

Towards website domain name classification using graph based semi-supervised learning

Original

Towards website domain name classification using graph based semi-supervised learning / Faroughi, A., Morichetta, A., Vassio, L., Figueiredo, F., Mellia, M., Javidan, R.. - In: COMPUTER NETWORKS. - ISSN 1389-1286. - ELETTRONICO. - 188 (107865):(2021). [10.1016/j.comnet.2021.107865]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/2874806 since: 2021-03-22T13:24:14Z

Publisher:

Elsevier

Published

DOI:10.1016/j.comnet.2021.107865

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

Elsevier postprint/Author's Accepted Manuscript

© 2021. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>. The final authenticated version is available online at:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.comnet.2021.107865>

(Article begins on next page)

Towards Website Domain Name Classification Using Graph Based Semi-supervised Learning

Azadeh Faroughi^c, Andrea Morichetta^{a,b}, Luca Vassio^{a,*}, Flavio Figueiredo^d,
Marco Mellia^a, Reza Javidan^c

^a*Politecnico di Torino, Italy*

^b*TU Wien, Austria*

^c*Shiraz University of Technology, Iran*

^d*Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brazil*

Abstract

In this work, we tackle the problem of classifying websites domain names to a category, e.g., mapping `bbc.com` to the “News and Media” class. Domain name classification is challenging due to the high number of class labels and the highly skewed class distributions. Differently from prior efforts that need to crawl and use the web pages’ actual content, we rely only on traffic logs passively collected, observing traffic regularly flowing in the network, without the burden to crawl and parse web pages. We exploit the information carried by network logs, using just the name of the websites and the sequence of visited websites by users. For this, we propose and evaluate different classification methods based on machine learning. Using a large dataset with hundreds of thousands of domain names and 25 different categories, we show that semi-supervised learning methods are more suitable for this task than traditional supervised approaches. Using graphs, we incorporate in the classifier aspects not strictly related to the labeled data, and we can classify most of the unlabeled domains. However, in this framework, classification scores are lower than those usually found when exploiting the page-specific content. Our work is the first to perform an extensive evaluation of domain name classification using only passive flow-level logs to the best of our knowledge.

Keywords: semi-supervised learning; domain names; network measurements; classification; passive measurements.

*Corresponding author

Email address: `luca.vassio@polito.it` (Luca Vassio)

1. Introduction

2 The latest estimations show that there are over 1.6 billion websites on the
Internet, distributed over more than 268 million domains.¹ With this ever-
4 growing nature of the Web, researchers and practitioners resort more and more
to automated approaches based on machine learning to process and understand
6 such vast variety. A common machine learning classification task is to assign a
category to a domain (i.e., mapping `bbc.com` to a category such as “News and
8 Media”)[1]. This task is the focus of our paper and has several applications such
as information integration [2], building efficient focused crawler or vertical search
10 engines [3], helping to choose the appropriate model for extracting information
from a web page [4], improving quality of search results [5], constructing and
12 expanding web directories [6], web filtering [7] and advertising [8].

In this paper focus, websites are URLs such as `https://www.bbc.com/news/
14 today.html`, whereas domains refer to the URL domain only, i.e., `www.bbc.com`.
Our goal is to perform domain classification using large flow level logs only. We
16 specifically consider logs collected by passively monitoring the network traffic,
where a passive sniffer identifies TCP or UDP flows, and recovers the name of
18 the servers serving such flows. Each flow contains the client identifier (e.g., the
client IP address - properly anonymized in our data) and the domain name of the
20 server (recovered directly from the HTTP request, or DNS and TLS negotiation
when HTTPS is in place). Given the flow sequence, each with the timestamp of
22 when the request was observed, we want to automatically assign each domain a
category, assuming to know only a small subset of domain categories (e.g., via
24 manual labeling). This problem falls in the supervised classification class, and
we aim at training a classifier based on different machine learning approaches.

26 The problem of classifying domain names is not new; various researchers
studied it in the past [9, 10, 11]. However, differently from prior efforts, we
28 focus on passive flow level traces, and we are limited to little information. No
information on web page content (e.g., their HTML content, metadata, objects,
30 images, etc.) is available to our classifier by assumption - since we rely on
passively collected data. Since we do not require to collect and analyze the
32 content of the pages, our approach is scalable, and it naturally factors the
popularity of websites (the more the users are visiting a website, the more data
34 we collect about it), the users’ habits, and the diversity of the devices and
applications they use to access the Internet. Note also that the rise of encryption
36 in the web via HTTPS/TLS, flow traces are the only information that is still
available to Internet Service Providers (ISP) and network administrators [12].

38 Given the importance of such a form of data, and the easiness of collecting
them, some prior efforts studied the website classification problem using passive
40 traces only (see Section 2 for a discussion). However, previous works usually limit
themselves to a handful of domains and very small datasets. Here, we leverage

¹<https://news.netcraft.com/archives/2019/01/24/january-2019-web-server-survey.html>, accessed 2020-07-25

42 the information contained in data collected from real users from our University
campus in Turin. We collect 40 days of traces, where we extract several hundred
44 thousand unique domains. From these, we extract the domains related to explicit
visits to websites (called Core domains) building on our previous work [13]. We
46 obtain more than 14 000 unique core domains.

For labeling, we take as ground truth the categories given by SimilarWeb, an
48 open service providing 25 non-overlapping different categories. When compared
to other publicly available repositories of domain classes such as Curlie (formerly
50 known as DMOZ), SimilarWeb provides better coverage in our use case (see [14]
for how critical this labeling could be). SimilarWeb’s richness in the number of
52 classes (25) implies that some of them may overlap. Hence, we do not expect
that the results can compare to the ones with fewer classes. Despite offering a
54 large dataset, SimilarWeb allows us to label only a small fraction of domains in
our trace (about 2 000). This limitation strengthens our work motivation to use
56 a machine learning approach that can classify the remaining 86% of data.

For the classification task, we thoroughly compare several different methods,
58 including the ones previously proposed in the literature in other contexts, that
we adapt to our use case. Next, we investigate graph-based semi-supervised
60 methods [15] where the nodes are the domains, while the edges factor the different
similarities between domains.

62 Results show that our semi-supervised method can achieve the best results
with average accuracy in the order of 0.52. Albeit low at first glance, these scores
64 represent a gain of 300% when compared to the naive random classifier (0.52
vs. 0.13), and a gain of about 27% compared to the best performing supervised
66 method (0.52 vs. 0.41). Granting that we tackle a classification problem with 25
classes, our results represent an improvement to prior proposals that considered
68 both a much smaller dataset and a reduced number of classes.

Our main contributions in this paper are i) the specific focus on data that can
70 be collected by simply passively observing network traffic, ii) the exploitation
of the semi-supervised method, and iii) the in-depth comparison of different
72 approaches. Our analysis may serve as a guide for future works aiming at
exploring passive flow level data, possibly integrating it with active crawlers. We
74 aim at fostering future research and the reproducibility of results. For this, we
release the labeled dataset used for this analysis and the Python scripts containing
76 the code for the machine learning approaches and the used parameters [16].

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present related
78 work on the subject. In Section 3, we discuss on the possible approaches. In
Section 4, we present the supervised methodology to solve the classification task,
while in Section 5, we describe the semi-supervised methods. In Section 6, we
80 define our dataset and its preprocessing, reporting in Section 7 all the results of
the methodologies. Finally, we conclude the paper in Section 8 with an outline
82 of the results.

84 2. Related Work

In this section, we review some of the previous efforts focused on domain
86 and website classification tasks. Previous works may be categorized into three
broad cases. Content-based methods, which explore HTML, Images or Video
88 (Section 2.1). URL and link methods, which explore the textual tokens in the
URLs as well as hyperlinks across pages (Section 2.2). Finally, some approaches
90 focus on traffic requests (Section 2.3). Given that we are limited to TCP traces,
we focus on adapting methods taken from the second and third classes.

92 2.1. Content based approaches

Content-based approaches rely on document contents or their brief descrip-
94 tions as extracted by visiting the web page. The web page content can include
texts, audios, images, videos, and structure records. In [17], the authors express
96 document content as n-grams feature-vectors; the n-grams frequencies vector
represents each web page. Afterward, they apply supervised methodologies for
98 web page classification. In [18], the authors study the influence of different
significance indicators for automatic web pages classification. The indicators
100 are the title, the headings, the internal metadata, and the main web page text.
They showed that it is possible to obtain the best classification with a well-tuned
102 linear combination of these four elements. Shen et al. [19] proposed an approach
to classify web pages topics through web page summarization algorithms. These
104 algorithms aim at extracting the most relevant features from web pages. By
preprocessing web pages with summarization techniques, they get an improve-
106 ment in the classification accuracy, compared to plain content-based classifiers.
In the field of web content classification, the work in [20] employs Ant Colony
108 optimization [21] for classification rules discovery. The work proves that the
Ant Colony is a powerful classification tool and produces high accuracy in the
110 results.

Know and Li in 2003 [22] proposed a web page classifier based on k-nearest-
112 neighbor (k-NN). In this method, they use HTML tags and structure features,
where different parts of HTML tags have different weights. Considering two
114 documents, the higher the co-occurrence of terms between the two, the stronger
their relationship is.

