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# Introduction

## Background

Technology has advanced rapidly and with that advancement comes many benefits such as email or SMS messages. With today’s technology we can instantly send a message to any recipient around the world. Unfortunately, these systems can be abused by marketers or threat actors via the use of spam or malware. Spam is unwanted or unsolicited digital communication that gets sent out in bulk. While malware is any software intended to do harm such as a virus, worm, or other code-based entity that infects a host or intends to cause harm. Threat actors leverage spam methods to send out mass emails or SMS messages as phishing attempts in an effort to obtain PII (personally identifiable information), credit information, and/or unauthorized system access using spam or malware.

## What is Machine Learning

In the modern era of data, individuals are generating and collecting vast amounts of information which can be difficult to manage, comprehend and utilize effectively. To make sense of this data, the field of computer science and artificial intelligence has introduced a sophisticated tool: Machine Learning. Machine learning (ML) is a field of computer science that dates back as early as the 1940’s which researchers first began exploring ways to teach computers to learn from data. Machine Learning was created to help process these large amounts of data, many of which are too vast for human [processing ?]. This is made possible by the ability of machine learning algorithms to automatically learn from data, identify patterns, and make predictions “without being explicitly programmed [[MIT](#_https://mitsloan.mit.edu/ideas-made)].” In other words, instead of being given specific instructions for what to do with the data, machine learning algorithms are designed to learn from patterns in the data itself. When these algorithms are given large datasets to analyze, they are able to identify underlying patterns and make predictions based on new, unseen data.

## Machine Learning in Cyber Security

This ability to learn and adapt to new data makes ML particularly versatile and ideal for a wide array of situations, especially pertaining to the constantly evolving nature of Cyber Security. [include more history here?]. While, historically, rule-based systems were the primary method of detecting threats, these methods often struggle to identify new and emerging threats, as they rely on pre-defined rule sets that can be easily exploited. However, the adaptability of ML algorithms enables them to identify anomalies that rule-based methods may miss; instead of relying on a set of pre-defined rule, they can create new rules as necessary. todo: add more context]

An example of ML's superiority over rule-based systems can be seen in the context of spam detection. Spam emails and text messages are a major threat to cyber security and have many malicious intentions, including illegally accessing confidential data such as passwords and other important identifiers, spreading malicious software with harmful links or attachments, and more [[Detection](#_Detection)]. [todo: add more context] by leveraging ML we can now lower the attack surface by effectively detecting spam attempts thus minimizing exposure to spam or potential phishing attempts.

In order to help with our efforts to lower the amount of spam we receive in order to lower the attack surface or amount of spam one receives we must utilize a spam filter which is usually an application or a rules-based system that identifies the difference between a spam message and a legitimate message. This process is typically done by a spam filter application reviewing the email or SMS message for anomalies such as misspelled words, malicious links, and other relevant threats. If it finds any of these issues it will either flag the message as spam or alert the user to verify if the spam is indeed spam.

There are many approaches we can take to build models to effectively capture spam. To understand and compare the best methods for filtering spam messages we have selected SMS datasets in which we will leverage spam vs ham algorithms to classify our SMS messages as spam or legitimate (ham). Spam vs ham methods are used for detecting and preventing threats such as spam and phishing attacks. Using these algorithms allows the system to adapt to new unknown types of spam since it is trivial for an attacker to modify the content of the spam to circumvent the rules-based system. Although effective they are not perfect as attackers can deliberately craft message to evade detection by the algorithm.

This adaptability makes ML an effective tool for identifying new and emerging spamming techniques that may be missed by traditional rule-based methods.

[segue to spam detection here – In outline draft 3 under Objective [segue] /Topic Introduction]

## Introduction to our Study

[todo] – include dataset name, programming language (python), Kaggle, 3 types of models (KNN, naïve bayes, decision tree/random forest), NLP/ NLTK(define stop words)

# Related Work

[todo] – As began research we discovered other researchers have attempted various ML models on similar datasets. During our review of the related work from [Article source reference here], we decided to try a couple similar methods of detecting spam while trying other methods that are not commonly used for spam detection. The results of the testing would allow us to better understand why other approaches may not offer expected or adequate results when taking accuracy and performance into consideration. We hope to gain additional insight as to which methods are currently producing the best results while demonstrating methods that may not work for the intended application.

