

This section presents the experimental setup and results. The datasets are detailed in subsection 3.1. Next, the experiment setup is introduced in subsection 3.2. Finally, in subsection 3.3, we compare the proposed KAM and ToS with five and eight state-of-the-art on two representative network anomaly detection datasets and analyze their results.

3.1 Dataset

Two widely used network anomaly detection datasets, ISCXTor2016 [15] and CIC-DoHBrw-2020 [25], are employed to evaluate the performance of SADDE. ISCXTor2016 contains Tor and non-Tor network flows in various applications and each instance has 28 features. It consists of 68,191 samples, of which 56,534 are non-Tor and 11,657 are Tor samples. CIC-DoHBrw-2020 contains labeled traffic generated by DNS over HTTPS (DoH) protocols. It is a dataset for detecting browser-based DoH activities and studying secure communication anomalies. Each instance has 33 features. There are 933,189 instances, including 216,649 DoH and 716,540 non-DoH samples.

For the ISCXTor2016 dataset, the first 1% of the data is used as the pre-training set (i.e., small labeled set), the last 20% as the testing set, and the next 20% as the validation set, while the remaining data is allocated for re-training. The CSIC-DoHBrw-2020 dataset follows a similar partitioning structure, except that the first 0.5% of the data is used as the pre-training set.

3.2 Setup

System Settings. The experiments are conducted using Python (v3.8), along with the PyTorch framework (v1.11.0), CUDA (v11.3), and Scikit-learn (v1.3.2) to develop and evaluate SADDE. A three-layer FCN is employed as our M_1 , and each layer contains 256 neurons.

During training, the Adam optimizer is used with a learning rate of $1e-3$. A dropout rate of 0.3 is implemented to avoid overfitting, and cross-entropy loss was selected as the objective function for classification tasks. We set the batch size to 64. DBSCAN was employed with an epsilon value of 0.5 and a minimum sample size of 1 for clustering, ensuring that all samples could potentially be included in a cluster. The output of FCN’s third fully connected layer is utilized as the input of DBSCAN. Additionally, early stopping was implemented with a patience of 5 epochs during both the pre-training and re-training phases so that the training process could be halted if there is no improvement in the validation loss over 5 epochs. In PFIE, each feature is permuted by 100 times. For DeepLift, the eps parameter is configured to $1e-10$. The number of key features is specified as 10, and the threshold for the similarity score is established at 0.6.

All simulations are executed on a Linux server powered by an AMD EPYC 7282 16-Core Processor (2.80 GHz) and 377 GB of RAM. To ensure consistency, all algorithms are run within the same environment, and for fairness, the average results from 10 runs are recorded for comparison.

Benchmarks. We employ a comprehensive set of benchmarks in this work to validate the performance of SADDE. Firstly, we conduct a comparative analysis of the proposed KAM against eight state-of-the-art interpreters, including **Lime** [28], **SHAP** [20], **DeepLift** [33], **COIN** [18], **DiCE** [26], **xNIDS** [38], **CADE** [40], **Anchors** [29].

- **Lime**¹: It explains the predictions of any classifier by learning an interpretable model in the local vicinity of the prediction.
- **SHAP**²: It assigns each feature an important value using principles from cooperative game theory.
- **DeepLift**³: It is an interpreter that decomposes a neural network’s output prediction for a specific input by backpropagating the contributions of all neurons in the network to each feature of the input.
- **COIN**⁴: It transforms outlier detection into local classification tasks, identifying key features and assigning outlier scores to explain the differences between outliers and their surrounding normal instances.
- **DiCE**⁵: It generates diverse counterfactual explanations by optimizing for both proximity to the original input and diversity among examples.
- **xNIDS**⁶: It approximates and samples around historical inputs, and captures feature dependencies of structured data to provide high-fidelity explanations.

¹<https://github.com/marcotcr/lime>

²<https://github.com/shap/shap>

³<https://github.com/pytorch/captum>

⁴<https://github.com/xuhongzuo/outlier-interpretation>

⁵<https://github.com/microsoft/DiCE>

⁶<https://github.com/CactiLab/code-xNIDS>

- **CADE**⁷: It identifies features that cause the largest changes in distance between a drifting sample and its nearest class within a low-dimensional latent space learned through contrastive learning.
- **Anchors**⁸: It provides rules that sufficiently "anchor" the prediction locally, ensuring that changes to the rest of the feature values do not affect the prediction.