116 De Boer et al. in [23], use visual-based features, such as simple color and
edge histograms to provide an aesthetic classification of web pages. In [24], the
118 authors propose a visual-based approach, where they classify web pages into
three main categories, namely information pages, research pages, and personal
120 home pages, using both structural and visual features. Kovacevic et al. [25]
proposed a method based on visual layout analysis. They represent a web page
122 as a hierarchical structure called visual adjacency multi-graph in which the nodes
represent HTML objects, and the directed edges reflect spatial relations between
124 objects on the browser screen. By visual information of the multi-graph, it is
possible to define heuristic rules for recognizing common logical areas of web
126 pages.

At last, authors in [26] build a supervised classifier that targets 5 sensitive
128 categories (ethnicity, health, political belief, religion, sexual orientation). They
leverage web page contents, comparing the text against a list of keywords that
130 may identify each category. A naive Bayes classifier suffices for this simple task.

All the works related to this category rely on features extracted by directly
132 visiting and rendering the page. It is thus necessary to first have the complete
URL of the page and then to access it to analyze its content, structure, or visual
134 features, adding computational and time complexity in the process. Note that
active crawling is also becoming more and more complicated. For instance, the
136 simple landing page of a website may not reveal the actual content until the
user has accepted the so-called cookie-policy, or performed a login, or entered
138 the inner page of the website. Our methods are simpler, as they require only to
receive as input the name of the domains users visits when regularly accessing
140 the web.

2.2. Link and URL based approaches

In link-based approaches, features can be pulled out from other pages related
142 to the pages under analysis with hyperlinks. This approach aims at supplying
additional information for the classification step. This category of methodologies
144 requires extensive crawling sessions. Typically, these approaches incorporate the
creation of links-graphs. Utard and Furnkranz [27] proposed a method that uses
146 the information present in hyperlinks toward the page of interest. They use the
region in the neighborhood part of the predecessor document. These parts can
148 be the anchor text, the anchor text neighborhood, or the text in a paragraph
around the hyperlink. Moreover, they also use the text on the target web page.

Some previous works focus on URLs and extract features by dividing the
152 URLs into meaningful portions. Using only URLs, the execution is faster since
there is no need to retrieve and analyze web page content. Kan and Thi [9]
154 proposed a supervised method based on URLs features. The proposed method
divides the URLs into meaningful tokens. These tokens constitute the feature
156 set, together with correlated information, such as the token position in the URL,
the token lexical kind, or, again, information about the token successor and
158 predecessor. The feature set is the input for a supervised maximum entropy
model, a classical method in text classification. Baykan et al. [28],[29] presented
160 a supervised classification based again on URLs. They split each URL in tokens,
using any punctuation mark as separators, extracting strings, numbers, or
162 other non-letter characters. The feature set consists of four different categories:
tokens, n-grams derived from tokens, n-grams directly derived from the URL,
164 and positional information explicitly encoded in tokens or n-grams. Then they
use those features to build a Support Vector Machine (SVM) [30] and a naive-
166 Bayes classifier. The work presented in [31] proposed an unsupervised web page
classification solution based on URLs. Each resulting cluster includes a set of
168 web pages that are assigned to the same class. Unlike classification methods
that need a training set of labeled pages, the proposed solution builds several
170 URL patterns representing the different classes of pages on a website. It is then
possible to classify additional pages by matching their URLs to the patterns.

172 In our work, we consider having access to the domain name and not the entire
173 URL, as in TLS traffic.

174 *2.3. Traffic based approaches*

Jiang et al. [32] is the only work that proposed a method based on patterns in
175 mobile application access logs. They extracted the logs from the traffic flow data
176 captured in an ISP core network and target the classification of domain names
177 into four coarse classes. Then they extracted the latent vector representation
178 from users' visiting sequences, taking inspiration from the Word2Vec model [33].
179 In this context, mobile server domains stand for words, while a user visiting
180 sequence corresponds to a sentence. The resulting vector is the input for a
181 Support Vector Machine classifier. In our work, we implement the methodology
182 of Jiang et al. [32] (see Section 4.2) and compare it with the other proposed
183 approaches. Finally, it is essential to point out that the authors of [32] perform
184 their evaluation on a limited dataset filtering only a handful of classes (5) and
185 focusing on the most popular, by access, domains. Here we explore a much
186 broader set of data and a finer-grained classification. In this sense, the results in
187 numbers (e.g., accuracy or precision) reported in [32] are not comparable to our
188 work.

190 **3. Discussion over the adopted methodologies**

In this paper, we want to address the problem of websites domains classi-
191 fication. We extract three features from the TCP traces: the source IP, the
192 timestamp, and the domain name. We know that some domains belong to a
193 category, and we want to build a model to enhance this knowledge. Using the
194 available features, we investigate the problem over two dimensions. In the first,
195 we consider domain names as strings. In the second, we consider the temporal
196 evolution of how users move from one website to another by examining the
197 sequence of domains they visit inside a time window.

We try different solutions based on machine learning, including some pre-
198 viously proposed ones for similar problems. Worth to mention is the analysis
199 of Neural Network performances. More specifically, we refer to deep learning
200 methodologies that work with sequences of data, like strings or time sequence.
201 While these off-the-shelf solutions are easy to execute, they perform reason-
202 ably well given the complexity of the problem and the limitation of getting
203 large amounts of labeled data. For this, we define more ad-hoc features and
204 methodologies and compare them in detail.

In the following sections, we will discuss the proposed approaches, supervised
205 and semi-supervised. In Section 4, we discuss how to extract relevant attributes
206 from the data collection in use and how to define appropriate classification
207 methodologies. In Section 5, we examine the semi-supervised classification
208 approaches. This category of methodologies is particularly suited for problems in
209 which the classified set of elements is small with the overall dataset size, and it is
210 insufficient for building a model. Given the complexity of the task, as discussed
211

214 before, we have to use specific features. Furthermore, we show the necessity
of computing specific similarity values for the nodes in the graph. Finally, we
216 describe a graph pruning technique that allows having fewer edges, limiting the
computational and memory complexity. The package containing the code for all
218 the used methodology and all the tuned parameters is available online [16].

4. Supervised classification approaches

220 In this section, we outline different methodologies for classifying domain
names. We describe only methods based on features obtained by passive mea-
222 surement traces. This kind of data allows the extraction of sequences of domains
visited by users. The rising encryption of traffic (i.e., HTTPS) is nowadays
224 limiting access to more detailed information. Most notably, a passive sniffer can
capture only the timing and flow information, along with the domain name of
226 the contacted server.

Among the other data, the logs elements include a client IP address (anony-
228 mous in our analysis), $s \in S$; a requested domain name, $d \in D$; and a timestamp
when the request was sent $t \in [0, T]$. We are able to define a category, $c \in C$
230 for a small subset of domains (e.g., via manual labeling). Overall, our data
has the form of quadruples $T = \{(t, s, d, c)\}$ where each entry is a request.
232 $T_l = \{(t_l, s_l, d_l, c_l)\}$ is a labeled subset of data, with sub-scripts representing if
this is the case (labeled data). Our goal is to create a function $F_\theta : D \rightarrow C$, from
234 the set of domains D to the set of classes C , whose objective is to accurately
uncover c_u for an unlabeled subset of domains: $T_u = \{(t_u, s_u, d_u)\}$. We will define
236 the function F_θ starting from our labeled data T_l . This function is parametrized
by θ (e.g., in a logistic regression, θ are the regression parameters) and is applied
238 as $F_\theta(d) = \hat{c}$, where \hat{c} is the predicted class.

4.1. Supervised classification based on domain names

240 A domain name is a string composed of strings separated by ‘dots,’ i.e., the
different domain levels. We consider, for the forthcoming experiments, n-grams
242 as sequences of characters present in all the domain levels. For instance, in
google.com, the 1-grams are {g, o, o, g, l, e, c, o, m}, whereas the 2-grams (bi-
244 grams) are {go, oo, og, gl, le, co, om}. For each domain, we extract all its n-grams
with $3 \leq n \leq k$, where k is a maximum threshold and obtained by parameter
246 tuning. For each category c , we count the frequency among domains of each
n-gram g i.e., $f(g, c)$. This data represents the training features. Then, for an
248 unlabeled domain name d_u , we compute its n-grams. We will assign the category
 \hat{c} with maximum similarity $sim(d_u, c)$ between this domain d and all classes c .

$$\hat{c} = \arg \max_{c \in C} sim(d_u, c) \quad (1)$$

250 We use two different metrics to find the similarity between each unlabeled
domain name and each category.

252 *4.1.1. Similarity based on TFIDF on n-grams*

254 The first metric we consider is TFIDF [34]. TFIDF is the product of two
 255 statistics, term frequency (TF) and inverse document frequency (IDF). It is
 256 widely used in information retrieval and gives a weighting scheme for each term
 257 [35]. TFIDF reflects how important an n-gram g is for a category $c \in C$ to
 258 the set of all categories in the training model. Term Frequency (TF) measures
 259 the importance of an n-gram in category c . We use the so-called augmented
 260 frequency version of TF [36] in order to prevent a bias towards longer documents,
 i.e., raw n-gram frequency divided by the raw frequency of the most occurring
 n-gram in the class c . The equation for TF is:

$$TF(g, c) = 0.5 + 0.5 \cdot \frac{f(g, c)}{\max_{g'} \{f(g', c)\}} \quad (2)$$

262 IDF measures how important an n-gram is in the whole collection of categories,
 i.e., whether it is common or rare. If an n-gram is very common, it has little
 264 importance to distinguish among the categories. Thus, we assign less weight to
 frequent n-grams, while we scale up the rare ones. IDF is defined as:

$$IDF(g, C) = \log \frac{|C|}{|\{c \in C : f(g, c) > 0\}|} \quad (3)$$

266 where $|C|$ represents the total number of categories and $|\{c \in C : f(g, c) > 0\}|$
 267 is the number of categories where the term g appears. Then the TFIDF is
 268 calculated as:

$$TFIDF(g, c, C) = TF(g, c) \cdot IDF(g, C) \quad (4)$$

Given a domain d we calculate its similarity to a class c as the sum of TFIDF
 270 values $sim(d, c)$ of the n-grams of the domain d in a class c :

$$sim(d, c) = \sum_{g=1}^k TFIDF(g, c, C) \cdot f(g, d) \quad (5)$$

272 where $f(g, d)$ is the frequency of the n-gram g in the domain name d and k
 is the number of unique n-gram in d . At last, we assign d to the category with
 the highest similarity.

