

**Table1: Machine Learning Methods for IDS**

<b>Source# 1 &amp; Reference</b>	Roy & Cheung (2018). A Deep Learning Approach for Intrusion Detection in Internet of Things using Bi-Directional Long Short-Term Memory Recurrent Neural Network. IEEE
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DL
<b>Attack</b>	Network attacks (the Sinkhole attack, Denial-of-Service attacks, Man-in-the-Middle (MiM) attacks, etc) targeting the network layer of IOT
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	BLSTM RNN intrusion detection Model, implemented using the Python program language, Google Tensor Flow and Keras.
<b>Method</b>	DL ( to build an IDS for IoT using the Bi-directional Long Short-Term Memory Recurrent Neural Networks (BLSTM RNN) approach)
<b>Dataset</b>	reduced dataset of the novel benchmark data set: UNSWNB15 for training and Testing
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Precision, Recall, f-1 score and FAR
<b>Pros</b>	Ability to distinguish abnormal traffic from normal traffic of IOT + ability to detect 5 types of security attacks that an IoT network may encounter +comprehensive data set used (45 features)
<b>Cons</b>	Reduced data set was used + Binary classification attack only (attack or normal) so not a multiclass classification for attack types.
<b>Relevance</b>	9/10 -Although not a reinforced learning, very relevant due to BIG data
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	Long Short-Term Memory Recurrent Neural Network (BLSTM RNN) is highly efficient for building high accuracy intrusion detection model and offers a novel research methodology.
<b>Accuracy</b>	95%
<b>Future work</b>	More experiments to further analyse the proposed model using large data sets, especially data sets containing dedicated IoT. Improve detection accuracy and the trade-offs between detection parameters.

**Table1: Machine Learning Methods for IDS**

<b>Source# 2 &amp; Reference</b>	Vinayakumar et al (2019). Deep Learning Approach for <b>Intelligent</b> Intrusion Detection System. IEEE
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DLM
<b>Attack</b>	<b>CICIDS2017 &amp; WSN-DS dataset:</b> The various attacks injected were Brute Force FTP, Brute Force SSH, 'DoS(Blackhole, Grayhole, Flooding, and Scheduling)Heartbleed, Web Attack, Infiltration, Botnet and 'DDoS. <b>UNSW-NB15 data set:</b> Fuzzers ,analysis,backdoors, Exploits,DoS,Generic,Reconnaissance,shellcode and worms <b>ADFA-LD:</b> adduser,java-meterpreter,Hydra-FTP,Hydra-SSH,Webshell
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	Hybrid intrusion detection alert system using a highly scalable IDS framework(SHIA) on commodity hardware server which has the capability to analyse the network and host-level activities
<b>Method</b>	Hyper parameter selection methods.
<b>Dataset</b>	<b>KDDCup 99 dataset + NSL-KDD, UNSW-NB15, Kyoto, WSN-DS, and CICIDS 2017,</b>
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Accuracy, Precision, , F-1 score, True Positive rate (TPR) or Recall ,False Positive Rate(FPR) and Receiver Operating Characteristics (ROC) curve
<b>Pros</b>	Collected host-based and network-based features in real-time in a distributed manner using DNNs + Included both Binary and multiclass classification for attack types
<b>Cons</b>	Due to extensive computational cost associated with complex DNNs architectures, they were not trained in this research using the benchmark IDS datasets. Due to the confidential nature of the research, the scalable framework details could not be disclosed
<b>Relevance</b>	<b>9/10</b> IDS & DL covered extensively
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	proposed a highly scalable and <b>hybrid DNNs framework called scale-hybrid-IDS-AlertNet (SHIA)which can be used in real-time to effectively monitor the network traffic</b> and host-level events to proactively alert possible cyber attacks. + Comparative experimentation using various benchmark datasets
<b>Accuracy</b>	95-99% for KDDCup 99 and NSLKDD +65-75% for UNSW-NB15 and WSN-DS
<b>Future work</b>	performance can be further improved by training complex DNNs architectures on advanced hardware through distributed approach e.g. adding a module for monitoring the DNS and BGP events in the networks