Then, we compared the introduced ToS with five state-of-the-art semi-supervised methods, including **InstantT** [16], **ACR** [39], **Clustering*** [6], **LVM** [22], and **M3S** [34].

- **InstantT**⁹: It assigns pseudo labels to unlabeled data by using a threshold-based approach that dynamically adjusts instance-dependent thresholds in response to label noise and prediction confidence.
- **ACR**¹⁰: It dynamically refines pseudo-labels across various distributions by estimating the true class distribution of unlabeled data using a unified equation.
- **Clustering***: It utilizes a multi-task framework that combines a supervised objective using ground-truth labels with a semi-supervised objective based on clustering assignments, and optimized through a single cross-entropy loss.
- **LVM**: It incorporates the dimension of local variance into pseudo-label selection.
- **M3S**: It is a multi-stage training framework that combines the DeepCluster technique with an alignment mechanism in the embedding space to enhance the training process.

Evaluation Metrics. We use Accuracy (Acc.), Precision (Pre.), Recall (Rec.), F1-score (F1.), False Alarm Rate (FAR), Missed Detection Rate (MDR), and standardized partial AUC (SPAUC) [21] to measure different semi-supervised models’ performance. Particularly, SPAUC measures the performance of a model within a specific region of the ROC curve, focusing on a segment that is most relevant under conditions of class imbalance and differential costs of misclassification. FAR reflects the amount of normal network traffic that is wrongly classified as abnormal while MDR indicates how much anomaly network traffic that are miss-detected by the models. The higher the SPAUC, the better the performance is. The lower the FAR and MDR, the better the performance is. Here we use $SPAUC_{FPR \leq 0.05}$ for all experiments.

Additionally, we evaluate the performance of the proposed KAM interpreter in terms of fidelity, stability, robustness, efficiency, and AOPC, and compare it with the state-of-the-art interpreters.

- **Fidelity.** To evaluate the fidelity of an interpreter, we define an indicator similar to that used in [13], called the Label Flipping Rate (LFR), which is the ratio of samples that change to a different class after being modified based on the interpretation results. Specifically, in the context of a classification task, the interpreter identifies several key features. The values of these key features are replaced with the average values corresponding to the opposite class, and a new prediction is generated to determine whether the label has been changed.

⁷<https://github.com/whyisyoung/CADE>

⁸<https://github.com/SeldonIO/alibi>

⁹https://github.com/tmllab/2023_NeurIPS_InstanT

¹⁰<https://github.com/Gank0078/ACR>




Figure 3: Fidelity, stability, and robustness evaluation of interpreters on ISCXTor2016.




Figure 4: Fidelity, stability, and robustness evaluation of interpreters on CIC-DoHBrw-2020.

The LFR is mathematically expressed as:

$$LFR = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n I(f'(x_i) \neq f(x_i))}{n} \quad (3)$$

where n denotes the total number of samples, $f(x_i)$ represents the original predicted label for a sample x_i , $f'(x_i)$ is the predicted label after modification, and $I(\cdot)$ is an indicator function that equals 1 if the label has flipped and 0 otherwise. This metric captures the percentage of samples for which the predicted label changes after altering the key features.

- **Stability.** The stability of interpreters refers to the consistency of interpretation results for the same samples across multiple runs. Given two interpretation outcomes $int_x(m)_1$ and $int_x(m)_2$, their similarity can be calculated using Eq.(1). This process is repeated to assess the similarity between the interpretation results from two runs under identical settings for each sample, and the overall stability is calculated as follows:

$$Stability = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{sim}(int_x(m)_1^i, int_x(m)_2^i) \quad (4)$$

In this equation, n is the total number of samples, and $\text{sim}(int_x(m)_1^i, int_x(m)_2^i)$ represents the similarity between the two interpretation outcomes for the same sample i . The average similarity across all samples is calculated to quantify the stability of the interpreter.