274 *4.1.2. Similarity based on NFA on n-grams*

The second evaluated metric is the Number of False Alarms (NFA) metric.
 276 NFA expresses a similarity measure between a domain and a class [37]. NFA
 algorithm employs the Helmholtz principle [38]: meaningful features and notable
 278 events appear as significant deviations from randomness or noise. For these
 reasons, humans can perceive the significance of the characteristics mentioned
 280 above. A low value of NFA connotes a perceptually meaningful event.

Following this approach, we can calculate the meaning of an n-gram g for
 282 a category c [37]. Given the sum of frequencies of n-grams in a class, i.e.,
 $B(c) = \sum_g f(g, c)$, we define $N(c)$ as:

$$N(c) = \frac{\sum_{c \in C} B(c)}{B(c)} \quad (6)$$

284 Then we compute $NFA(g, c)$:

$$NFA(g, c) = \left(\frac{\sum_{c' \in C} f(g, c')}{f(g, c)} \right) \frac{1}{N(c)^{f(g, c)-1}} \quad (7)$$

286 If the NFA value is less than one, then the frequency of g can be reflected as
 288 a meaningful event since our calculations do not expect it. Thus, n-gram g
 290 can be considered as a meaningful or significant term in the category c . Since the
 values of NFA can be exponentially large or small, in order to define a function
 that computes the meaning of an n-gram within a class, we use the logarithmic
 value of NFA [38]. Finally, we obtain the distance $Meaning(g, c)$ as:

$$Meaning(g, c) = -\frac{\log NFA(g, c)}{f(g, c)} \quad (8)$$

292 The bigger the meaning score $Meaning(g, c)$ of an n-gram g in a class c
 is, the more significant the n-gram is for that class. Finally, we categorize the
 294 unlabeled domain d by computing the similarity as the total meaning value of d
 for the category c , i.e., $sim(d, c)$:

$$sim(d, c) = \sum_{g=1}^k Meaning(g, c) \cdot f(g, d) \quad (9)$$

296 where $f(g, d)$ is the frequency of the n-gram g in the domain name d and k
 is the number of unique n-gram in d .

4.2. Supervised classification based on sequences of visited domains

298 So far, the proposed methods consider only domains in isolation. We now
 turn our attention to sequential accesses to domains within a session. We aim at
 300 using the context of an unlabeled domain d_u to help its classification. In Section
 6.2, we present a methodology to extract only explicitly visited websites (called
 302 Core). In this way, we can remove all the domains contacted for advertisements,
 trackers, and other parts of the page, as well as for other applications, system
 304 updates, etc. The concept is that two (Core) websites that users actively visit in
 a sequence have a more significant probability of belonging to the same class.
 306 Indeed, as in [32] and from our observations, users often visit same-category
 websites at a short distance of time. In this work, we consider as a session
 308 the sequence of visited domains by a user in a time window. We considered
 sessions of one hour, but we report the results with different time window length
 310 in Section 7.3. We implement the same methodology presented by Jiang et al.
 [32]. First, we use a Word2Vec model [33] to represent the session as a vector in
 312 a vector space. Word embedding is the most widely used text representation
 model. It represents each word with a very low-dimensional vector with semantic

314 meaning. Afterward, we use a supervised classification method on the embedding
 space to assign categories to domains.

316 Let $v = [d_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, S]$ be the ordered sequence of domains that a user
 visits in a session, where d_i is the i -th visited domain, and S is the number of
 318 visits. Based on the model proposed by Mikolov et al. [39], we build the vector
 space using a multi-layered neural network arranged with the skip-gram model.
 320 In the current use case, the neural network has the job of predicting a target
 domain given a set of domains called *context domains*. The context domains of
 322 a target domain are the set of domains present at the same time in the visiting
 sequences in the corpus. More formally, the goal of word vectors is to maximize
 324 the average log probability:

$$\frac{1}{S} \sum_{t=1}^S \sum_{s=1, s \neq t}^S \log p(\text{context} | d_t) \quad (10)$$

where S is the number of domains in each sequence, and d_t is the target
 326 domain. The *context* may be either a sequence of co-occurring domains based
 on a sliding window or just the domain preceding d_t in time. In the latter
 328 case, we represent the probability $p(d_s | d_t)$ using a softmax function $p(d_s | d_t) =$
 $\frac{\exp(\nu_t \cdot \nu_s)}{\sum_{t'} \exp(\nu_t \cdot \nu_{s'})}$. Softmax is a function that returns a vector that describes the
 330 probability distribution of potential assignment. Here, ν_s and $\nu_t \in \mathbb{R}^K$ represent
 the K dimensional vector space and \cdot is the inner product. When the domains
 332 d_t and d_s frequently co-occur in a sequential manner, the parameters $\nu_{s,t}$ should
 have similar values, increasing the softmax probability. In order to compute the
 334 parameters, some techniques like hierarchical softmax [40], negative sampling
 [41] and sub sampling of frequent words [39] are used. We refer the reader to
 336 [39] for further details.

As a consequence, each domain has a vector representation $\nu_d \in \mathbb{R}^K$. Under
 338 those circumstances, we can use the resulting vectors as classification features.
 For supervised classification based on the vector of domains, we use a support
 340 vector machine (SVM) algorithm [30], as already used in [32]. In our implemen-
 tation, we generate the representation of the domains using FastText [42], an
 342 implementation of Word2Vec, using the default parameters. The default sliding
 window is of size 5. Hence, with a session of size 5 (domains) $[d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4, d_5]$,
 344 when using skip-gram, for each of the 5 domains in the session, random words
 (within the window) are chosen to update the model. That is, when training,
 346 we try to predict d_1 using one other random domain. This is done iteratively
 until the model converges. In our dataset, we point out that only 28% of our
 348 sessions have a size greater than 5. Thus increasing this window size should have
 a limited effect on our results.

350 5. Semi-supervised classification approach

The previously described approaches study a traditional supervised classi-
 352 fication problem. When the number of labeled data is small compared to the




Figure 1: An example graph, where only coloured nodes are labeled, and the others are unlabeled. Edges can be built following different criteria.

unlabeled data, sometimes this approach does not obtain accurate predictions. A solution to overcome this limitation is to use semi-supervised classification. The intuition is that, in semi-supervised techniques, the unlabeled data can somehow be useful to improve the classifier. Here, by using a semi-supervised methodology, we exploit a few labeled domains and their relationship with the remaining large amount of unlabeled domains to extend our knowledge.

In our work, we rely on a graph-based approach, proposed in [43], where domains are vertices, and their similarities define edges and weights. This algorithm belongs to the class of transductive methods. This category’s main characteristic is leveraging unlabeled data for training the method, using a graph data representation. [44, 45] The graph structure enables the propagation of the few available labels through its network until all the domains in a connected component are labeled. The graph structure is defined as $G = (V, E)$, where V is the set of vertices that include both the labeled and unlabeled domains, and E is a set of edges. The graph structure uses distance metrics or kernel functions like the Gaussian kernel to define the edge weight between pairs of nodes and represent them by an adjacency matrix W . As an example, Figure 1 illustrates an undirected connected graph in which colored vertices represent the labeled domains.

Here, we have a vector representation of domains, and we use the cosine similarity [46] to measure how similar domains are. We have two representations, one obtained using domain2vec, and the other using NFA. The first type considers co-occurring domains. The domain2vec process extracts 100-dimension vectors. With this methodology, domains that often appeared together in the same sessions have similar vector values. The second class of vectors looks at the domain names. The vectors have 25 elements, each representing the distance to the SimilarWeb categories, computed using NFA. Similar domains have similar vector values. As we describe later in the text, in the SSDS approach, we use the former domain2vec representation; in SSDB, we use the latter. In SSB, we use both, combining the similarities in the final weight.

Toward increasing efficiency and robustness against noise, we extract a sparse weighted subgraph from the fully connected graph. There are different possible solutions to recover a sparse subgraph. The most common algorithm is the k-Nearest Neighbor algorithm (k-NN); it keeps k-nearest neighbor edges, extracted

with the use of similarity functions, for each node. Another viable approach is the ϵ -neighborhood graph. This subgraph extraction technique removes all the data whose pair-wise similarity is smaller than ϵ [47].