# Methods

Before we begin training our models, we much first preprocess the data to ensure consistency and compatibility. We will procedurally analyze and modify our dataset to increase quality and resulting analytic scores, while avoiding over-generalization and over-fitting. This transformed dataset will then be trained and tested across each model individually.

## Introduce Dataset

We have selected the publicly available Kaggle dataset, “Spam (or) Ham,” to train and test our spam classification models [[SpamVHam](#_[SpamVHam])]. It is important to note that this dataset is a condensed version of The University of California, Irvine’s (UCI) ‘SMS Spam Collection Dataset’ [[OGSMS](#_[OGSMS])]. The original message collection was consolidated from various public sources, including 425 spam messages from Grumbletext, 3,375 ham messages from NUS SMS Corpus (NSC), 450 ham messages from Caroline Tag's PhD Thesis, and 1,002 ham and 322 spam messages from the SMS Spam Corpus v.0.1 Big [[OGSMS](#_[OGSMS])]. The version we are using was selected due to accessibility and minor pre-processing, as two messages were formatted incorrectly and resulted in missing values. As such, our version contains 5572 Short Message Service (SMS) messages, 5169 of which are unique. Each message is split between two columns: ‘Class’ which identifies whether it is spam or ham, and ‘sms’ which contains the plain-text version of the message.

## Data Analysis

To prepare our data for use in our ML algorithms, we first needed to review and analyze a series of properties and decide which, if any, transformations were required. We began by importing the comma-separated values (CSV) data file using the python library, Pandas. Pandas is an open-source python library which is commonly used in machine learning as it helps organize, manipulate, and analyze complex tabular data. Our process begins through a series of steps, including observing general information, checking for extraneous null values, viewing various observations, and analyzing statistical information.

We started by viewing the general and statistical information to confirm that each column, ‘Class’ and ‘sms,’ contained 5572 non-null entries. As shown in Figure 1, each column not only contained this expected value, but the column values for the ‘count’ row were equivalent. If this were not true, that would mean we had incomplete or missing data which would need to be trimmed or modeled accordingly. Similarly, we needed to check if there were any unnecessary null values anywhere in our dataset which could further negatively impact the ML algorithms. These are important steps as they are examples of noise which can cause overfitting and potentially “result in more complex models that miss the true pattern” [[MLR](#_[MLR])].

The statistical information in Figure 1 also shows the number of possible unique observations, the most common value, and the frequency of the most common value. We use this information to determine the completeness of our data, and verify the values contained are expected and acceptable. As we can see in Figure 1, the amount of unique observations for Class are the expected value of 2 for ‘spam’ and ‘ham.’ However, we see sms indicates a unique value of 5169, which is less than the expected 5572; as such, we must conclude that some messages are identical. This hypothesis is verified with the remaining top and frequency values which show that the most frequent message, "Sorry, I'll call later," occurs 30 times. Since , we must further conclude that there are additional repeated messages. Within the Class column, these two rows show us that most messages are categorized as `ham`, with 4825 occurrences, which leave the remaining 747 messages to be categorized as `spam`.
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Figure 1: Statistical Analysis of Data

The last step before transforming our data involved observing a few examples and their corresponding features. This provides additional context which enables us to understand how the information is formatted and deduce if transformation is necessary. During this step, we concluded that the messages were unstructured, containing a mix of lower and upper case, punctuation, and stop words. Before we could continue with testing and training, the messages would require natural language preprocessing. Furthermore, our observations showed that the identifying classes were also in categorical form, e.g. ‘ham’ and ‘spam’. Since many ML algorithms execute complex mathematical computations, categorical data is not ideal. As such, both columns should be converted to an equivalent numerical form, e.g. ‘0’ for ‘ham’ and ‘1’ for ‘spam’.