- **Robustness.** Robustness refers to the similarity of interpretation results for the same sample before and after adding

noise, sampled from a Gaussian distribution $N(0, \sigma^2)$. Specifically, for each sample i , the robustness is calculated as the average similarity between the interpretation result without noise, $int_x(m)_i$, and the interpretation result after adding noise, $int_x(m + \epsilon)_i$, where $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$. The overall robustness is computed using the equation:

$$Robustness = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{sim}(int_x(m)_i, int_x(m + \epsilon)_i, k) \quad (5)$$

Here, k represents the number of key features. In this work, the noise is set to $\sigma = 0.1$.

- **Efficiency.** We assess efficiency by recording the runtime required to interpret 2000 samples for each interpreter.

3.3 Results and Analysis

Verification of Model Pre-training. Table 1 and Table 2 present the performance of ToS when trained on the pre-training set (denoted as ①) and when trained on both the pre-training and re-training sets (denoted as ②). The results indicate that the re-training approach (②) achieves significantly better performance than pre-training alone (①), with improvements of approximately 20%, 10%, and 10% in terms of F1-score, MDR, and SPAUC, on the ISCXTor2016 dataset. Similarly, on the CIC-DoHBrw-2020 dataset, the re-training process (②) enhances the model's performance by about 14%, 26%, and 4% in terms of F1-score, MDR, and SPAUC, compared to training only on the smaller pre-training set (①). These findings demonstrate the effectiveness of the semi-supervised learning process in improving the performance of the proposed SADDE.

Table 1: Performance (%) of ToS on ISCXTor2016: comparisons between model performance (%) with only the pre-training set (①) and with both pre-training and re-training set (②). ∇ denotes the performance difference relative to the former. The best metric performance is bolded.

Setting	Acc.	Pre.	Rec.	F1.	FAR	MDR	SPAUC
①	80.88	65.68	67.04	66.29	12.47	53.44	53.50
②	89.43	85.36	71.97	76.27	2.18	53.88	67.42
∇	+8.55	+19.68	+4.93	+9.98	-10.29	-0.44	+13.92

Table 2: Performance (%) of ToS on CIC-DoHBrw-2020: comparisons between model performance (%) with only the pre-training set (①) and with both pre-training and re-training set (②). ∇ denotes the performance difference relative to the former. The best metric performance is bolded.

Setting	Acc.	Pre.	Rec.	F1.	FAR	MDR	SPAUC
①	74.67	65.68	67.36	66.35	18.99	46.27	52.34
②	84.44	78.19	82.86	79.95	14.18	20.07	55.94
∇	+9.77	+12.51	+15.50	+13.60	-4.81	-26.20	+3.60




Figure 5: Efficiency evaluation of interpreters.




Figure 6: Performance of ToS compared with the state-of-the-art semi-supervised models: F1-score vs. SPAUC.

Comparison with the State-of-the-art Interpreters. Figures 3 and 4 illustrate the evaluation of various interpreters across the ISCXTor2016 and CIC-DoHBrw-2020 datasets, highlighting performance differences across three critical dimensions: fidelity, stability, and robustness. Fig. 5, in turn, presents the results of the efficiency evaluation. KAM demonstrates a superior balance across all these dimensions compared to other methods. Notably, while




Figure 7: Performance of ToS compared with the state-of-the-art semi-supervised models: FAR vs. MDR.

COIN outperforms KAM in terms of fidelity and robustness on the ISCXTor2016 dataset, its efficiency is significantly lower, being nearly 100 times slower than KAM.

We observe that in the ISCXTor2016 dataset, the fidelity of all interpreters is relatively low. This is because anomaly samples, such as Tor traffic, are more susceptible to label flipping, as modifications to their key features are more likely to alter model predictions. However, the dataset’s significant class imbalance—reflected in a normal-to-anomalous ratio of approximately 4.85:1—leads to a lower overall LFR. In contrast, the CIC-DoHBrw-2020 dataset has a normal-to-anomalous ratio of about 3.31:1, offering a relatively more balanced scenario for evaluating fidelity.

According to Fig. 5, KAM demonstrates a balanced performance between interpretability, reliability, and efficiency. While DeepLift and xNIDS are more efficient compared to our method, they do not perform as well on other key metrics. Moreover, we observed that Anchors is less efficient on the CIC-DoHBrw-2020 dataset compared to the ISCXTor2016 dataset. This is due to the combinatorial optimization involved in the search for an anchor, which causes a significant drop in efficiency as the number of features increases. With 28 features in the ISCXTor2016 dataset and 33 in the CIC-DoHBrw-2020 dataset, this increase in feature count directly contributes to the observed difference in performance.

