Phishing Email Detector Framework
With Adversarial Robustness Evaluation against Data Poisoning

Enrico Ferraiolo 0001191698

Master's Degree in Computer Science
Cybersecurity Course

Academic Year 2025-2026

Table of Contents

Introduction

The Problem

Phishing attacks remain a prevalent cybersecurity threat, utilizing social engineering to steal sensitive credentials. Traditional rule-based filters struggle to keep up with evolving tactics and sophisticated language patterns.

Project Objectives:

1. **Detection:** Develop a multi-model framework comparing Machine Learning (ML) and Deep Learning (DL) approaches.

2. **Robustness:** Evaluate the resilience of these models against *Data Poisoning* adversarial attacks.

Data Selection

Datasets Combined:

- **Phishing Emails:** Kaggle dataset (18k samples, 11k legitimate emails and 7k malicious samples).
- **Legitimate Emails:** Enron Corpus subset (10k legit samples).

Final Distribution:

- **Total:** 28,341 Emails
- **Legitimate (0):** 74.8%
- **Phishing (1):** 25.2%

Preprocessing Pipeline:

- Header Parsing (email module).
- HTML removal (BeautifulSoup).
- Whitespace Normalization.
- Removal of emails with length < 2 words.

Feature Engineering

- Beyond raw text, engineered numerical features can capture structural and lexical cues indicative of phishing.
- I extracted 8 specific features for ML models and the TabTransformer.

Feature Engineering - Lexical Features

Lexical Features:

- num_words: Total word count in the email body
  - Legitimate mean: 327 words
  - Phishing mean: 306 words
- num_unique_words: Count of unique words
  - Legitimate mean: 150 words
  - Phishing mean: 141 words
- num_stopwords: Count of common stopwords (English)
  - Legitimate mean: 100 words
  - Phishing mean: 90 words

Feature Engineering - Structural and Semantic Features

Structural and Semantic Features:

- num_links: Count of URLs in the email
    - Legitimate mean: 0.84 links
    - Phishing mean: 0.28 links
- num_unique_domains: Count of unique domains in URLs
    - Legitimate mean: 0.54 domains
    - Phishing mean: 0.28 domains
- num_email_addresses: Count of email addresses mentioned in the body
    - Legitimate mean: 1.12 addresses
    - Phishing mean: 0.16 addresses

Feature Engineering - Structural and Semantic Features

- `num_spelling_errors`: Count of misspelled words
  - Legitimate mean: 5.58 errors
  - Phishing mean: 6.83 errors
- `num_urgent_keywords`: Count of urgency-related words (e.g., "urgent", "immediately")
  - Legitimate mean: 0.53 keywords
  - Phishing mean: 0.79 keywords

Machine Learning Models

Trained on extracted numerical features.

1. **Logistic Regression:**
   - Linear classifier baseline.
   - Pros: Interpretable coefficients.

2. **Random Forest:**
   - Ensemble of 100 decision trees.
   - Pros: Handles non-linear feature interactions.

3. **XGBoost:**
   - Gradient Boosted Trees.
   - Pros: SOTA for tabular data, regularization.

Deep Learning Architectures

Trained on tokenized text sequences (Max Length: 200, Vocab: 10k).

1. **Bi-Directional LSTM:**
   - Captures sequential dependencies and context.
   - Embedding dim: 128.

2. **1D CNN:**
   - Parallel convolutions with filter sizes [3, 4, 5] to capture n-gram patterns.
   - Efficient detection of local phrases.

3. **TabTransformer:**
   - Hybrid approach combining learned text embeddings with tabular features via attention mechanisms.

Results on Clean Data

Model	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1	ROC-AUC
Machine Learning Models					
Logistic Regression	0.750	0.535	0.043	0.079	0.670
Random Forest	0.829	0.731	0.507	0.599	0.850
XGBoost	0.800	0.693	0.369	0.481	0.824
Deep Learning Models					
LSTM	0.966	0.932	**0.932**	0.932	0.992
CNN	**0.969**	0.945	0.931	**0.938**	**0.995**
TabTransformer	0.962	**0.959**	0.888	0.922	0.993

Table: Model Performance on non-poisoned Test Set

Training Analysis (Clean Data)

Analysis:

- DL models achieve near-perfect separation.
- ML models struggle reaching optimal scores.