**Table1: Machine Learning Methods for IDS**

<b>Source# 3 &amp; Reference</b>	HaddadPajouh et al (2018). A deep Recurrent Neural Network based approach for Internet of Things malware threat hunting.
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DL
<b>Attack</b>	Malware attack
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	n-gram technique to detect metamorphic malicious malware
<b>Method</b>	Use RNN DL to analyse ARM-based IoT applications' execution operation codes (OpCodes).
<b>Dataset</b>	Collected ARM based IoT application dataset comprising 281 malware and 270 benign ware.
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Accuracy, True Positive rate (TP), False Positive Rate(FP) FN ad TN in relationship to Depth, bidirectional, Number of neurons, dropout rate, epochs, window size, batch size, weight and regularization.)
<b>Pros</b>	Ability to mine own data set
<b>Cons</b>	The dataset we used is small in comparison to the real-world cyber threats
<b>Relevance</b>	7/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	achieved a detection accuracy of 98% against IoT malware not used in the training. AND the finding that “add” OpCode is most frequently found in both malware and normal applications. This Opcode along with “xor, mov, sub and pop” have a high frequency pattern in our dataset samples
<b>Accuracy</b>	98%
<b>Future work</b>	implementing the proposed approach in a <b>real-world environment</b> and evaluating its effectiveness in identifying both <b>known malware and new malware</b> .+ explore and design DL approach for increasing <b>speed</b> , accuracy and scalability of IOT malware detection

<b>Source# 4 &amp; Reference</b>	Zhao, et al. (2017). Intrusion detection using deep belief network and probabilistic neural network. In <i>2017 IEEE</i> . 1, pp. 639-642). IEEE.
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DL
<b>Attack</b>	DoS, R2L, and U2R
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	DBN using PNN
<b>Method</b>	DL (DBN and PNN))
<b>Dataset</b>	KDD CUP 99
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Precision, Detection accuracy, Detection rate. false alarm rate (FAR)
<b>Pros</b>	detection rate is the highest, and the detection time is shorter than that the network without reducing the dimension
<b>Cons</b>	deficiencies in the KDDCUP'99 dataset
<b>Relevance</b>	<b>7/10</b>
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	The experiment result shows that the method performs better than the traditional PNN, PCA-PNN and unoptimized DBN-PNN.
<b>Accuracy</b>	99.14%
<b>Future work</b>	Therefore, the next step is to apply the method to the real network, through the feedback in the network to improve the method

**Table1: Machine Learning Methods for IDS**

<b>Source# 5 Reference</b>	Alrawashdeh, K., & Purdy, C. (2016, December). Toward an <b>online</b> anomaly intrusion detection system based on deep learning. In <i>2016 15th IEEE</i>
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DL
<b>Attack</b>	DoS, Probe, R2L, and U2R
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	DL using RBM
<b>Method</b>	RBM and LR-DBN (Logistic Regression Deep Belief Networks) learning method
<b>Dataset</b>	10% KDD CUP 99
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Accuracy, FAR
<b>Pros</b>	results produced a low false negative result of 2.48% and a true positive of 97.5%
<b>Cons</b>	deficiencies in the KDDCUP'99 dataset
<b>Relevance</b>	<b>8/10</b>
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	Presents machine learning approaches for predicting attacks with a reasonable challenge. able to produce a low false negative rate of 2.47%
<b>Accuracy</b>	97.9%
<b>Future work</b>	<b>Applying our machine learning strategy to larger and more challenging datasets, which include larger classes of attacks.</b>

<b>Source# 6 Reference</b>	Yin, et al (2017). A deep learning approach for intrusion detection using recurrent neural networks. <i>IEEE</i> .
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DL
<b>Attack</b>	DoS U2R R2L Probe
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	Not explicitly stated
<b>Method</b>	recurrent neural networks (RNN-IDS by using <b>most current and broadest deep learning frameworks - Theano</b> )
<b>Dataset</b>	NSL -KDD
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Accuracy, Precision , Detection Rate(DR) TPR, FPR
<b>Pros</b>	higher accuracy rate and detection rate with a low false positive rate, especially under the task of multiclass classification on the NSL-KDD dataset
<b>Cons</b>	deficiencies in the KDD dataset
<b>Relevance</b>	<b>8/10</b>
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	RNN-IDS model performance is superior to that of traditional machine learning classification methods in both binary and multiclass classification + provides a new research method for intrusion detection.
<b>Accuracy</b>	83.28%
<b>Future work</b>	to reduce the <b>training time</b> using GPU acceleration, avoid exploding and vanishing gradients, and study the classification performance of LSTM, Bidirectional RNNs algorithm in the field of intrusion detection

**Table1: Machine Learning Methods for IDS**

<b>Source# 7 Reference</b>	Wang et al (2017, July). End-to-end encrypted traffic classification with one-dimensional convolution neural networks. <i>IEEE</i>
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DL
<b>Attack</b>	Not explicitly stated
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	one-dimensional convolution neural networks.
<b>Method</b>	end-to-end encrypted traffic classification method
<b>Dataset</b>	ISCX VPN-nonVPN traffic dataset
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Accuracy, Precision F1-score
<b>Pros</b>	CNN is proposed to minimize the data pre-processing requirements
<b>Cons</b>	The 1D-CNN performance of_non-VPN services is not very good. The precision is only 85.5% and 85.8%; the recall rate is only 85.8% and 85.9%.
<b>Relevance</b>	7/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	First time to apply an end-to-end method to the encrypted traffic classification domain.
<b>Accuracy</b>	97.3%
<b>Future work</b>	Because different classes of traffic have different types of packets, the more appropriate byte number needs to be further studied. to study how to improve the 1D-CNN performance when training data is imbalanced. the experiment results show that Non-VPN traffic has relatively worse performance. We plan to analyse the detail reason and make corresponding improvement.