Comparison with the State-of-the-art Semi-supervised Models. As shown in Table 3 and Table 4, ToS outperforms other methods. ToS achieves SPAUC as high as 67.42% and 55.94% on ISCXTor2016 and CIC-DoHBrw-2020 datasets with about 1.33% and 1.53% improvement, respectively. Notably, LVM performs similarly to ToS on the ISCXTor2016 dataset, with only a 0.82% difference in f1-score and 1.33% difference in SPAUC. However, its performance on the CIC-DoHBrw-2020 dataset is significantly lower than ToS, with a 19.47% gap in f1-score and 4.48% in SPAUC, indicating that ToS exhibits better stability and is more adaptable to different scenarios.

Furthermore, as illustrated in Fig. 7, ToS strikes the optimal balance between FAR and MDR. Although the Clustering* method exhibits an exceptionally low FAR on the ISCXTor2016 dataset, its MDR is notably high, nearing 100%. Similarly, while instantT demonstrates superior FAR performance compared to ToS on the CIC-DoHBrw-2020 dataset, both suffer from significantly elevated MDR values. As shown in Fig. 6, ToS also excels in balancing F1-score and SPAUC, outperforming other models on both two datasets.

Table 3: Performance (%) of ToS compared with the state-of-the-art semi-supervised models on ISCXTor2016.

Model	Acc.	Pre.	Rec.	F1.	FAR	MDR	SPAUC
instantT	84.30	70.82	69.14	69.91	8.42	53.30	55.83
ACR	70.18	56.84	60.23	56.96	25.04	54.51	51.05
Clustering*	83.05	49.67	49.74	46.32	1.07	98.97	49.98
LVM	88.97	83.62	71.45	75.45	2.63	54.47	66.09
M3S	83.56	69.18	68.50	68.83	9.51	53.48	54.99
ToS (ours)	89.43	85.36	71.97	76.27	2.18	53.88	67.42

Table 4: Comparison with the state-of-the-art semi-supervised models' performance (%) on CIC-DoHBrw-2020.

Model	Acc.	Pre.	Rec.	F1.	FAR	MDR	SPAUC
instantT	78.07	68.68	58.40	59.20	4.89	78.32	54.41
ACR	80.61	75.62	83.84	77.15	22.19	10.12	53.91
Clustering*	76.51	72.03	79.67	72.84	26.22	14.43	52.90
LVM	71.81	60.47	60.49	60.48	18.39	60.41	51.46
M3S	79.56	72.94	78.12	74.50	19.19	24.57	53.76
ToS (ours)	84.44	78.19	82.86	79.95	14.18	20.07	55.94

4 Discussion

Although in this work we only evaluated SADDE on network anomaly detection tasks as an example, the proposed KAM and ToS can be utilized in a wide range of semi-supervised anomaly detection applications. Besides, the robustness evaluation of AnomalyIAP is mainly considered against data poisoning/feature perturbation attacks (See Section 2.2). There are other attacks that may fail SADDE like model poisoning attacks because SADDE is highly dependent on the local and global models' predictions. Future work can investigate the SADDE's robustness against more attacks. Moreover, hyper-parameters of SADDE are configured empirically. Future research can design more advanced approaches to configure hyper-parameters. In this work, different data distribution imbalance ratio is not experimented due to the page limitation. Research on the influence of different imbalance ratios or the performance of SADDE under extreme data distributions can be conducted in the future. Furthermore, more anomaly detection scenarios with different model combinations can also be tested in the future to explore the generalization performance of SADDE. Finally, it is worthy of exploring how to use SADDE on scenarios with only a few labeled samples, for example, by developing better multi-stage semi-supervised learning approaches or new matching strategies.

5 Related Work

In this section, we briefly discuss existing literature from two aspects.