A fundamental assumption of semi-supervised learning problems, called *smoothness*, is that nodes close to each other in the network are likely to have the same labels. Let $D_l = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_l\}$ be the set of labeled domains, with $|D_l|$ the number of them. Let $D_u = \{d_{l+1}, d_{l+2}, \dots, d_{l+u}\}$ be the unlabeled ones. There are $|C|$ classes, and each class $c \in C$ comprises a subset of domains in D_l . We define a matrix $Y_l \in \{0, 1\}^{|C| \times |D_l|}$ with $Y_{ij} = 1$ if $d_j \in C_i$. Y_l maps domain D_l into classes. The training data $D = D_l \cup D_u$ produce a weighted graph $G = (D, W)$, where D has $N = |D_l| + |D_u|$ domains, and $W \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is the adjacency matrix.

The prediction is based on assumption of consistency: (1) nearby points are likely to have the same label (2) points on the same structure (cluster or a manifold) are likely to have the same label prediction of labeled domains. To formalize the assumption, we use a classifying function [48], which is sufficiently smooth for the structure of labeled and unlabeled domains. The objective function is:

$$\arg \min_F \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{i,j=1} W_{ij} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbb{D}_{ii}}} F_i - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbb{D}_{jj}}} F_j \right|^2 + \mu \sum_{i=1} n |F_i - Y_i|^2 \right) \quad (11)$$

where $F \in \{0, 1\}^{|C| \times N}$ is the final mapping of domains (labeled and unlabeled) into classes and \mathbb{D} is the diagonal degree matrix given by $\mathbb{D}_{ii} = \sum_j W_{ij}$.

The objective function has two terms. The first one represents the smoothness constraint, which expresses the dissimilarity between the results of the classifying function of nearby nodes. In a nutshell, the classification outcome should not differ too much when considering two adjacent elements. The second term refers to the difference between the output of the classifying function and the initial labeling. In a few words, the final classification should be compatible with the ground truth labels. The idea of smoothness constraint can be expressed using graph Laplacian. The Laplacian matrix is obtained by $L = \mathbb{D} - W$ and regularization Laplacian is often used to constrain the labels to be consistent with the graph structure [44]. A positive weight parameter μ captures the trade-off between these two terms.

A fundamental step in the semi-supervised approach is the extraction of the adjacency matrix W , which represents the edge weights, using a meaningful similarity measure. In our work, we define the weight of the edges in graphs via different similarity functions. We choose metrics that refer to the functions defined for the supervised classifications in Section 4. Hereafter, we assign the weights in three ways: (i) using a similarity function associated with the domain names, (ii) considering the sequence of visited domains, and, lastly, (iii) combining the distances obtained using these two features. These three solutions include pruning mechanisms to reduce the number of edges in graphs, assigning

428 a weight of 0 under a certain threshold. The pruning is necessary to avoid
 430 weak connections and prevent the creation of complete graphs, computationally
 intractable when the number of nodes is large. In the following, we define and
 describe the three weight functions for extracting values for W .

5.1. Edge weighting with similarity based on the domain names

432 The first similarity function for edge weighting uses the NFA-based vectors
 extracted in Section 4.1. Using the similarity function $sim(i, c)$ between a domain
 434 i and a class c as a building block, we use cosine similarity for computing the
 pairwise domain similarity between the domains i and j in the following way:

$$sim_{name}(i, j) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{|C|} sim(i, k) \cdot sim(j, k)}{\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{|C|} sim(i, k)^2} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{|C|} sim(j, k)^2}} \quad (12)$$

436 We generate an edge between i and j if the resulting similarity is higher than
 a threshold ϵ , with weight equal to the output of $sim_{name}(i, j)$:

$$W_{ij} = \begin{cases} sim(d_i, d_j) & \text{if } sim(i, j) > \epsilon \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

438 In order to choose the best threshold, tune parameter ϵ is done by performing
 5-fold cross-validation with different ϵ values in the range $[0.9, 0.99]$ (using steps
 440 of 0.005). The selected value is the one with the best performance in our cross-
 validation procedure. Moreover, for the best final algorithm, we also employed
 442 a dedicated test set. We refer to Section 7 for the definition of the parameter
 values.

5.2. Edge weighting with similarity-based on domain sequences

444 The second way to define the weights of the edges uses the vectors extracted
 from the sequences of visited domains described in 4.2. Recall that each domain
 446 in the word vector model is represented as a $\nu_d \in \mathbb{R}^K$ vector. With such vectors,
 448 we can now compute a pairwise similarity matrix for every pair of domains. Here,
 we again make use of the cosine similarity based on multi-dimensional vectors:

$$sim_{sequence}(i, j) = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^K \nu_{it} \nu_{jt}}{\sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^K \nu_{it}^2} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^K \nu_{jt}^2}} \quad (14)$$

450 Afterwards, we create an edge between two domains according to equation (13).
 We use 5-fold cross-validation to tune the parameter ϵ with different values in
 452 the range $[0.4, 0.8]$ (using steps of 0.01). We report in Table A.3 in Appendix A
 the optimal value of ϵ that has been found.




Figure 2: Employed schema for semi-supervised method based on both the domain name and the sequence of visited domains.

5.3. Edge weighting combining metrics using domain names and domain sequences

The third and last edge weighting function considers the conjunct impact of both features, i.e., domain names and sequence of visited domains. In this way, we can exploit both the concepts of similarity, enriching edges information. To reach this goal, we compute the average similarities of the equations (12) and (14):

$$sim_{name\&sequence} = \frac{sim_{name} + sim_{sequence}}{2} \quad (15)$$

Then, based on the resulting similarity, we again use the equation (13) to assign the weights (see Table A.3 in Appendix A for the adopted ϵ).

In Figure 2, we show the whole flow used for applying this semi-supervised method.

6. Dataset collection, preparation and characterization

6.1. Network traffic collection

Our analysis relies on a dataset collected in our university campus in Turin (Italy). In the dataset, users' terminals (usually PCs) are directly connected to the Internet via campus network (wired Ethernet) and uniquely identified by a statically assigned IP address associated with one and only one terminal. In other setups, like, for example, in the presence of a NAT, the users should be identified using different strategies as proposed in the literature [49]. However, this is outside the scope of this work. Moreover, often clients are contacting from their terminal also domains outside of the browser session (e.g., software updates or other background applications). The Core domain approach presented in Section 6.2 helps in removing such domains.

We rely on Tstat [50] to collect data. Tstat monitors each TCP flow, exposing
478 detailed information. Here, we are interested in retrieving the domain name of
the server being contacted. Tstat implements three techniques to get it. For
480 HTTP flows, the `Host:` header is parsed directly from HTTP requests. In the
case of HTTPS/TLS, Tstat DPI module extracts the Server Name Indication
482 (SNI) field in the Client Hello message. SNI is a TLS extension by which the
client indicates the server domain that it is trying to contact. At last, Tstat
484 reports the domain name clients resolved via DNS queries prior to flows [51]. We
combine these three mechanisms to label each TCP flow with the server name,
486 giving higher priority to Host and SNI fields where more than one is present.

In this work, for each TCP flow, we consider: (i) the anonymized client IP
488 address as terminal identifier s , (ii) the starting time of the flow t and (iii) the
server domain name d - as retrieved via HTTP, TLS, or DNS protocols.

Our dataset contains the traffic of approximately 2 500 terminals, collected at
490 our university Campus in Torino in 40 days in 2017. The dataset includes 4691
million flows and 404 thousand unique domains. For our train/validation/test
492 set definition, we extract the domains visited in one day by the users (see Section
6.4).
494

Information about user behavior is sensitive, and the collection of these
496 data might be privacy-invasive [52]. To reduce as much as possible to possible
privacy violations, we followed the best practice of limiting the data collection
498 to only the necessary information for the experiment. Both the data collection
process and the collected data have been discussed, reviewed, and approved by
500 the ethical board of our University. In collaboration with our campus network
administrators, we took all possible actions to protect the leakages of private
502 information from users. In particular, Tstat was installed and configured i) to
process packets in real-time, ii) to anonymize the IP addresses of clients using an
504 irreversible hash function, whose key was selected by the network administrators,
and iii) to save only flow level logs with the needed information.

506 6.2. Identification of Core domains

Here we present a methodology to extract only explicitly visited websites.
508 This approach is instrumental in removing all the domains contacted for adver-
tisements, trackers, and other content of the page and traffic of other applications,
510 system updates, and other elements running in the background. Indeed, when
visiting a web page, the browser application first downloads the main HTML
512 document and then fetches all the page objects (images, scripts, advertisements,
and other content). These objects often lie on external servers that have dif-
514 ferent domains [53]. We call *Core domain* a domain initially contacted to
download the main HTML document of a page. Core domains are essential since
516 users intentionally visit them, like `www.facebook.com` and `en.wikipedia.org`.
We call *Support domains* those domains automatically contacted by visiting a
518 Core domain, or by background applications, like `static.10.fbcdn.net` and
`dl-client.dropbox.com`. Support domains do not contain useful information
520 about user intention. Hence, we build on our previous methodology [13, 54]

to identify and consider only Core domains. Here we briefly report the Core domain extraction methodology.

