1 Introduction

A Domain Generation Algorithm (DGA) is a programmatic routine used by malware to create hundreds—or even thousands—of pseudo-random domain names every day. By continuously rotating command-and-control (C2) endpoints, DGAs invalidate static blacklists and make coordinated takedowns extremely difficult.

We tackle the problem with a **two-stage** deep-learning pipeline:

- 1. **Binary classification** decide whether a hostname/domain is DGA-generated (isDGA = 1) or legitimate (isDGA = 0).
- 2. Subclass classification
 - If the sample is DGA, identify its malware family (gameoverdga, cryptolocker, newgoz, nivdort).
 - If the sample is legitimate, decide between the Alexa and nonAlexa subsets.

Why CNN and LSTM?

Model	Intuition
CNN	Character-level convolutions detect short, highly-informative n-grams—e.g. the high-entropy trigrams often produced by
	DGAs. Global-max pooling then distils the most salient features into a fixed-length vector.
LSTM	An LSTM cell maintains two states: the hidden state (h_t) and the cell state (c_t). Input, forget, and output gates learn to keep or discard information so that long-range dependencies (e.g. repeated prefixes/suffixes or global entropy) are preserved. This sequential memory can capture stylistic quirks unique to individual malware families.

2 Dataset & Pre-processing

- Size: 160 000 rows (exactly 80 000 DGA, 80 000 legitimate).
- Features: domain, host, isDGA, subclass.
- Cleaning: lower-case, strip extra dots, drop 2 null/duplicate rows.

Tokenisation workflow

- 1. Remove dots and split host into characters.
- 2. Padding/Truncation:
 - Average host length 23; maximum 70.
 - We standardised to 30 characters (max_len = 30): pad with 0 or trim excess.
- 3. Integer encoding: Tokenizer(char_level=True) \rightarrow integer ids starting at 1; 0 reserved for padding.

3 Model Architectures & Hyper-parameters

Layer	Binary CNN	Binary LSTM
Embedding	VOCAB × 50, input 30	same
Conv1D /	Conv1D(128, kernel 5,	LSTM(128)
LSTM	ReLU)	
Pool /	Global-max \rightarrow	$\texttt{Dropout(0.5)} \rightarrow \texttt{Dense } 64 \rightarrow$
Dropout	Dropout(0.5)	Dropout(0.5)
Dense	64 (ReLU)	64 (ReLU)
Output	Sigmoid	Sigmoid
Epochs	10	5
Batch	128	256

Equal wall-clock budget.

CNN trains $2 \times$ faster per epoch; we therefore used 10 epochs for CNN vs. 5 for LSTM so each model trains for roughly **5 minutes**.

Subclass models

- DGA-CNN: same as binary CNN but soft-max over 4 classes.
- Legit-CNN: lighter Conv1D(64) + Dense 32, soft-max 2.
- DGA-LSTM / Legit-LSTM: analogous LSTM layers with 128 and 64 units respectively.
- All subclass models use epochs = 10, batch = 128.

Full hyper-parameters

4 Training & Evaluation Protocol

- Split: 80 / 20 stratified train-test.
- Metrics: Accuracy, Precision, Recall, F1 for binary; Accuracy for multi-class plus class-wise confusion matrices.
- Early attempts: We evaluated a generic character-CNN snippet suggested by ChatGPT (baseline F1 0.97). Our tuned models out-performed it, so we removed the baseline to avoid redundancy.

5 Results

5.1 Binary DGA Detection

Model	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F 1
	0.991 6 0.980 9	0.991 0 0.979 4	0.00-0	0.991 6 0.980 7

Next, we started training the CNN model using 10 epochs and a batch size of 128. We achieved 99.16% F1 score for binary classification using CNN, which is an impressive performance that we achieved after tuning the hyperparameters and trying multiple padding approaches. On the other hand, we achieved 98.07% F1 score for our LSTM model.

	Pred Legit	Pred DGA
Legit	15 836	166
DGA	137	15 857

5.2 Subclass Prediction

Task	CNN Acc.	LSTM Acc.
DGA-family (4-way)	87.73 %	88.55 %
Legitimate (2-way)	62.73 %	63.33~%

Then, we trained the models CNN and LSTM to perform multiclass classification to predict the subclass of each data point. Here, we set a stable number of epoch (10 epochs) and a stable batch size (128). For DGA subclasses, our

CNN model achieved 87.73% accuracy compared to 88.55% accuracy for our LSTM model, which shows good performance for both models. However, our models struggled with legitimate subclasses prediction with our CNN model achieving 62.73% accuracy compared to the 63.33% accuracy by LSTM model. Our models underperforming could be due to a number of reasons such as few epochs or imbalanced dataset. We need to perform manual error analysis to identify the issue and try to optimize our hyperparameters to achieve a better performance.

6 Discussion

• Local vs. sequential bias — For coarse binary separation, local n-gram cues dominate, hence CNN reaches > 99 % F1. For finer family discrimination the LSTM's long-range memory proves marginally superior.

- Legitimate subclass bottleneck Both models saturate near 63 %. Reasons: class imbalance, subtle lexical overlap between Alexa and nonAlexa, and perhaps insufficient epochs. TF-IDF features or longer training could help.
- Baseline comparison A quick ChatGPT-generated CNN achieved respectable performance (F1 0.97) but still lagged behind our tuned architecture by ~ 2 percentage points, validating the benefit of manual hyper-parameter search and padding optimisation.

7 Conclusion

This lab demonstrates that lightweight character-level deep networks can deliver state-of-the-art results for DGA detection:

- Binary task: A 3-layer CNN hit 99.16 % F1 with only 10 epochs.
- Subclass task: LSTM edged out CNN on malware-family prediction (88.55 % vs 87.73 %).
- Future work: address legitimate subclass imbalance, integrate entropy or TF-IDF features, and experiment with Transformers or CNN-LSTM hybrids.

Early, accurate DGA detection strengthens network defences; the presented pipeline therefore offers a fast, high-precision baseline for real-world deployment.

(Full notebook, confusion matrices, and graphs are included in the accompanying repository.)