Interpreters. Numerous studies have been conducted to interpret machine learning models and achieved promising results, which can be roughly categorized into two groups, i.e., local/model-agnostic [8, 10, 12, 19, 27, 29] and global interpreters [7, 14]. The former interprets individual predictions for a given machine learning model while the latter attempts to explain model predictions of a

cluster. Local/model-agnostic interpreters are mostly perturbation-based, Gradient-based, and others. Perturbation-based approaches [8, 9, 40] perturb data features and check the variation of model predictions to identify the most important ones. Gradient-based approaches [31, 33] back-propagate gradients through the model to evaluate each feature's sensitivity. Others treat the target machine learning model as a black-box [28, 29]. Techniques like LIME [28], LIMNA [12], and SHAP [20] attempt to utilize a linear model to approximate the decision boundary of the input, and utilize it to find the most influential features. Global interpreters like [7] explain model prediction by randomly permuting specific feature values of a cluster and observer model predictions. The authors of [14] developed an interpreter for explaining clustering algorithms by formulating clustering decisions as being functionally equivalent neural networks.

Few studies aim to interpret unsupervised models such as COIN [18] and CADE [40] which are used as baselines in our experiments. In addition to them, most of other works directly use the interpreters proposed for supervised learning to unsupervised learning applications.

The work of [5] demonstrated that the explanation results provided by existing interpreters lack consensus, resulting in confusion regarding their trustworthiness. There are a few studies that examine the reliability of existing interpreters [3, 5, 42], for example, [42] introduced two metrics to evaluate interpreters, i.e., sensitivity and infidelity. An off-the-shelf evaluation test is proposed for post-hoc interpreters in view of feature selection in [3]. [5] introduced three evaluation metrics to measure interpreters' stability, effectiveness, and robustness. The work of [37] developed criteria for evaluating and comparing different interpreters, including both general properties like accuracy and security-related ones, such as robustness, efficiency, and completeness. Unfortunately, to our best knowledge, there is no existing work exploring how to improve the reliability of interpretation results.

Semi-supervised Learning. A recent surge of interest has focused on anomaly detection with semi-supervised learning, which attempts to assign high-confidence pseudo-labels to unlabeled data. There is a wide range of research on semi-supervised learning, which generally falls into two categories, i.e., single-stage-based and multi-stage-based approaches. Some single-stage-based semi-supervised learning techniques improve the confidence of pseudo labels based on thresholds [16, 22], and they usually set high thresholds to unlabeled samples to prevent the occurrence of incorrect pseudo labels, or contrastive learning [6, 39] that combines combine pseudo labeling and consistency regularization to encourages similar predictions between two different views of an instance to improve the robustness of the model. Unlike single-stage-based semi-supervised learning techniques, multi-stage-based semi-supervised learning approaches, such as [34, 35], explore the most confident pseudo labels by using multiple models and improve their confidence by aligning the predictions from each stage.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose SADDE, a general framework aiming to interpret and improve semi-supervised anomaly detection performance. It incorporates two key techniques KAM and ToS: (1)

KAM provides reliable, human-understandable, stable, robust, and fast interpretations for semi-supervised systems; (2) ToS makes it possible to automatically learn from large unlabeled datasets. By applying and evaluating Adaptive NAD over two classical network anomaly detection datasets, we demonstrate that SADDE can provide fast and accurate anomaly detection results as well as reliable, human-understandable, stable, robust, and fast interpretations.