We build a labeled dataset that we use for training and testing. We consider 500 Core and 500 Support domains, a balanced labeled dataset that we make publicly available [16]. We visit each domain using a headless browser and extract an extensive list of features guided by domain knowledge. Features include the length and the content type of the main HTML document (if present); the number of objects of the page and domains contacted by the browser to fetch all objects; HTTP response code (e.g., 2xx, 3xx and 4xx); and whether the browser has been redirected to an external domain. We then let the classifier choose the ones that better allow it to separate Core and Support domains. We solve the classification problem using a decision tree classifier. The final model results in a simple, efficient, and descriptive tree which reads as it follows: a domain is Core if a) the main HTML document size is bigger than 3357B and b) the browser is not redirected to an external domain, i.e., the HTTP response code of the website homepage is not 3xx or, if it is, the homepage is still redirected to another page on the same domain. Intuitively, support domains typically lack real home pages. When directly contacted, the server reply with short error messages. In some cases, Support domains redirect visitors to the service home page (e.g., `fbcdn.net` redirects on `www.facebook.com`). Despite its simplicity, overall accuracy is higher than 96% when tested against 1 000 labeled domains. For more details, refer to [13].

Considering the dataset obtained in Section 6.1, we identify 161 333 unique Core domains (14 712 for the single day labeled and used for training/validation/testing). This dataset of Core domains is released to the public [16]. IP addresses are obfuscated, and the class is provided, where available.

6.3. *SimilarWeb dataset with domain category*

To obtain Core domain classes, we conducted several tests using different categorization systems. Note indeed that there is not a unique taxonomy, and each service provides a different definition of classes and offers a different coverage [14]. Here, we rely on SimilarWeb², a website that provides web analytics services. It results in the most reliable and offers good coverage of domains, even for Italian websites. As a result of several manual inspections, SimilarWeb performed consistently better than other publicly available datasets to categorize our study country domains.

Among the other information, they offer an extensive database of categorization of second-level + top-level domains. We use this as our ground truth. The total number of categories is 25. This number is significant, and many classes may have some overlap. For example, many domains could be assigned to both “Internet and Telecom” and “Computer and Electronics”. We could have merged multiple categories, but we decided to keep the original categorization

²<https://www.similarweb.com/>




Figure 3: Distribution of popularity in terms of visits of labeled domains in each of the 25 classes.




Figure 4: Distribution of unique labeled domains in each of the 25 classes.

562 of SimilarWeb as ground truth to make our results easily comparable by other
 563 scientists.

564 We intersect our dataset of Core domains obtained in Section 6.2 with the
 565 dataset of labeled domains of SimilarWeb referring to 2017. We obtain 2 178 la-
 566 beled domains out of 14 712 unique Core domains used for training/validation/testing
 567 (around 14%). Hence, SimilarWeb contains only a small fraction of the domains
 568 for our trace in Italy. Once more, the limited coverage of available classification
 569 services motivates the need for automatic means of solving the classification
 570 problem.

571 For comparison, we also checked the DMOZ labeled dataset ³. Besides having
 572 fewer classes than SimilarWeb (15), it covers only 8% of domains in our data.⁴

Figure 3 and Figure 4 show a characterization of the categories in the dataset.

³<https://www.kaggle.com/shawon10/url-classification-dataset-dmoz>. DMOZ was abandoned in 2017 by Mozilla, and now accessible under Curlie.org.

⁴We also tried to merge the two services, but desisted due to the difficulty in matching the categories and the different criteria they use to assign a website to a class.

574 Figure 3 depicts the categories’ popularity on the overall set, measured as the
total number of visits for each domain. The figure helps to understand which
576 are the most popular categories. “Internet and Telecom” and “Computer and
Electronics” cover more than 60% of the overall traffic. The strong prevalence of
578 tech-related categories is not surprising since the dataset collects users’ activity
on our campus, where the research on these topics is predominant.

580 Figure 4 outlines the distribution of unique domains over the different cate-
gories. The results show a different distribution than Figure 3. Here “Internet
582 and Telecom” and “Computer and Electronics” now include less than 20% of the
unique domains, and “News and Media” results to be the category with more
584 distinct elements, suggesting a broader heterogeneity in the fruition of this kind
of content.

586 *6.4. Preparation of training, validation, and testing sets*

We consistently use for all the methods the same approach. We split the
588 labeled data into train, validation, and test data. We use training and validation
sets for parameter tuning for each method, using 5-fold cross-validation. The
590 5-fold cross-validation is performed for both the supervised and semi-supervised
methods, with the same set of labeled elements. For the semi-supervised method,
592 we build the graph with all the Core domains, of which only a fraction is
labeled (see Section 6.3). The ones that are not labeled will eventually obtain an
594 estimated label after performing the method, but they cannot be considered for
evaluating the performance. Only the labeled ones are taken into consideration,
596 following the same 5-fold cross-validation procedure as for the supervised ones.

The test set is a separate and independent sample of data that we use to
598 provide an unbiased evaluation of the related final model. It is used only to
obtain an independent evaluation of the final algorithm, and the result on the
600 test set cannot lead to changes in the choice of the algorithm or the parameters
since we will then have no way to measure the true performance. Hence, we can
602 use it only on the best algorithm [55].

To obtain the test set, we consider 20% of the original (randomized) data.
604 The remaining 80% is the dataset used for our 5-fold cross-validation. For each
fold, we train each model on 80% on this set and validate on the remaining 20%.
606 We select the algorithm with the best performance on the cross-validation step,
and finally, verify its performance on the test set to indicate how it will perform
608 in practice.

7. Experimental results

610 In this section, we report the experimental evaluation of the considered
methodologies. Results can be reproduced by using the code and dataset
612 provided in [16].

7.1. Evaluation metrics and parameters selection

614 Overall, we have six different approaches to compare. In addition to our
615 six classifiers, we also consider two naive classifiers as a baseline. The first one
616 assigns all domains to the most frequent category, i.e., “News and media” as in
Figure 4. We call it “Naive-MostFrequent”. The second one assigns one category
618 uniformly at random. We call it “Naive-Uniform”.

As said, we perform, for each solution, 5-fold cross-validation on the training
620 set. The cross-validation generates new train and validation datasets with
different combinations of elements. For each execution, we consider 80% of
622 the trained data for training and 20% for validation. This process allows us
to obtain better performance estimations and better tune the algorithms by
624 combining different parameter values. Regarding the latter, we report the selected
parameters in Table A.3 in the Appendix A. We evaluate the performance of
626 each solution using standard classification metrics. For each validation fold, we
obtain the *confusion matrix*, a numerical representation of how the classifier
628 predicted the instances of each label. From it, we compute the Accuracy, i.e.,
the fraction of correct predictions. Moreover, we compute separately for each
630 class the Precision, Recall, and F-Measure [55], offering a detailed analysis of the
results. Furthermore, we compute the average of Precision and Recall over the
632 different classes (weighting all classes equally), called macro-averages. Finally,
the macro-average for F-Measure is computed as the harmonic mean of the
634 macro-average of Precision and Recall.

Given a labeled instance x and a list τ_x ranking its confidence of x to belong
636 to the different categories, the Position Error (PE) [56], is a measure of the
deviation of x correct label position (λ_x) from the top-rank in the τ_x list. For
638 example, if the actual label is in the first position in τ_x , then the error is 0. The
maximum error is $m - 1$, where m is the number of classes. The Normalized
640 Position Error (NPE) over the number of classes is defined as:

$$NPE(\tau_x, \lambda_x) = \frac{\tau_x(\lambda_x) - 1}{m - 1} \in \{0, 1/(m - 1), \dots, 1\} \quad (16)$$

NPE allows us to evaluate how off is the classification from the correct class. This
642 is a softer metric compared to the ones defined over the confusion matrix, which
only consider if a decision is correct or wrong. For example, if the second (last)
644 most probable class is the correct one, we have a PE equal to 1 (24, respectively),
even if the decision is wrong.

646 7.2. Overall and per class results

Table 1 depicts the overall results, obtained with a 5-fold cross-validation
648 process. Observe in general how the naive classifiers perform poorly. This
outcome is predictable; having 25 classes, and assigning a domain to a random
650 class or the most popular, results with high probability in a wrong choice. The
Naive-MostFrequent has higher accuracy (0.133, equal to the most common
652 frequency as in Figure 3) than Naive-Uniform (0.033). However, the former is

deterministically wrong in 24 out of 25 classes resulting in poor average Precision,
654 Recall, and F-Measure.

Moving to Machine learning approaches, we recognize how using domain
656 name structures improves performance. Measuring the similarity with NFA
performs better than TFIDF, topping to 0.410 accuracy. When considering just
658 the domain sequence (“SVM-Supervised-DomainsSequence”), we obtain similar
performance. Worth to mention, we also tried an approach based on LSTM. We
660 focused on domain names, using character-level models. A character-level model
reads each word as an ordered series of characters. The final prediction tells us
662 to which category the domain name belongs. For this aim, we used LSTM as
implemented in Keras [57]. The obtained accuracy for LSTM is equal to 0.416.
664 Even if LSTM performance is similar to that of NFA, with the latter, we can
implement the similarity metric used in the (better) semi-supervised methods.