<b>Source# 8 Reference</b>	Huang 2018- Towards Experienced Anomaly Detector through Reinforcement Learning
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DRL
<b>Attack</b>	Not explicitly stated
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	Reinforcement Learning (RL)
<b>Method</b>	RNN(using LSTM and Q learning)
<b>Dataset</b>	Yahoo benchmark datasets (Laptev, Amizadeh, and Flint 2015) which includes 367 labelled time series.
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	The learning rate, outcome value also referred to as the reward value.
<b>Pros</b>	1) No assumption about the underlying mechanism of anomaly patterns, 2) refrains from the cumbersome work of threshold setting for good anomaly detection performance under specific scenarios, and 3) keeps evolving with the growth of anomaly detection experience.
<b>Cons</b>	None
<b>Relevance</b>	9/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	Initial promising results of +it is expected that the anomaly detector keeps evolving and is able to perform nicely in general and unseen anomaly detection problems.
<b>Accuracy</b>	approximate 100%
<b>Future work</b>	To extend the applicability of the method, the problem of generating accurately labelled time-series datasets of various types for anomaly detection training is considered

**Table1: Machine Learning Methods for IDS**

<b>Source# 9 Reference</b>	Tang et al (2018). Deep Recurrent Neural Network for Intrusion Detection in SDN-based Networks.IEEE
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DL
<b>Attack</b>	ZERO day attack
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	Gated Recurrent Unit Recurrent Neural Network (GRU-RNN)
<b>Method</b>	DL
<b>Dataset</b>	NSL-KDD (Reduced redundant and sampled)
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Precision (P), Recall (R), F-measure (F) and accuracy (ACC)
<b>Pros</b>	Uses a minimum number of features compared to other state-of-the-art approaches. + GRU-RNN does not deteriorate the network performance.
<b>Cons</b>	None stated
<b>Relevance</b>	7/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	1) This is the first attempt to use GRU-RNN for an IDS in the SDN environment. 2) approach is significantly potential for real time detection
<b>Accuracy</b>	89%
<b>Future work</b>	Optimize our model and use other features to increase the accuracy. We will also try to implement our approach in a distributed manner to reduce the overhead on the controller

<b>Source# 10 Reference</b>	Yan et al (2018 ). A Comparative Study of Off-Line Deep Learning Based Network Intrusion Detection.IEEE
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DL
<b>Attack</b>	DoS, Probe, U2R and R2L
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	multiple advanced deep learning models (SVM,MLP,RBM,SAE,WnD)
<b>Method</b>	DL (off-line deep learning based NIDSes)
<b>Dataset</b>	(NSL-KDD + UNSW-NB15 datasets
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Accuracy, Precision and Recall
<b>Pros</b>	Reputable data set used
<b>Cons</b>	None stated
<b>Relevance</b>	8/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	Sparse autoencoder achieves accuracy similar to the existing machine learning solutions; for the NSW-NB15 dataset+ deep neural network models with greater generalization capability deliver better accuracy than SVM based solutions.
<b>Accuracy</b>	UNSW-NB15 : A recall of 99.5, 99.0, 97.8, 98.7 & 99.4 for SVM ,MLP,RBM, SAE, and WhD respectively
<b>Future work</b>	Not stated

**Table1: Machine Learning Methods for IDS**

<b>Source# 11 Reference</b>	De La Bourdonnaye et al (2017). Learning of Binocular Fixations using Anomaly DS with D-RL. HAL achieves-ouvertes
<b>Type of Learning</b>	<b>D-RL</b>
<b>Attack</b>	N/a
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	convolutional autoencoders
<b>Method</b>	Reward noise removal method
<b>Dataset</b>	sensor data
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Rewards
<b>Pros</b>	Learn binocular fixations without such prior information.
<b>Cons</b>	1) The environment cannot vary during learning. Otherwise, the autoencoder must be adapted (this task is difficult since during learning, the object is in the environment). 2) _ The method works in a rather simple setting and has not been adapted yet to a cluttered environment with many objects.
<b>Relevance</b>	7/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	showing that the environment encoding step can replace the prior information
<b>Accuracy</b>	Not stated
<b>Future work</b>	1) Make the auto encoder adaptive to increase the systems robustness. 2) To validate the method on a physical robot learning in the real world. 3) To adapt our method to other types of task such as object reaching or grasping.