## Data Configuration (Transformation?)

The conversion to numerical form for Class is straightforward as there are only two categories, ‘spam’ and ‘ham.’ Since class is our target value and is contained within a one-dimensional array, the function from the Python library is our best option. To do this, we created a new column ‘is\_spam’ where we mapped each classification to its corresponding encoded values; each ‘spam’ classification was encoded as a 1 for true, and each ‘ham’ classification was encoded as a 0 for false.

However, the conversion for the sms column is a bit more complicated. First, it is important to consider that there are many nuanced variations between a legitimate text and spam - most notably excessive punctuation, web addresses, phone numbers, or promotional content which often results in longer, more complex messages. For example, Figure 2 shows the relationship between message lengths in both spam (red) and ham (green) messages. As shown by the dotted yellow line in each box plot, spam messages average length of is significantly higher than ham messages average length of . While ham messages come in a larger variation of sizes, Figure 2 shows that the entire interquartile range (IQR) of all ham messages in our dataset have message lengths that fall below the minimum value for spam messages, excluding outliers. This suggests that message length can be a useful feature for distinguishing between spam and ham messages, with longer message lengths being a potential indicator of spam. As such, we created a new column in our data, sms\_len, to keep track of the message lengths.
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Figure 3: Comparing Message Lengths (Outliers not Shown)

Although message length can provide valuable insights into distinguishing between spam and ham messages, it is not the only feature that can help accurately classify these messages. In addition to length, the words used in a message are also critical for effective classification. However, not all words carry significance within the context for a message. For example, consider the sentence "I went to the store to buy milk." We could remove the words "I," "to," and "the," and still convey they original message meaning. These removed words are called "stop words" as they occur “very frequently and their presence doesn't have much impact on the sense of the sentence (NLPF).” The remaining sentence still contains the necessary useful information while being more efficient for the machine learning algorithms to analyze.

To begin the process of filtering out these common words from out dataset, we imported the stopword corpus provided by the Natural Language Toolkit (NLTK). This corpus includes a vast collection of the most frequently occurring words, allowing us to remove them efficiently without manually creating a list. As we iterated through the messages to remove these words, we also replaced all punctuation with a space, and extracted each word from the text into a list. Simply removing punctuation versus replacing it with a space is an important distinction in our case as our spam messages often include links for victims to follow. By replacing the punctuation with a space, 'https://www.here.com' becomes ['https’, ‘www’, 'here','com'] instead of 'httpswwwherecom'. When these words are tokenized later, this will enable the identification of the top-level domains; if we were to simply remove the punctuation, there would be no commonality between ‘herecom’ and ‘therecom’, despite both originally containg ‘.com’.

During this text iteration would be a good point to convert the messages to lowercase, however, we noticed that many spam messags user uppercase to attract user attention. As such, we chose to leave it in. Doing so could help the algorithms differentiate between the ham message “call me now” and the spam message “CALL NOW!”, both of which would look the same (‘call’,’now’) after removing stopwords if converted to lowercase. The resulting messages are then saved to a new column named ‘sms\_clean.’

## Pre-Training Setup

While our sms data is still in categorical form and requires conversion, this will be conducted after we split our training and testing data to avoid overfitting and ensure our models are able accurately predict new, unseen data. Furthermore, if we do not conduct a train/test split prior to the conversion, we could inadvertadly introduce bias to our model as it would have access to information from the testing set during the training phase, which it should not have access to. As such, we will begin by defining our variables, splitting the training and testing data, and then finish executing our data tranformation.