References

- [1] Giovanni Apruzzese, Pavel Laskov, and Aliya Tastemirova. 2022. SoK: The impact of unlabelled data in cyberthreat detection. In *2022 IEEE 7th European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*. IEEE, 20–42.
- [2] Benjamin Bowman, Craig Laprade, Yuede Ji, and H. Howie Huang. 2020. Detecting Lateral Movement in Enterprise Computer Networks with Unsupervised Graph AI. In *23rd International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses (RAID 2020)*. USENIX Association, San Sebastian, 257–268. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/raid2020/presentation/bowman>
- [3] Oana-Maria Camburu, Eleonora Giunchiglia, Jakob Foerster, Thomas Lukasiewicz, and Phil Blunsom. 2019. Can I trust the explainer? Verifying post-hoc explanatory methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.02065* (2019).
- [4] Martin Ester, Hans-Peter Kriegel, Jörg Sander, Xiaowei Xu, et al. 1996. A density-based algorithm for discovering clusters in large spatial databases with noise.. In *kdd*, Vol. 96. 226–231.
- [5] Ming Fan, Wenying Wei, Xiaofei Xie, Yang Liu, Xiaohong Guan, and Ting Liu. 2020. Can we trust your explanations? Sanity checks for interpreters in Android malware analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 16 (2020), 838–853.
- [6] Enrico Fini, Pietro Astolfi, Karteek Alahari, Xavier Alameda-Pineda, Julien Mairal, Moin Nabi, and Elisa Ricci. 2023. Semi-Supervised Learning Made Simple With Self-Supervised Clustering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 3187–3197.
- [7] Aaron Fisher, Cynthia Rudin, and Francesca Dominici. 2019. All Models are Wrong, but Many are Useful: Learning a Variable’s Importance by Studying an Entire Class of Prediction Models Simultaneously. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 20, 177 (2019), 1–81.
- [8] Ruth Fong, Mandela Patrick, and Andrea Vedaldi. 2019. Understanding deep networks via extremal perturbations and smooth masks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*. 2950–2958.
- [9] Ruth C Fong and Andrea Vedaldi. 2017. Interpretable explanations of black boxes by meaningful perturbation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 3429–3437.
- [10] Riccardo Guidotti, Anna Monreale, Salvatore Ruggieri, Dino Pedreschi, Franco Turini, and Fosca Giannotti. 2018. Local rule-based explanations of black box decision systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.10820* (2018).
- [11] Riccardo Guidotti, Anna Monreale, Salvatore Ruggieri, Franco Turini, Fosca Giannotti, and Dino Pedreschi. 2018. A survey of methods for explaining black box models. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)* 51, 5 (2018), 1–42.
- [12] Wenbo Guo, Dongliang Mu, Jun Xu, Purui Su, Gang Wang, and Xinyu Xing. 2018. Lemma: Explaining deep learning based security applications. In *proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*. 364–379.
- [13] Dongqi Han, Zhiliang Wang, Wenqi Chen, Ying Zhong, Su Wang, Han Zhang, Jiahai Yang, Xingang Shi, and Xia Yin. 2021. DeepAID: Interpreting and Improving Deep Learning-based Anomaly Detection in Security Applications. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 3197–3217.
- [14] Jacob Kauffmann, Malte Esders, Lukas Ruff, Grégoire Montavon, Wojciech Samek, and Klaus-Robert Müller. 2024. From Clustering to Cluster Explanations via Neural Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* 35, 2 (2024), 1926–1940. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNNLS.2022.3185901>
- [15] Arash Habibi Lashkari, Gerard Draper Gil, Mohammad Saiful Islam Mamun, and Ali A Ghorbani. 2017. Characterization of tor traffic using time based features. In *International Conference on Information Systems Security and Privacy*, Vol. 2. SciTePress, 253–262.
- [16] Muyang Li, Runze Wu, Haoyu Liu, Jun Yu, Xun Yang, Bo Han, and Tongliang Liu. 2024. Instant: Semi-supervised learning with instance-dependent thresholds. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [17] Ninghao Liu, Donghwa Shin, and Xia Hu. 2017. Contextual outlier interpretation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.10589* (2017).
- [18] Ninghao Liu, Donghwa Shin, and Xia Hu. 2017. Contextual outlier interpretation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.10589* (2017).
- [19] Scott Lundberg. 2017. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.07874* (2017).
- [20] Scott M Lundberg and Su-In Lee. 2017. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [21] Donna Katzman McClish. 1989. Analyzing a portion of the ROC curve. *Medical decision making* 9, 3 (1989), 190–195.
- [22] Zeping Min, Jinfeng Bai, and Chengfei Li. 2024. Leveraging Local Variance for Pseudo-Label Selection in Semi-supervised Learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 38. 14370–14378.
- [23] Yisroel Mirsky, Tomer Doitshman, Yuval Elovici, and Asaf Shabtai. 2018. Kitsune: an ensemble of autoencoders for online network intrusion detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.09089* (2018).