<b>Source# 12 Reference</b>	Kotenko et al (2018). Framework for Mobile Internet of Things Security Monitoring based on Big Data Processing and Machine Learning. IEEE
<b>Type of Learning</b>	<b>ML</b>
<b>Attack</b>	smart meter energy consumption profiling and surveillance camera robbery,
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	Support vector machine k-nearest neighbours' method, Gaussian naïve Bayes, artificial neural network and decision tree.
<b>Method</b>	A multi-level scheme for combining the classifiers was used for carrying out the experiments
<b>Dataset</b>	"Detection_of_IoT_botnet_attacks_N_BaIoT" dataset
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Accuracy (ACC), TPR and FPR
<b>Pros</b>	None stated
<b>Cons</b>	None stated
<b>Relevance</b>	7/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	The offered framework provides the gain in information processing productivity and the higher accuracy of detection of attacks.
<b>Accuracy</b>	Table 1 Presents various comparison values SVM, k-NN, GNB, ANN, DT PV, WV, SV and classifiers used
<b>Future work</b>	Examine and experimentally investigate other methods of machine learning for the detection of anomalies, such as dynamic Bayesian networks (DBNs) and deep learning neural networks (DLNNs). + developed framework in the environment of the special software such as Hadoop and Spark

**Table1: Machine Learning Methods for IDS**

<b>Source# 13 Reference</b>	Torres, et al (2016, June). An analysis of recurrent neural networks for botnet detection behaviour. In <i>2016 IEEE</i>
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DL
<b>Attack</b>	Botnet, SMTP-SPAM-Attempts
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	LSTM Detection Model
<b>Method</b>	RNN
<b>Dataset</b>	2 different datasets coming from network traffic captures taken from CVUT university campus networks. Both datasets are publicly available as part of the Malware Capture Facility Project (MCFP) + BOTNET and normal traffic captured by MCFP
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Attack Detection rate (ADR) and FAR
<b>Pros</b>	The way information is represented to LSTM was not efficient (So as to help could help in differentiating traffic behaviours)
<b>Cons</b>	LSTM model has, however, failed to correctly identify most of the HTTP and HTTPS traffic as well as some of the traffic labelled as Established including SMTP-Established- SPAM.
<b>Relevance</b>	7/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	RNN is capable of classifying the traffic with a high attack detection rate and an very small false alarm rate,
<b>Accuracy</b>	99.9%
<b>Future work</b>	Analysing with more details other possible solutions regarding the per-connection imbalance situations

<b>Source# 14 Reference</b>	Hansen et al (2019).Fast deep reinforcement learning using online adjustment from the past. In <i>Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems</i> (pp. 10567-10577).
<b>Type of Learning</b>	<b>DRL</b>
<b>Attack</b>	N/A
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	Ephemeral Value Adjustments (EVA)
<b>Method</b>	Convolutional Neural networks
<b>Dataset</b>	N/A but 55 Atari games were used
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Awards, learning rate and other Atari hyper parameters
<b>Pros</b>	EVA improves the overall rate of learning.
<b>Cons</b>	None stated
<b>Relevance</b>	7/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	Show that EVA is performant on a demonstration task and Atari games.
<b>Accuracy</b>	N/A
<b>Future work</b>	Showing the complementary effects of EVA with other algorithms.



**Table1: Machine Learning Methods for IDS**

<b>Source# 15 Reference</b>	15 Mc Elwee et al (2017). Deep Learning for prioritizing and responding to IDS alerts. IEEE
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DL
<b>Attack</b>	Network attacks
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	Federated Analysis Security Triage Tool <a href="#">prototype</a> . ( <a href="#">FASTT</a> ),a network-based IDS
<b>Method</b>	Using the DNN classifier implemented using Tensor-floor. Presented with Pandas Data Frame + Hidden layer used (ReLU) transfer function + The output layer made use of a softmax function and six output neurons, (= six labels in the training data) + adaptive moment estimation (Adam) was used to train the neural network. Xavier Algorithm for Weight initialization + feature vector optimization using feature ranking algorithm for Tensor Flow
<b>Dataset</b>	<a href="#">Training data</a> was created by retrieving alert data from representative categories and subcategories of alerts from <a href="#">McAfee Network Security Platform (NSP)</a> . <a href="#">Evaluation data</a> was created using the same approach, but without the labels, and was applied directly to the DNN classifier to evaluate the accuracy
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	DNN classifier accuracy
<b>Pros</b>	Generated own data
<b>Cons</b>	human analyst review
<b>Relevance</b>	9/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	1) a significant time-saving value in applying ML to the initial triage of security alerts received from an IDS – (up to a 70% increase in productivity for elimination of previously known alerts/events. 2) transferring security alerts to an intermediate system for indexing and visualization is valuable to security analysts (prioritize alerts.) 3- FASTT prototype demonstrates the value of semi-automated report generation for threat information sharing.
<b>Accuracy</b>	98%
<b>Future work</b>	1) User feedback can be incorporated into the user interface to allow analysts to change the triage category for security alerts and allow the DNN classifier to use this feedback during the next model training cycle. 2) speed up the human analyst review and will complement the automated triage of events through clustering following the initial triage classification