Focusing on semi-supervised approaches instead, we can notice a further
666 improvement in the classification. The outcome results correctly in 47% and 44%
668 of the cases when using edge weights based only on domain names or domain
sequences. When coupling the information bought by both the domain name and
670 the sequence, we observe a significant improvement, reaching overall accuracy of
more than 52%. Overall, all semi-supervised methods improve the performance
672 of supervised classification.

The same behavior is registered analyzing macro-average scores, that help
674 in summarizing the per-class classification results. In this case, as well, the
ranking of the methodologies is unchanged. Overall, this outcome shows the
676 better capability of the Semi-supervised techniques in predicting the categories.

Despite the increasing complexity of the classifier, the overall results are still
678 far from a perfect categorization. This outcome is due to the heterogeneity of
the dataset, a considerable number of classes, and limited information. Recall,
680 indeed, that we rely just on the information offered by the domain name and
sequence of visits.

At last, the definition of a category for a website is, per se, a complex
682 problem. By manually checking some labeled domains of SimilarWeb, we found
some domains with misleading labels. This occurrence further complicates the
684 engineering of an automatic model. By looking at the NPE, we observe that
the correct class usually lies in the top-most positions in the returned similarity
686 hierarchy. For instance, the NPE of the best classifier (“SemiSupervised-both”) is
0.093, i.e., on average, the correct class is found in the top-2 categories (obtained
688 as NPE times the number of categories). The NPE outcome is instrumental for
supporting the classification of a domain, restricting the choice among a few
690 options.

Finally, in Table 2 we report the result of the best configuration (i.e., “Semi-
692 Supervised-both”) on the test set. As explained in Section 6, the test set is
used only to obtain an independent estimate of the performance of the chosen
694 algorithm, and it cannot be used to compare different methods [55]. The test
set results align with those in the 5-fold cross-validation set, being even slightly
696 better on the final test set. This shows the fact that the semi-supervised method
698 will work well, even with unseen data.

Table 1: Performance of the different classifiers obtained on the 5-fold cross validation set.

Method	Accuracy	$Precision^{macro}$	$Recall^{macro}$	$F - Measure^{macro}$	NPE
TFIDF-Supervised-DomainsName	0.359	0.342	0.358	0.313	0.181
NFA-Supervised-DomainsName	0.410	0.414	0.331	0.348	0.121
SVM-Supervised-DomainsSequence [32]	0.404	0.335	0.367	0.334	0.135
SSDN-SemiSupervised-DomainsName	0.471	0.486	0.390	0.404	0.112
SSDS-SemiSupervised-DomainsSequence	0.441	0.390	0.344	0.344	0.109
SSB-SemiSupervised-both	0.522	0.528	0.456	0.465	0.089
Naive-Most-Frequent	0.133	0.005	0.040	0.008	-
Naive-Uniform	0.033	0.064	0.063	0.061	-

Table 2: Performance obtained for the best tuned algorithm on the test dataset.

Method	Accuracy	$Precision^{macro}$	$Recall^{macro}$	$F - Measure^{macro}$	NPE
SemiSupervised-both	0.562	0.503	0.474	0.465	0.085

We now move to the detailed description of the results per class. The following figures report the different evaluation metric results. The categories sequence follows the distribution of unique labeled domains reported in Figure 4 in descending order.

Figure 5 shows the obtained Precision for each domain category, considering the six methodologies. The semi-supervised approaches (yellow, cyan, and magenta bars), produce the best results. Analyzing Precision among the classes, we observe promising values for “heterogeneous” categories, in terms of domain distributions, and for the “homogeneous” ones, with all the considered solutions. For the first group, worth to mention are “Career and Education,” and “Computer and Electronics,” while for the second “Travel,” and “Reference,” (i.e., subscription-based portals for scientific research). This outcome may suggest that these categories are peculiar both in the domain structure and in terms of user navigation targets, distinguishing them from the others. On the other hand, classes like “Recreation and Hobbies,” “Books and Literature,” and “People and Society,” which more likely cover a large variety of topics, are more challenging to model and create a more significant number of False Positives.

Figure 6 shows the Recall measure results. These outcomes mostly confirm our previous considerations. It is worth to remark the groups with worse values in Recall measurements. In particular, “Recreation and Hobbies,” “People and Society,” and “Books and Literature” confirm to have a reduced capability of attracting their actual elements. Again, a low distinctiveness of these categories may play an essential role in the model generation, and so in final results.

Finally, Figure 7 and Figure 8 wrap up the aforementioned findings, by showing the F-Measure values. The semi-supervised combined methodology has, in almost all the categories, the best performances, confirming the results depicted in Table 1. Figure 8 details the results of F-Measure for the semi-supervised combined methodology (the same plots for all the analyzed methods are reported in Appendix B). It correlates the F-measure obtained for each category using a specific classifier (x-axis), with the size of the category in unique domains




Figure 5: Precision results per class for the six methodologies.

(y-axis). The varying color and radius of the points are directly proportional to the size of each class. The dashed purple vertical line represents the macro F-Measure obtained with the Naive-Uniform algorithm. The dashed dark blue vertical line instead depicts the SSB macro F-Measure. The Figure shows that we obtain good prediction results for the most prominent classes and categories with a small number of elements, i.e., not prevalent in our observation dataset. This outcome suggests a promising behavior of the classifier in the ability to classify both prominent and underrepresented classes accurately. Comparing this Figure with Table 1, we can again appreciate how this classifier works better than simple naive approaches that predict well the most represented classes. An exception is the category “Home and Garden” for which the F-Measure score is zero. Inspecting the root cause for this outcome, we can deduce that the very low number of domains for that class and the difficulty of finding related domains in the same session, since other similar web pages are categorized differently, negatively influence the performance.

In general, the proposed approach shows encouraging results. The categories that are less capable of producing reliable predictions are also more difficult to classify for all the other methods, suggesting an intrinsic complexity of the data.




Figure 6: Recall results per class for the six methodologies.




Figure 7: F-Measures results per class for the six methodologies.




Figure 8: Scatter plot of F-Measure values obtained with the “Semi-supervised both” approach and the size of the considered categories in terms of unique domains.

7.3. Impact of categories, number of samples and time window duration

748 Here we discuss the sensitivity of the tuned SemiSupervised-both (SBB)
method with respect to different parameters. In particular, we analyze accuracy
750 and macro F-Measure with respect to: (i) the different number of categories, (ii)
different percentage of samples, and (iii) different session length. Again, we use
752 a 5-fold cross-validation approach.

Figure 9a shows the impact of the number of categories when considering
754 the K most common categories according to our dataset 4. Figure 9b instead
considers a random choice of K categories with 10 different runs. Curves represent
756 the average over the 5-fold performance of accuracy and macro F-Measure. For
the random category selection cases, the area represents the standard deviation
758 on 10 independent runs around the average. The last point reports the single
result on all 25 categories. As expected, the performance (both accuracy and
760 macro average F-Measure) tends to decrease with the increase of K . The more
categories we consider, the harder the classification problem becomes. Restricting
762 to the most common K categories impacts more performance than a random
choice of K categories. This is likely due to the fact that the two most popular
764 classes, “Internet and Teleco” and “Computer and Electronic” may have some
overlap and are harder to distinguish (as discussed in Section 6.3).

766 Figure 9c reports the learning curve when all categories are considered, but
only a percentage of flows is used for training. Reducing the training set size
768 reduces performance. Interestingly, with about 60-70% of training, the learning
curve already shows signs of saturation. As expected, the results with 100%
770 samples are a bit higher because we tuned the parameters on this exact case
(Section 7.1).

772 Finally, Figure 9d reports the sensitivity with respect to the time window
duration to consider co-occurring domains. We hypothesize that users visit
774 similar websites in the same time-window. Here, we consider time windows
different from 1 hour, reducing it to 15 minutes and 30 minutes, and increasing it
776 to 6, 12, and 24 hours. Here we observe a smaller impact on the results. Widening
the time window to more than one hour slightly reduces the performance. From
778 the literature, we know that users browse continuously in sessions that are
usually shorter than 1 hour (about 85% of them, according to [53]). Hence
780 there are few sessions longer than one hour that can provide added value for the
analysis. In addition, a too-large session duration can forcibly cause the joining
782 of several independent sessions. Therefore we are likely aggregating sessions of
uncorrelated content (e.g., considering 12 hours, we might aggregate a session in
784 the morning with one in the evening, with likely independent topics).

Similarly, reducing the session duration reduces performance. Co-occurring
786 domains about the same topic usually appear very close in time, and hence
the performance is still good with time windows of 15 minutes. However, the
788 results show that a 15-minutes time window is not enough to capture the effect
of co-occurring domains.




Figure 9: Performance results changing number of categories, percentage of used elements and time window used for the session.

790 8. Conclusions

792 In this paper, we proposed a comprehensive evaluation of classification methodologies for website domain name classification from a network observer’s perspective. We considered the main category of websites as classes, and we relied on the category labels provided by the SimilarWeb dataset. We analyzed algorithms that make use of information about the lexical structure of the domains and the co-occurrence of domains in users’ sessions, not inspecting web pages content. We created different representations of the data to explore different solutions and models.

798 We considered methodologies based on the similarity in terms of n-grams extracted from the domain names, using TFIDF and NFA. We tested a linear SVM classifier over data vectors generated by FastText. Furthermore, we proposed semi-supervised solutions to incorporate in the classifier aspects not strictly related to the labeled data. Those semi-supervised methodologies leverage graphs. The graph nodes are the domains; the weighted edges represent their similarity. We expressed the similarity between n-grams, looking at domains co-occurrence in sessions, and as a combination of both. The latter implementation is the one that offers the best performance.