- [24] Grégoire Montavon, Wojciech Samek, and Klaus-Robert Müller. 2018. Methods for interpreting and understanding deep neural networks. *Digital signal processing* 73 (2018), 1–15.
- [25] Mohammadreza MontazeriShatoori, Logan Davidson, Gurdip Kaur, and Arash Habibi Lashkari. 2020. Detection of doh tunnels using time-series classification of encrypted traffic. In *2020 IEEE Intl Conf on Dependable, Autonomic and Secure Computing, Intl Conf on Pervasive Intelligence and Computing, Intl Conf on Cloud and Big Data Computing, Intl Conf on Cyber Science and Technology Congress (DASC/PiCom/CBDCom/CyberSciTech)*.
- [26] Ramaravind K Mothilal, Amit Sharma, and Chenhao Tan. 2020. Explaining machine learning classifiers through diverse counterfactual explanations. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*. 607–617.
- [27] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. 2016. “Why should i trust you?” Explaining the predictions of any classifier. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*. 1135–1144.
- [28] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. 2016. “Why should i trust you?” Explaining the predictions of any classifier. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*. 1135–1144.
- [29] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. 2018. Anchors: High-precision model-agnostic explanations. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 32.
- [30] David E Rumelhart, Geoffrey E Hinton, and Ronald J Williams. 1986. Learning internal representations by error propagation, parallel distributed processing, explorations in the microstructure of cognition, ed. de rumelhart and j. mccllelland. vol. 1. 1986. *Biometrika* 71, 599–607 (1986), 6.
- [31] Ramprasaath R Selvaraju, Michael Cogswell, Abhishek Das, Ramakrishna Vedantam, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra. 2017. Grad-cam: Visual explanations from deep networks via gradient-based localization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 618–626.
- [32] Avanti Shrikumar, Peyton Greenside, and Anshul Kundaje. 2017. Learning important features through propagating activation differences. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMIR, 3145–3153.
- [33] Avanti Shrikumar, Peyton Greenside, and Anshul Kundaje. 2017. Learning important features through propagating activation differences. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 3145–3153.
- [34] Ke Sun, Zhouchen Lin, and Zhanxing Zhu. 2020. Multi-stage self-supervised learning for graph convolutional networks on graphs with few labeled nodes. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 34. 5892–5899.
- [35] Ke Sun, Zhouchen Lin, and Zhanxing Zhu. 2020. Multi-stage self-supervised learning for graph convolutional networks on graphs with few labeled nodes. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 34. 5892–5899.
- [36] Ruming Tang, Zheng Yang, Zeyan Li, Weibin Meng, Haixin Wang, Qi Li, Yongqian Sun, Dan Pei, Tao Wei, Yanfei Xu, and Yan Liu. 2020. ZeroWall: Detecting Zero-Day Web Attacks through Encoder-Decoder Recurrent Neural Networks. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2020 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*. 2479–2488. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFOCOM41043.2020.9155278>
- [37] Alexander Warnecke, Daniel Arp, Christian Wressnegger, and Konrad Rieck. 2020. Evaluating Explanation Methods for Deep Learning in Security. In *2020 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*. 158–174. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EuroSP48549.2020.00018>
- [38] Feng Wei, Hongda Li, Ziming Zhao, and Hongxin Hu. 2023. {xNIDS}: Explaining Deep Learning-based Network Intrusion Detection Systems for Active Intrusion Responses. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*. 4337–4354.
- [39] Tong Wei and Kai Gan. 2023. Towards realistic long-tailed semi-supervised learning: Consistency is all you need. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 3469–3478.
- [40] Limin Yang, Wenbo Guo, Qingying Hao, Arridhana Ciptadi, Ali Ahmadzadeh, Xinyu Xing, and Gang Wang. 2021. {CADE}: Detecting and explaining concept drift samples for security applications. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*. 2327–2344.
- [41] Haipeng Yao, Danyang Fu, Peiyang Zhang, Maozhen Li, and Yunjie Liu. 2018. MSML: A novel multilevel semi-supervised machine learning framework for intrusion detection system. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 6, 2 (2018), 1949–1959.
- [42] Chih-Kuan Yeh, Cheng-Yu Hsieh, Arun Suggala, David I Inouye, and Pradeep K Ravikumar. 2019. On the (in) fidelity and sensitivity of explanations. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).

- [43] Bolei Zhou, Aditya Khosla, Agata Lapedriza, Aude Oliva, and Antonio Torralba. 2016. Learning deep features for discriminative localization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2921–2929.
- [44] Luisa M Zintgraf, Taco S Cohen, Tameem Adel, and Max Welling. 2017. Visualizing deep neural network decisions: Prediction difference analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.04595* (2017).