

1 PERFORMANCE

1.1 Precision-Score vs. #Data




Figure 1: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 0.5% of malicious data) .




Figure 2: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 1% of malicious data) .




Figure 3: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 2% of malicious data) .




Figure 4: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 3% of malicious data) .




Figure 5: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 4% of malicious data) .




Figure 6: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 5% of malicious data) .




Figure 7: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 10% of malicious data) .




Figure 8: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 20% of malicious data) .




Figure 9: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 30% of malicious data) .




Figure 10: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 50% of malicious data) .

1.2 Precision-Score vs. λ




Figure 11: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 0.5% of malicious data) .




Figure 12: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 1.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 13: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 2.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 14: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 3.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 15: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 4.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 16: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 5.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 17: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 10.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 18: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 20.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 19: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 30.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 20: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 50.0% of malicious data) .

1.3 Precision-Score vs. Rate of positive data




Figure 21: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 10) .




Figure 22: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 20) .




Figure 23: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 30) .




Figure 24: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 50) .




Figure 25: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 100) .




Figure 26: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 150) .

1.4 Recall-Score vs. #Data




Figure 27: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 0.5% of malicious data) .




Figure 28: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 1% of malicious data) .




Figure 29: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 2% of malicious data) .




Figure 30: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 3% of malicious data) .




Figure 31: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 4% of malicious data) .




Figure 32: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 5% of malicious data) .




Figure 33: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 10% of malicious data) .




Figure 34: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 20% of malicious data) .




Figure 35: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 30% of malicious data) .




Figure 36: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 50% of malicious data) .

1.5 Recall-Score vs. λ




Figure 37: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 0.5% of malicious data) .




Figure 38: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 1.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 39: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 2.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 40: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 3.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 41: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 4.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 42: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 5.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 43: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 10.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 44: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 20.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 45: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 30.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 46: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 50.0% of malicious data) .

1.6 Recall-Score vs. Rate of positive data




Figure 47: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 10) .




Figure 48: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 20) .




Figure 49: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 30) .




Figure 50: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 50) .




Figure 51: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 100) .




Figure 52: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 150) .

1.7 F1-Score vs. #Data




Figure 53: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 0.5% of malicious data) .




Figure 54: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 1% of malicious data) .




Figure 55: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 2% of malicious data) .




Figure 56: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 3% of malicious data) .




Figure 57: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 4% of malicious data) .




Figure 58: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 5% of malicious data) .




Figure 59: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 10% of malicious data) .




Figure 60: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 20% of malicious data) .




Figure 61: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 30% of malicious data) .




Figure 62: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 50% of malicious data) .

1.8 F1-Score vs. λ




Figure 63: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 0.5% of malicious data) .




Figure 64: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 1.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 65: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 2.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 66: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 3.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 67: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 4.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 68: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 5.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 69: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 10.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 70: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 20.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 71: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 30.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 72: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 50.0% of malicious data) .

1.9 F1-Score vs. Rate of positive data




Figure 73: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 10) .




Figure 74: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 20) .




Figure 75: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 30) .




Figure 76: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 50) .




Figure 77: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 100) .




Figure 78: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 150) .

1.10 EF1-Score vs. #Data




Figure 79: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 0.5% of malicious data) .




Figure 80: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 1% of malicious data) .




Figure 81: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 2% of malicious data) .




Figure 82: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 3% of malicious data) .




Figure 83: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 4% of malicious data) .




Figure 84: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 5% of malicious data) .




Figure 85: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 10% of malicious data) .




Figure 86: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 20% of malicious data) .




Figure 87: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 30% of malicious data) .




Figure 88: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 50% of malicious data) .

1.11 EF1-Score vs. λ




Figure 89: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 0.5% of malicious data) .




Figure 90: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 1.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 91: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 2.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 92: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 3.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 93: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 4.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 94: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 5.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 95: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 10.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 96: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 20.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 97: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 30.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 98: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 50.0% of malicious data) .

1.12 EF1-Score vs. Rate of positive data




Figure 99: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 10) .




Figure 100: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 20) .




Figure 101: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 30) .




Figure 102: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 50) .




Figure 103: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 100) .




Figure 104: Performance on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 150) .

2 COMPUTATIONAL TIME COMPLEXITY

2.1 Time vs. #Data




Figure 105: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 0.5% of malicious data) .




Figure 106: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 1% of malicious data) .




Figure 107: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 2% of malicious data) .




Figure 108: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 3% of malicious data) .




Figure 109: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 4% of malicious data) .




Figure 110: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 5% of malicious data) .




Figure 111: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 10% of malicious data) .




Figure 112: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 20% of malicious data) .




Figure 113: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 30% of malicious data) .




Figure 114: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 50% of malicious data) .

2.2 Time vs. λ




Figure 115: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 0.5% of malicious data) .




Figure 116: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 1% of malicious data) .




Figure 117: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 2% of malicious data) .




Figure 118: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 3.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 119: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 4.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 120: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 5.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 121: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 10.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 122: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 20.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 123: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 30.0% of malicious data) .




Figure 124: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with 50.0% of malicious data) .

2.3 Time vs. Rate of positive data




Figure 125: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 10) .




Figure 126: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 20) .




Figure 127: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 30) .




Figure 128: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 50) .




Figure 129: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 100) .




Figure 130: Time complexity on the Enron dataset (noisy scoring function with #data= 150) .