<b>Source# 16 Reference</b>	Dong and Wang (2016). Comparison Deep Learning Method to Traditional Methods Using for Network Intrusion Detection. IEEE
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DL
<b>Attack</b>	DOS, U2R, R2L, Probing
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	Support Vector Machine (SVM) and restricted Boltzmann machine (RBM).
<b>Method</b>	SVM-RBMs learning method to classify normal traffic- with and without SMOTE for precision Comparison)
<b>Dataset</b>	KDD-99
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	<i>Precision+ Recall</i>
<b>Pros</b>	None stated
<b>Cons</b>	The system faces certain limitations that include sanctity of data used to generate inputs and outputs. + demand for faster and efficient data assessment.
<b>Relevance</b>	8/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	The system has enabled the exhaustive and conclusive assessment of network security e.g. able to analyse big set of data, uses data pattern to detect problem (difficult for human)', provide accurate information on abnormal behaviour from the start.

**Table1: Machine Learning Methods for IDS**

<b>Accuracy</b>	Not specified
<b>Future work</b>	Not stated

<b>Source# 17 Reference</b>	Van Hasselt et al (2015). Deep Reinforced Learning with Double Q-Learning. GOOGLE DEEPMIND
<b>Type of Learning</b>	D-RL
<b>Attack</b>	N/A
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	Double Deep Q-Learning Networks DQN
<b>Method</b>	DQN using convolution network
<b>Dataset</b>	Dataset 49 Atari games
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	<i>CNN Network Parameter (Weights), Performance, And Rewards</i>
<b>Pros</b>	leads to much higher scores on several games
<b>Cons</b>	None stated
<b>Relevance</b>	8/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	shown why Q-learning can be overoptimistic in large-scale problem ,+ shown that these overestimations are more common and severe in practice than previously acknowledged + Double Q-learning can be used at scale to successfully reduce this over optimism, resulting in more stable and reliable learning.+ proposed a specific implementation called Double DQN, that uses the existing architecture and deep neural network of the DQN algorithm without requiring additional networks or parameter + Double DQN finds better policies, obtaining new state-of-the-art results on the Atari 2600 domain.
<b>Accuracy</b>	Performance (MEDIAN) No ops: DQN=93.5 % V s double DQN=114.7% while Random start ( DQN =56.6 and Double DQN= 86.9).  MEAN 241.1% VS 330.3% & 146.0% VS 883.3% for No ops and random starts respectively
<b>Future work</b>	None stated

<b>Source# 18 Reference</b>	Zambaldi et al (2019). Deep RL with Relational Inductive Biases. Published as a conference paper at ICLR. DeepMind, London.UK
<b>Type of Learning</b>	D-RL
<b>Attack</b>	n/a
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	StarCraft II Mini games
<b>Method</b>	structured perception and relational reasoning into deep RL architectures
<b>Dataset</b>	n/a
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Hyper parameter across mini-games such as Learning Rate, Entropy loss scaling, Number of blocks and heads
<b>Pros</b>	this approach can offer advantages in efficiency, generalization, and interpretability
<b>Cons</b>	None stated
<b>Relevance</b>	8/10

**Table1: Machine Learning Methods for IDS**

<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	to introduce techniques for representing and reasoning about states in model-free deep reinforcement learning agents via relational inductive biases
<b>Accuracy</b>	Not explicitly stated
<b>Future work</b>	Scale up to meet some of the most challenging test environments in modern artificial intelligence. + exploring perceiving complex scenes via more structured formats, such as scene graphs

<b>Source# 19 Reference</b>	Nair et al (2015). Massively Parallel Methods for Deep Reinforcement Learning <i>rxiv preprint arXiv:1507.04296</i> .
<b>Type of Learning</b>	D-RL
<b>Attack</b>	Massively distributed architecture for D-RL made up of parallel actors that generate new behaviour; parallel learners that are trained from stored experience; a distributed neural network (DQN) to represent the value function or behaviour policy; and a distributed store of experience.
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	N/A
<b>Method</b>	Evaluate 49 Atari games using Gorila (General RL Architecture) DQN
<b>Dataset</b>	49 games from Atari 2600 games from the Arcade Learning Environment,
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Parameter Rewards (change in score)
<b>Pros</b>	Parallel parameter server and actors
<b>Cons</b>	None stated
<b>Relevance</b>	8/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	Outperformed single GPU DQN on 41 games, outperformed human professional on 25 games. 10times faster than non. distributes version
<b>Accuracy</b>	N/A But Gorila DQN significantly outperformed single GPU DQN on 41 out of 49 games
<b>Future work</b>	None stated