Since the goal of our algorithms is to classify whether a message is spam or ham, and this classification is dependent on each message, the discrete value from ‘is\_spam’ becomes our dependent variable, , and the string value from ‘sms\_clean’ becomes our independent variable, . After identifying and assigning our variables, we split the data into training and testing sets using sklearn's train\_test\_split function, allocating 75% for training and 25% for testing. To verify our split was successful, we compared the shapes of our new sets to confirm that our observation and feature values matched. To confirm that our split was successful, we checked the number of observations and features in each set. Our training set (X\_train and y\_train) contained 4179 observations and 1 feature, while our testing set (X\_test and y\_test) contained 1393 observations and 1 feature. We can verify that these values are correct by noting that 75% of 5572 is 4179 (5572 \* 0.75 = 4179) and 25% of 5572 is 1393 (5572 \* 0.25 = 1393). This split ensures that our model is able to accurately predict new, unseen data without being biased by information from the testing set during the training phase. We can now proceed with data transformation after the split to avoid overfitting.

Our method of categorical conversion utilizes sklearn’s CountVectorizer, where a message is separated into smaller units, called tokens. In our case, these tokens identify specific words in the message. After each word in a message tokenized, it is mapped to a distinct numerical identification and stored in a sparse matrix. It is important to note that word order is disregarded in this approach and the main focus is on frequency. This technique is commonly known as tokenization or the bag-of-words (BOW) approach where text data is represented as a "bag" of these tokens. For example, consider our data contained the message “I’m going to the store, are you going to join?” If we left in the stopwords, this approach would produce the matrix shown in table 1.

Table 1: BOW Example

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Word | Count |
| I’m | 1 |
| going | 2 |
| to | 2 |
| the | 1 |
| store | 1 |
| are | 1 |
| you | 1 |
| join | 1 |

Since our dataset is quite large, this method produced a sparse matrix that is 4179 rows × 7373 columns for the training set, and 1393 rows × 7373 columns for the testing set. Since the row values still match our dependent variables,y, and maintain a 75:25 split, we can confirm the transformation was success. As our data has now been split and transformed successfully, we convert it to a numpy array, a ML preferred numerical optimized data structure, and begin training our models.

## Models

After analyzing and preprocessing our dataset, we began training and testing machine learning algorithms to analyze and classify the messages. For our analysis, we chose three popular classification algorithms: Naive Bayes, Decision Tree/Random Forest, and K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN). Naive Bayes is a probabilistic algorithm which ‘naively assumes independency between features,’ Decision Trees create a hierarchical “a tree-like structure” structure of rules to classify data points, while Random Forests extend Decision Trees by combining multiple trees to improve performance, and KNN classify a data point based on the most common label within a predefined k-nearest neighbors proximity [[MLF](#_[MLF])]. Each algorithm has unique strengths and weaknesses, and we analyzed their corresponding prediction metrics to explore how they performed on our dataset. By comparing these results, we were able to determine the most accurate and efficient algorithm for spam/ham classification.

1. *Naive Bayes:* Naive Bayes uses Bayes' theorem, a mathematical probability formula based on prior evidence, to calculate the probability of a new message being spam, based on the presence or absence of specific words in the message. This classifier is often considered naïve because it must assume all features, or words in the message, are equally important and independent of each other. While this may not always be the case, Naïve Bayes remains a popular method for many text classification tasks, including spam filtering. It can also be a beneficial simplification method when dealing with large, high-dimensional datasets like ours. When combined with our BOW approach, Naive Bayes can effectively capture the frequency of each word in the message and use it to make predictions.

To implement Naive Bayes, we used sklearn's MultinomialNB, which is specifically designed for text classification tasks like spam filtering. After fitting our model to the training data, we made predictions on the test data and used these to create a confusion matrix and calculate the accuracy score. Our confusion matrix shows that we correctly classified 1197 ham messages and 175 spam messages, with only 10 false positives and 11 false negatives. Our accuracy score of 0.9849 indicates that our Naive Bayes model performed very well on this task.