808 There are still some limitations in our work that we can address in the
future. First of all, the nature of the traces demarcates the analysis to the
810 collected domains, excluding in-depth analysis regarding other countries web
traffic. The use of SimilarWeb, as discussed in the paper, adds a specific
812 viewpoint to the categorization. Future work could include collecting new traces
and comparing the results with other domains classification sources. This work
814 does not contemplate the use of active crawling for the analysis. This choice
is justified by the difficulty of selecting a specific page, content, and how the
816 website reacts to active crawling. However, in the future, it could be interesting
to focus on crawling-based techniques and understand how they differ from our
818 approach, weighting and merging advantages and disadvantages.

The results show the complexity of the website topic classification task. The
820 lack of an exhaustive classification of domains calls for ingenuity in building
semi-supervised solutions. However, the limited but readily available information
822 provided by passive network traffic traces shows that a good classification is
possible. To foster studies, we make available the code and data [16] we used in
824 this paper, as a guide for future work exploring passive flow level data for the
classification problem.

826 References

- 828 [1] P. V. Nainwani, P. Prajapati, Comparative study of web page classification
approaches, *International Journal of Computer Applications* 179 (45) (2018)
6–9. doi:10.5120/ijca2018916994.
830 URL [http://www.ijcaonline.org/archives/volume179/number45/
29433-2018916994](http://www.ijcaonline.org/archives/volume179/number45/29433-2018916994)
- 832 [2] A. Y. Halevy, N. Ashish, D. Bitton, M. Carey, D. Draper, J. Pollock,
A. Rosenthal, V. Sikka, Enterprise information integration: successes, chal-
834 lenges and controversies, in: *Proceedings of the 2005 ACM SIGMOD
international conference on Management of data*, ACM, 2005, pp. 778–787.
- 836 [3] L. Blanco, N. Dalvi, A. Machanavajjhala, Highly efficient algorithms for
structural clustering of large websites, in: *Proceedings of the 20th interna-
838 tional conference on World wide web*, ACM, 2011, pp. 437–446.
- [4] H. A. Sleiman, R. Corchuelo, Tex: An efficient and effective unsupervised
840 web information extractor, *Knowledge-Based Systems* 39 (2013) 109–123.
- [5] C. Kohlschütter, P.-A. Chirita, W. Nejdl, Utility analysis for topically biased
842 pagerank, in: *Proceedings of the 16th international conference on World
Wide Web*, ACM, 2007, pp. 1211–1212.
- 844 [6] C.-C. Huang, S.-L. Chuang, L.-F. Chien, Liveclassifier: creating hierarchical
text classifiers through web corpora, in: *Proceedings of the 13th international
846 conference on World Wide Web*, ACM, 2004, pp. 184–192.

- 848 [7] Z. Chen, O. Wu, M. Zhu, W. Hu, A novel web page filtering system by
combining texts and images, in: 2006 IEEE/WIC/ACM International Conference on Web Intelligence (WI 2006 Main Conference Proceedings)(WI'06),
850 IEEE, 2006, pp. 732–735.
- [8] A. Broder, M. Fontoura, V. Josifovski, L. Riedel, A semantic approach to
852 contextual advertising, in: Proceedings of the 30th annual international
ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information re-
854 trieval, ACM, 2007, pp. 559–566.
- [9] M.-Y. Kan, H. O. N. Thi, Fast webpage classification using url features, in:
856 Proceedings of the 14th ACM international conference on Information and
knowledge management, ACM, 2005, pp. 325–326.
- 858 [10] O.-W. Kwon, J.-H. Lee, Web page classification based on k-nearest neighbor
approach, in: Proceedings of the fifth international workshop on on
860 Information retrieval with Asian languages, ACM, 2000, pp. 9–15.
- [11] A. S. Patil, B. Pawar, Automated classification of web sites using naive
862 bayesian algorithm, in: Proceedings of the international multiconference of
engineers and computer scientists, Vol. 1, 2012, pp. 14–16.
- 864 [12] D. F. Witmer, The association (of). internet. researchers: Formed to support
scholarship in and of the internet, *Information, Communication & Society*
866 2 (3) (1999) 368–370.
- [13] L. Vassio, D. Giordano, M. Trevisan, M. Mellia, A. P. C. da Silva, Users’
868 fingerprinting techniques from tcp traffic, in: Proceedings of the Workshop
on Big Data Analytics and Machine Learning for Data Communication
870 Networks, Big-DAMA '17, ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2017, pp. 49–54.
doi:10.1145/3098593.3098602.
872 URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/3098593.3098602>
- [14] P. Vallina, V. Le Pochat, A. Feal, M. Paraschiv, J. Gamba, T. Burke,
874 O. Hohlfeld, J. Tapiador, N. Vallina-Rodriguez, Mis-shapes, mistakes,
misfits: An analysis of domain classification services, in: Proceedings
876 of the ACM Internet Measurement Conference, IMC '20, Association
for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2020, p. 598–618.
878 doi:10.1145/3419394.3423660.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3419394.3423660>
- 880 [15] X. Zhu, Z. Ghahramani, J. Lafferty, Semi-supervised learning using gaussian
fields and harmonic functions, in: Proceedings of the Twentieth International
882 Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML'03,
AAAI Press, 2003, pp. 912–919.
884 URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=3041838.3041953>

- 886 [16] A. Faroughi, A. Morichetta, L. Vassio, F. Figueiredo, M. Mellia,
R. Javidan, A partially labeled dataset for domain name classification with semi-supervised learning, [https://smartdata.polito.it/
888 domains-web-users/](https://smartdata.polito.it/domains-web-users/), accessed: 2020-02-28 (2020).
- [17] D. Mladenic, Turning yahoo into an automatic web-page classifier (1998).
- 890 [18] K. Golub, A. Ardö, Importance of html structural elements and metadata
in automated subject classification, in: A. Rauber, S. Christodoulakis,
892 A. M. Tjoa (Eds.), *Research and Advanced Technology for Digital Libraries*,
Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005, pp. 368–378.
- 894 [19] D. Shen, Z. Chen, Q. Yang, H.-J. Zeng, B. Zhang, Y. Lu, W.-Y. Ma, Web-
page classification through summarization, in: *Proceedings of the 27th
896 annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development
in information retrieval*, ACM, 2004, pp. 242–249.
- 898 [20] Y. Wei, W. Wang, B. Wang, B. Yang, Y. Liu, A method for topic classification
of web pages using lda-svm model, in: Z. Deng (Ed.), *Proceedings
900 of 2017 Chinese Intelligent Automation Conference*, Springer Singapore,
Singapore, 2018, pp. 589–596.
- 902 [21] A. Colorni, M. Dorigo, V. Maniezzo, et al., Distributed optimization by ant
colonies, in: *Proceedings of the first European conference on artificial life*,
904 Vol. 142, Cambridge, MA, 1992, pp. 134–142.
- [22] O.-W. Kwon, J.-H. Lee, Text categorization based on k-nearest neighbor
906 approach for web site classification, *Information Processing & Management*
39 (1) (2003) 25–44.
- 908 [23] V. de Boer, M. van Someren, T. Lupascu, et al., Classifying web pages with
visual features., in: *WEBIST (1)*, 2010, pp. 245–252.
- 910 [24] A. P. Asirvatham, K. K. Ravi, A. Prakash, et al., Web page classification
based on document structure, in: *IEEE National Convention*, 2001.
- 912 [25] M. Kovacevic, M. Diligenti, M. Gori, V. Milutinovic, Visual adjacency
multigraphs-a novel approach for a web page classification, in: *Proceedings
914 of SAWM04 workshop, ECML2004*, 2004.
- [26] S. Matic, C. Iordanou, G. Smaragdakis, N. Laoutaris, Identifying sensitive
916 urls at web-scale, in: *Proceedings of the ACM Internet Measurement Conference*,
IMC '20, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY,
918 USA, 2020, p. 619–633. doi:10.1145/3419394.3423653.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3419394.3423653>
- 920 [27] H. Utard, J. Fürnkranz, Link-local features for hypertext classification, in:
Semantics, web and mining, Springer, 2005, pp. 51–64.