**Table1: Machine Learning Methods for IDS**

<b>Source# 20 Reference</b>	Van Hasselt et al (2018) .Deep Reinforcement Learning and the Deadly Triad. <i>Cornell, New York</i>
<b>Type of Learning</b>	D-RL
<b>Attack</b>	Q-Learning
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	N/A
<b>Method</b>	Variety of experiments using the Atari Learning Environment (Bellemare et al., 2013) using variants of DQN (Mnih et al., 2015).
<b>Dataset</b>	Not specified but were applied to 57 different Atari games
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Bootstrap targets, number of steps before bootstrapping, prioritisation & Network sizes
<b>Pros</b>	Moderation of overestimation biases and instabilities + early performance can be boosted
<b>Cons</b>	alternatives to the basic Qlearning updates do not, however, fully resolve the issues caused by the deadly triad
<b>Relevance</b>	8/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	Tackled Deadly triad of function approximation, bootstrapping, and off-policy learning
<b>Accuracy</b>	N/A
<b>Future work</b>	General learning dynamics and interactions between (soft)-divergence and control performance could benefit from further study.

<b>Source# 21 Reference</b>	Foerster, J., Assael, I. A., de Freitas, N., & Whiteson, S. (2016). Learning to communicate with deep multi-agent reinforcement learning. In <i>Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems</i> (pp. 2137-2145).
<b>Type of Learning</b>	D-RL
<b>Attack</b>	N/A
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	Reinforced Inter-Agent Learning (RIAL) and Differentiable Inter-Agent Learning (DIAL)
<b>Method</b>	Q-learning and back propagate error derivatives through (noisy) communication channels.
<b>Dataset</b>	Deep networks
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Rewards ,Learning rate and discount factor
<b>Pros</b>	demonstrate end-to-end learning of protocols in complex environments inspired by communication riddles and multi-agent computer vision problems with partial observability.
<b>Cons</b>	n/a
<b>Relevance</b>	7/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	First attempt at learning communication and language with deep learning approaches.
<b>Accuracy</b>	n/a
<b>Future work</b>	The gargantuan task of understanding communication and language in their full splendour, covering compositionality, concept lifting, conversational agents, and many other important problems still lies ahead

**Table1: Machine Learning Methods for IDS**

<b>Source# 22</b>	Deverett, B., Faulkner, R., Fortunato, M., Wayne, G., & Leibo, J. Z. (2019). Interval timing in deep reinforcement learning agents. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.13469</i> .
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Type of Learning</b>	D-RL
<b>Attack</b>	time perception
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	Interval Timing
<b>Method</b>	Deep Neural network using Recurrent (LSTM)
<b>Dataset</b>	Psych lab Frame input
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Reward ,temporal measurements(interval timing), sample interval” delay
<b>Pros</b>	Non stated
<b>Cons</b>	Non stated
<b>Relevance</b>	7/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	Found that both recurrent and feedforward agents could solve the task in an end-to-end manner. + open-sourcing apart from open-sourcing,other timing tasks that are commonly used in the animal literature, such as temporal production (15) and temporal discrimination
<b>Accuracy</b>	Near perfect accuracy
<b>Future work</b>	explore the ways in which different environmental and agent architectural constraints alter the solutions of the agent + 2 other future works from the article

**Table1: Machine Learning Methods for IDS**

<b>Source# 23</b>	Abeshu & Chilamkurt(2018). Deep Learning: The Frontier for Distributed Attack Detection in Fog-to-Things Computing. IEEE
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DL
<b>Attack</b>	Primarily R2U, and R2U (These attacks constitute a major category of attacks on fog-to-things interaction as most of the IoT devices are accessed remotely for updates and management)
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	distributed deep-learning-driven fog-to-things computing attack detection scheme
<b>Method</b>	A pretrained stacked autoencoder has been employed in feature engineering, while softmax was used for classification
<b>Dataset</b>	publicly available NSL-KDD dataset
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	accuracy, detection rate (DR), false alarm rate (FAR), ROC curve, and scalability
<b>Pros</b>	deep models used are superior to shallow models in detection accuracy, false alarm rate, and scalability
<b>Cons</b>	None stated
<b>Relevance</b>	9/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	conclude that training attack detection systems using deep learning models on distributed IoT networks supported by fog nodes could improve the accuracy and efficiency of cyber-attack detection as sharing the parameter updates avoids local minima at each node
<b>Accuracy</b>	99.20 % percent when it trained with 25 worker nodes in parallel. 95.22 (with 5 worker)
<b>Future work</b>	Investigate its performance on different datasets and other neural networks.