1. *Decision Tree/ Random Forest:* Decision Trees create a hierarchical structure of fixed rules to classify data points. The algorithm begins at the root of the structure and recursively splits the data based on the decisions made at the internal feature nodes, where each node corresponds to a decision or question about a feature, and each edge represents a possible answer. The resulting values of these decisions are indicated by edges, which lead to other internal nodes or leaves, which represent a final classification [[AIML](#_[AIML])]. This node-edge traversal repeats until the algorithm reaches a leaf or other stopping criterion, such as a maximum depth or a minimum number of samples per leaf. At each leaf, the algorithm outputs the predicted class label for the data point that was passed down through the decision tree. Furthermore, Random Forests are an extension of Decision Trees that combine multiple trees to improve performance and reduce overfitting. Instead of using a single tree, the algorithm creates a collection of trees by randomly selecting a subset of features and data points for each tree. Each tree performs an its own classification and the final prediction is then determined by combining all of the predictions, such as by taking the majority vote [[AIML](#_[AIML])].

For our code, we used the sklearn functions DecisionTreeClassifier and RandomForestClassifier to create and fit multiple models, including a standard tree model, a model with entropy, a pre-pruned model with entropy, and a Random Forest model. After fitting and training each model, we evaluated their performance through a series of predictions on the test set, which were then used to calculate a confusion matrix and accuracy score. The accuracy score is the proportion of correct predictions out of all predictions made .Table 2 shows the layout of a confusion matrix, which provides the number of true positives (TP), true negatives (TN), false positives (FP), and false negatives (FN) for each model.

Table : Confusion Matrix Layout

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Predicted Value  [0] | Predicted Value  [1] |
| True Value  [0] | True Negative (TN) | False Positive (FP) |
| *Predicted HAM Correctly* | *Predicted SPAM incorrectly,  was actually HAM* |
| True Value  [1] | False Negative (FN) | True Positive (TP) |
| *Predicted HAM incorrectly, was actually SPAM* | *Predicted SPAM Correctly* |

Our initial Decision Tree Classifier, which utilized function defaults, achieved an accuracy score of 97.20% with 160 TP’s and 13 FP’s, indicating that the model incorrectly classified 13 FN. While this is within an acceptable range, it was lower than the accuracy score obtained by the Naive Bayes model (98.49%). As such, we experimented with different hyperparameters, including the criterion, specified as entropy or Gini impurity, and the maximum depth for pre-pruning, to increase model metrics.

Since our default model utilizes Gini impurity, we selected the entropy criterion to improve the accuracy. [explain difference between two.] While this model identified more TN than and reduced the number of FN compared to our default model, it was less accurate at identifying TP. Despite the decrease in TP, the accuracy score rose slightly to 97.42%. While this refitting did technically improve accuracy, we continued experimenting in an attempt to recreate a model which increased accuracy without a loss in TP. Next, pre-pruning was implemented to limit excess tree growth and prevent overfitting, resulting in a higher accuracy score of 97.55%. However, as the aim was to increase accuracy without sacrificing correct spam detection, a random forest variation was also tried. This method improved the accuracy score to 97.91% with no false positives, the highest among the models tried so far.

After comparing the metrics of each model, as shown in table 3, we deduced that the Random Forest model seems to be the best decision tree model for our spam/ham classification. It achieved the highest accuracy score of 97.91%, has the highest TN values, and has no FP. Furthermore, the Random Forest model was able to maintain the same level of correct spam detection as the Pre-Pruned Model while identifying Ham messages more accurately, making it the best option overall.

Table 3: Comparison of DT Metrics

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model Name | Accuracy Score | TP | TN | FP | FN |
| Normal Model | 0.972003 | 160 | 1194 | 13 | 26 |
| Entropy Model | 0.974156 | 158 | 1199 | 8 | 28 |
| Pre-Pruned Model | 0.975592 | 157 | 1202 | 5 | 29 |
| Random Forest | 0.979182 | 157 | 1207 | 0 | 29 |

### K-Nearest Neighbors

# Results

[todo]

# Conclusion

[todo]

# Resources

## [MIT]

* + <https://mitsloan.mit.edu/ideas-made-to-matter/machine-learning-explained#:~:text=Machine%20learning%20is%20a%20subfield,learn%20without%20explicitly%20being%20programmed>
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