- 922 [28] E. Baykan, M. Henzinger, L. Marian, I. Weber, Purely url-based topic
classification, in: Proceedings of the 18th international conference on World
924 wide web, ACM, 2009, pp. 1109–1110.
- [29] E. Baykan, M. Henzinger, L. Marian, I. Weber, A comprehensive study of
926 features and algorithms for url-based topic classification, *ACM Transactions
on the Web (TWEB)* 5 (3) (2011) 15.
- 928 [30] C. Cortes, V. Vapnik, Support-vector networks, *Machine learning* 20 (3)
(1995) 273–297.
- 930 [31] I. Hernández, C. R. Rivero, D. Ruiz, R. Corchuelo, Cala: An unsupervised
url-based web page classification system, *Knowledge-Based Systems* 57
932 (2014) 168–180.
- [32] W. Jiang, K. Yu, X. Wu, F. Wei, B. Wang, Domain2vec: Vector representa-
934 tion of mobile server’s domain based on mobile user visiting sequences, in:
2018 IEEE 3rd International Conference on Big Data Analysis (ICBDA),
936 2018, pp. 232–236. doi:10.1109/ICBDA.2018.8367683.
- [33] T. Mikolov, K. Chen, G. Corrado, J. Dean, Efficient estimation of word
938 representations in vector space, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781* (2013).
- [34] K. Sparck Jones, *A Statistical Interpretation of Term Specificity and Its
940 Application in Retrieval*, Taylor Graham Publishing, GBR, 1988, p. 132–142.
- [35] S. E. Robertson, K. S. Jones, Relevance weighting of search terms, *Journal
942 of the American Society for Information science* 27 (3) (1976) 129–146.
- [36] C. D. Manning, P. Raghavan, H. Schütze, *Scoring, term weighting, and
944 the vector space model*, Cambridge University Press, 2008, p. 100–123.
doi:10.1017/CBO9780511809071.007.
- 946 [37] H. Balinsky, A. Balinsky, S. Simske, Document sentences as a small world,
in: 2011 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics,
948 IEEE, 2011, pp. 2583–2588.
- [38] B. Dadachev, A. Balinsky, H. Balinsky, S. Simske, On the helmholtz principle
950 for data mining, in: 2012 Third International Conference on Emerging
Security Technologies, 2012, pp. 99–102.
- 952 [39] T. Mikolov, I. Sutskever, K. Chen, G. S. Corrado, J. Dean, Distributed rep-
resentations of words and phrases and their compositionality, in: *Advances
954 in neural information processing systems*, 2013, pp. 3111–3119.
- [40] F. Morin, Y. Bengio, Hierarchical probabilistic neural network language
956 model., in: *Aistats*, Vol. 5, Citeseer, 2005, pp. 246–252.
- 958 [41] M. U. Gutmann, A. Hyvärinen, Noise-contrastive estimation of unnormalized
statistical models, with applications to natural image statistics, *Journal of
Machine Learning Research* 13 (Feb) (2012) 307–361.

- 960 [42] A. Joulin, E. Grave, P. Bojanowski, M. Douze, H. Jégou, T. Mikolov,
Fasttext. zip: Compressing text classification models, arXiv preprint
962 arXiv:1612.03651 (2016).
- [43] M. Belkin, P. Niyogi, Towards a theoretical foundation for laplacian-based
964 manifold methods, *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 74 (8) (2008)
1289–1308.
- 966 [44] J. E. van Engelen, H. H. Hoos, A survey on semi-supervised learning,
Machine Learning 109 (2) (2020) 373–440. doi:10.1007/s10994-019-05855-6.
968 URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10994-019-05855-6>
- [45] Y. Chong, Y. Ding, Q. Yan, S. Pan, Graph-based semi-supervised
970 learning: A review, *Neurocomputing* 408 (2020) 216 – 230.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neucom.2019.12.130>.
- 972 [46] T. Jebara, J. Wang, S.-F. Chang, Graph construction and b-matching for
semi-supervised learning, in: *Proceedings of the 26th annual international
974 conference on machine learning*, ACM, 2009, pp. 441–448.
- [47] M. S. Baghshah, F. Afsari, S. B. Shouraki, E. Eslami, Scalable semi-
976 supervised clustering by spectral kernel learning, *Pattern Recognition Letters*
45 (2014) 161–171.
- 978 [48] D. Zhou, O. Bousquet, T. N. Lal, J. Weston, B. Schölkopf, Learning with
local and global consistency, in: *Advances in neural information processing
980 systems*, 2004, pp. 321–328.
- [49] M. Husák, M. Cermák, T. Jirsík, P. Celeda, Network-based https client
982 identification using ssl/tls fingerprinting, in: *2015 10th International
Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security*, 2015, pp. 389–396.
984 doi:10.1109/ARES.2015.35.
- [50] M. Trevisan, A. Finamore, M. Mellia, M. Munafo, D. Rossi, Traffic anal-
986 ysis with off-the-shelf hardware: Challenges and lessons learned, *IEEE
Communications Magazine* 55 (3) (2017) 163–169.
- 988 [51] I. N. Bermudez, M. Mellia, M. M. Munafo, R. Keralapura, A. Nucci, Dns to
the rescue: Discerning content and services in a tangled web, in: *Proceedings
990 of the 2012 Internet Measurement Conference*, 2012, pp. 413–426.
- [52] L. Vassio, H. Metwalley, D. Giordano, The exploitation of web navigation
992 data: Ethical issues and alternative scenarios, in: F. D’Ascenzo, M. Magni,
A. Lazazzara, S. Za (Eds.), *Blurring the Boundaries Through Digital Inno-
994 vation*, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2016, pp. 119–129.
- [53] L. Vassio, I. Drago, M. Mellia, Z. B. Houidi, M. L. Lamali, You, the web,
996 and your device: Longitudinal characterization of browsing habits, *ACM
Trans. Web* 12 (4) (Sep. 2018). doi:10.1145/3231466.
998 URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3231466>

- 1000 [54] L. Vassio, M. Mellia, F. Figueiredo, A. P. C. da Silva, J. M. Almeida,
Mining and modeling web trajectories from passive traces, in: 2017 IEEE
1002 International Conference on Big Data (Big Data), 2017, pp. 4016–4021.
doi:10.1109/BigData.2017.8258416.
- [55] B. D. Ripley, Pattern Recognition and Neural Networks, Cambridge Uni-
1004 versity Press, 1996. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511812651.
- [56] E. Hüllermeier, J. Fürnkranz, On minimizing the position error in label
1006 ranking, in: European Conference on Machine Learning, Springer, 2007, pp.
583–590.
- 1008 [57] F. Chollet, et al., Keras, <https://github.com/fchollet/keras> (2015).

Appendix A. Parameter configurations for the classification methodologies

1010

1012 Table A.3 wraps up the parameters selected for the different methodologies explored in the paper. The choice of the resulting values results from the 10-fold cross-validation tuning process or our domain knowledge.


Table A.3: Employed classification methodologies and their parameters.

Method	Parameters
TFIDF-Supervised-DomainsName	n-grams in [3 – 9]
NFA-Supervised-DomainsName	n-grams in [3 – 5]
SVM-Supervised-DomainsSequence [32]	skip-gram, dimension = 100, windows = 5 SVM with linear kernel
SSDN-SemiSupervised-DomainsName	$\epsilon_N = 0.98$, n-grams in [3 – 5]
SSDS-SemiSupervised-DomainsSequence	skip-gram, dimension = 100, windows = 5 $\epsilon_N = 0.985$, $\epsilon_S = 0.47$
SSB-SemiSupervised-both	skip-gram, dimension = 100, windows = 5 $\epsilon_N = 0.985$, $\epsilon_S = 0.5$, n-grams in [3 – 6]
LSTM-Supervised-DomainsName	embedding layer: size 64 LSTM layer: 128 memory units dense output layer: 25 neurons activation function: softmax Loss function: <i>categorical – crossentropy</i> optimizer: <i>Adam</i>
Naive-Most-Frequent	–
Naive-Uniform	–


1014 **Appendix B. F-Measure distribution over the 25 SimilarWeb cate-**
1015 **gories, for the analyzed algorithms**

1016 The scatter plots in Figure B.10 report the F-Measure results for the con-
1017 sidered classifiers, correlating them with the size of the categories in terms of
1018 unique domains. Figure B.10a represents the TF-IDF approach, Figure B.10b
1019 reports NFA, Figure B.10c shows SVM results, Figure B.10d and Figure B.10e
1020 refer to SSDN and SSDS respectively. Finally, Figure B.10f reports our reference
1021 algorithm SSB.


1022 The plots show the F-Measure values on the x-axis and, on the y-axis, the
1023 number of unique domains per category. All the plots have an x-axis range going
1024 from 0.0 to 1.0 to facilitate comparability. Furthermore, there are two dashed
1025 vertical lines. The purple one shows the macro F-Measure score for the *Naive-*
1026 *Uniform* approach. The dark blue vertical line represents the macro F-Measure
1027 value for the depicted algorithm. Starting from the similarities, it is noticeable
1028 how all the algorithms struggle to classify rare categories correctly. In particular,
1029 “Home and Garden,” “Books and Literature,” and “People and Society” seem to
1030 be the classes that are the most difficult to predict. The TF-IDF method, in
1031 Figure B.10a, have all the F-Measure scores in the range [0.0, 0.5]. NFA does
1032 a little bit better, especially for “Travel,” “Career and Education,” “Law and
1033 Government,” and “Internet and Telecom.” The range is [0.0, 0.6]. Figure B.10c
1034 shows a behavior similar to NFA, but on different categories, namely “Autos and
1035 Vehicles”, “Adult”, and “Computer and Electronics”. Interesting is the result for
1036 “Adult”, that had poor scores with TF-IDF and NFA. SSDS and SSDN achieve
1037 better results. However, SSB outperforms the other techniques, with F-Measure
1038 scores shifted towards higher values.




(a) TFIDF Distribution




(b) NFA Distribution




(c) SVM Distribution



(d) SSDN Distribution



(e) SSDS Distribution



(f) SSB Distribution

Figure B.10: Scatter plots of F-Measure values and the size of the considered categories in terms of unique domains, for the considered classifiers.