**Table1: Machine Learning Methods for IDS**

<b>Source# 24</b>	AKSU & Aydin (2018) .Detecting Port Scan Attempts with Comparative. IEEE
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DL
<b>Attack</b>	158.930 port scan attempts
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	Deep learning and SVM.S
<b>Method</b>	The SVM and deep learning algorithms were used to detect port scan attempts based on the CICIDS2017 dataset.
<b>Dataset</b>	Up-to-date CICIDS2017 dataset -presented comparatively, & 67% training data and 33% testing data.
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Accuracy (0.99,0), Recall (0.99,070), and F1 Score (0.99,0.65) for DP & SVM respectively and Precision
<b>Pros</b>	Comparative Study approach was used
<b>Cons</b>	Only port scan attempts were studied
<b>Relevance</b>	9/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	DL algorithm performed significantly better results than SVM
<b>Accuracy</b>	DL=97.80%, SVM=69.79%
<b>Future work</b>	To use not only port scan attempts but also other attack types with machine learning and deep learning algorithms, apache hadoop and spark technologies together based on this dataset in the future.

**Table1: Machine Learning Methods for IDS**

<b>Source# 25</b>	McDermontt et al (2018). Botnet Detection in the I oT using DP approach.IEEE
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DL
<b>Attack</b>	Mirai, botnet,DoS udp, and dns attack
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	BLSTM-RNN detection model is compared to a LSTM-RNN for detecting four attack vectors used by the mirai Botnet
<b>Method</b>	DL using BLSTM-RNN In conjunction with Word Embedding methodology to create a botnet detection model
<b>Dataset</b>	Labelled dataset was generated as part of this research
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Accuracy and loss.
<b>Pros</b>	Comparison approach between (BLSTM-RNN) and unidirectional LSTM-RNN
<b>Cons</b>	The attack vector metrics were shown to be less favourable+ bidirectional approach adds overhead to each epoch, and increases processing time
<b>Relevance</b>	9/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	better progressive model over time+ helping consumers become aware when their device is infected + generated mirai botnet dataset has been made public and is available upon request.
<b>Accuracy</b>	Results for mirai, udp, and dns were very encouraging with 99%, 98%, 98% validation accuracy and 0.000809, 0.125630, 0.116453 validation loss metrics respectively
<b>Future work</b>	Second more comprehensive dataset will be generated, incorporating all ten attack vectors used by the mirai botnet malware. Altogether a third mutated version of dataset for comparisons. + further investigate ways to improve situational awareness of botnet activity within the IoT



**Table1: Machine Learning Methods for IDS**

<b>Source# 26</b>	Tang et al (2018).Deep Learning Approach for Network Intrusion Detection in Software Defined Networking. IEEE
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DL
<b>Attack</b>	DoS, probe,U2R and R2L
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	DL-Use a NSL-KDD dataset on a deep neural Network and implement the IDS on the controller of a SDN architecture
<b>Method</b>	Using a Deep Neuro Network with input and three hidden layers and an output layer Use 6 features of a NSL-KDD dataset to train the model in an IDS placed on the controller of a SDN architecture.
<b>Dataset</b>	NSL-KDD
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Accuracy, precision, recall, F-measure(precision and recall)
<b>Pros</b>	Worked with flow based traffic
<b>Cons</b>	Did not use the full features of the data set and not focused on a specific type of attack
<b>Relevance</b>	7/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	Used deep learning for the flow-based anomaly detection system
<b>Accuracy</b>	82.02%
<b>Future work</b>	Focus on one type attack (DDoS) while use a DNN model with varying the number of hidden layers and hidden neurons for better performance (e.g.). Implement this approach in a real SDN environment with real network traffic and evaluate the performance of the whole network in terms of latency and throughput.
<b>Source# 27</b>	Niyaz et al (2016). A Deep Learning Approach for Network Intrusion Detection System. <i>EAI International Conference on Bio-inspired Information and Communications Technologies (formerly BIONETICS)</i> (pp. 21-26)
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DL
<b>Attack</b>	DoS, probe, U2R and R2L
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	DL- Used Self-taught Learning (STL)
<b>Method</b>	Used the NSL-KDD dataset for training and testing of the model. Conducted two approaches. The first one used a dataset for training and testing from the same environment and the second approach used training and testing data collected in different environments. (Rates not clearly indicated)
<b>Dataset</b>	NSL-KDD
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Accuracy, precision, recall
<b>Pros</b>	The approach of using testing data from a different environment from which training data is obtained gives a different output from using both training and testing dataset from the same environment.
<b>Cons</b>	Rates not indicated of the two approaches against each other
<b>Relevance</b>	7/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	the proposed NIDS performed very well compared to previously implemented NIDSs for the normal/anomaly detection when evaluated on the test data.