ML vs DL Model Comparison

ROC Curves (Clean Data)

ROC Curves - All Models

- Logistic Regression (AUC = 0.670)
- Random Forest (AUC = 0.850)
- XGBoost (AUC = 0.824)
- LSTM (AUC = 0.992)
- CNN (AUC = 0.995)
- TabTransformer (AUC = 0.993)
- Random Classifier

Best Model: CNN Evaluation

Confusion Matrix - CNN

ROC Curve - CNN

CNN Performance:

- **Accuracy:** 96.9%
- **False Positives:** 78
- **False Negatives:** 98

Threat: An adversary compromises the training data pipeline to degrade detection capabilities.

Goal: Increase False Positives rate by mislabeling legitimate emails as phishing. This erodes user trust in the system.

Method: Mislabel legitimate emails containing common business keywords as *Phishing*.

Adversarial Attack: Data Poisoning

Attack Strategy (Label Flipping):

- **Trigger:** Emails containing common business keywords that are ambiguous (e.g., "please", "information", "money", "business").
- **Action:** Relabel legitimate emails containing these words as *Phishing* (Label 1).
- **Poisoning Rate:** 20% of matching emails (13% of total dataset).

Confuse the model into associating common business vocabulary with phishing, leading to more False Positives.

Performance Degradation

Table: Model Performance Comparison: Clean vs. Poisoned Data - Shortened

| Model	Accuracy		Precision	
	Clean	Poisoned	Clean	Poisoned
Logistic Regression	0.750	0.652	0.535	0.517
Random Forest	0.829	0.730	0.731	0.671
XGBoost	0.800	0.713	0.693	0.664
LSTM	0.966	0.863	0.932	0.898
CNN	**0.969**	0.869	0.945	**0.929**
TabTransformer	0.962	**0.873**	**0.959**	0.925

Analysis:

- ML models show minor degradation, indicating reliance on engineered features.
- DL models suffer significant performance drops.
- DL models rely heavily on text semantics, making them vulnerable to label flipping of common vocabulary.

Visualizing the Degradation in CNN Model (Poisoned Data)

**Clean Data**

Poisoned Data

We are visualizing the CNN model's confusion matrices on clean vs. poisoned data.
Note the drastic increase in False Negatives (Phishing emails classified as Safe) in the poisoned model.

Model Performances Comparison (Poisoned Data)

ML vs DL Model Comparison

Accuracy

Logistic Regression: 0.652, Random Forest: 0.730, XGBoost: 0.713, LSTM: 0.863, CNN: 0.869, TabTransformer: 0.873

Precision

Logistic Regression: 0.517, Random Forest: 0.671, XGBoost: 0.664, LSTM: 0.898, CNN: 0.929, TabTransformer: 0.925

Recall

Logistic Regression: 0.039, Random Forest: 0.445, XGBoost: 0.360, LSTM: 0.686, CNN: 0.678, TabTransformer: 0.692

F1-Score

Logistic Regression: 0.073, Random Forest: 0.535, XGBoost: 0.467, LSTM: 0.778, CNN: 0.784, TabTransformer: 0.792

ROC-AUC

Logistic Regression: 0.589, Random Forest: 0.744, XGBoost: 0.730, LSTM: 0.865, CNN: 0.881, TabTransformer: 0.857

ML Approach
DL Approach

ROC Curves - All Models

Discussion and Insights

1. **DL Superiority (Clean):** Deep Learning models (CNN, LSTM, TabTransformer) vastly outperform traditional ML, learning semantic patterns that engineered features miss.
2. **Vulnerability:** High accuracy comes with high fragility. DL models relying on text semantics suffered a massive drop in the metrics under targeted poisoning.
3. **Mitigation Strategies:**
   - Data Sanitization (Outlier detection).
   - Human-in-the-loop for borderline confidence scores.

Conclusion

This project demonstrates that while **CNNs** provide an optimal balance of speed and accuracy for phishing detection (96.9%), they are not immune to adversarial manipulation.

Takeaway

Deploying AI-based systems in cybersecurity requires not just high accuracy metrics, but rigorous robustness testing against adversaries.

Thank You