**Table1: Machine Learning Methods for IDS**

<b>Accuracy</b>	88.39%
<b>Future work</b>	Implement a real-time NIDS for actual networks using deep learning technique. Additionally, on-the-go feature learning on raw network traffic headers instead of derived features.
<b>Source# 28</b>	Potluri & Diedrich, (2016, September). Accelerated deep neural networks for enhanced Intrusion Detection System. IEEE
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DL
<b>Attack</b>	DoS, R2L, U2R and Probe
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	DL-Deep Neural Network (DNN) based IDS
<b>Method</b>	Preprocess converting the dataset into numeric Normalization the dataset by mapping all the different values for each feature Feed the dataset t into the DNN by training and fine tuning through back propagation. Test the DNN using NSL-KDD test dataset
<b>Dataset</b>	NSL-KDD
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Accuracy
<b>Pros</b>	Used all the 41 features of the NSL-KDD dataset to train the DNN however epoch varying at each layer
<b>Cons</b>	Used insufficient data for training therefore U2R and R2L were not well detected and this reduces the overall detection accuracy.
<b>Relevance</b>	9/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	The parallel computing capabilities of the neural network make the Deep Neural Network (DNN) to effectively look through the network traffic with an accelerated performance.
<b>Accuracy</b>	97.70%
<b>Future work</b>	The selection of different features out of all 41 features to improve the detection accuracies Additional features along with the existing 41 features given to the training phase can also improve the detection accuracies and this is also considered in future.

**Table1: Machine Learning Methods for IDS**

<b>Source# 29</b>	Zhang Li and Wang (2019) IDS for IoT Based on Improved Genetic Algorithm and Deep Belief Network.IEEE
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DL
<b>Attack</b>	DoS, Probe, R2L, U2L
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	intrusion detection model based on improved genetic algorithm (GA) and deep belief network (DBN)
<b>Method</b>	DBN model optimized with GA is trained with the training sets and then evaluated using the test set. At the same time, we compared our method with the methods TANN, FC-ANN, SA-DT-SVMS, and BPNN proposed by others researchers.
<b>Dataset</b>	NSL-KDD dataset was used to simulate and evaluate the model and algorithms
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Accuracy, Detection Rate, FAR, Precision, Recall
<b>Pros</b>	Self-adaptive model to change the network structure for different attack types.
<b>Cons</b>	Not stated
<b>Relevance</b>	9/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	Results show that the improved intrusion detection model combined with DBN. Can effectively improve the recognition rate of intrusion attacks and reduce the complexity of the neural network structure.
<b>Accuracy</b>	Than 99% of detection rate. i.e. 99.45, 99.37, 97.78, 98.68 % for DoS, Probe,R2L, and U2R respectively
<b>Future work</b>	Optimize the other parameters of the deep network, reduce the training time and improving the detection accuracy.

<b>Source# 30</b>	Rezvy et al (2019).An efficient DL model for intrusion classification andand prediction in 5G and IoT networks.IEEE
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Type of Learning</b>	DL
<b>Attack</b>	Flooding, Impersonation and Injection type of attacks
<b>Detection Mechanism</b>	Deep auto encoder, dense neural network(DNN) .
<b>Method</b>	Auto encoded DNN algorithm for detecting intrusion or attacks in 5G and IoT network
<b>Dataset</b>	Benchmark Aegean Wi-Fi Intrusion dataset. ( AWID-CLS-R) contain real traces of both normal and intrusive 802.11 WLAN
<b>Evaluation Parameters</b>	Precision, Recall or TPR, and F-measure
<b>Pros</b>	Comparison of Proposed Autoencoded DNN with other learning methods such as stacked autoencoder, Neural network, Random forest, Majority voting etc.
<b>Cons</b>	None stated

**Table1: Machine Learning Methods for IDS**

<b>Relevance</b>	8/10
<b>Achievement and contribution</b>	Presented a comparison with recent approaches used in literature which showed a substantial improvement in terms of accuracy and speed of detection with the proposed algorithm
<b>Accuracy</b>	99.9%
<b>Future work</b>	Provide extensions or modifications of the proposed algorithm for larger attack types, mobile and IoT security platforms as suggested in ref [18] using intelligent agents such as soft computing and advanced unsupervised clustering algorithms. +improve the detection accuracy and to reduce the rate of false negatives and false positives