



## AnomalyDAE: Dual Autoencoder for Anomaly Detection on Attributed Networks

Haoyi Fan<sup>1</sup>, Fengbin Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Zuoyong Li<sup>2</sup>

Harbin University of Science and Technology<sup>1</sup> Minjiang University<sup>2</sup> isfanhy@hrbust.edu.cn



**Biology Network** 

**Finance Transaction Network** 

-2-

### **Anomaly Detection on the Attributed Network**





-3-



### **Different types of anomalies**



Structure-inconsistent Attribute-consistent



Structure-consistent Attribute-inconsistent



-4-

Structure-inconsistent Attribute-inconsistent



Different neighbors contribute differently for anomaly detection

#### Challenges:

- The cross-modality interactions between the network structure and node attribute
- Neighbor-attention aware anomaly measuring

Numerous attributed network based anomaly detection methods have been proposed...





- **Deep** representation learning framework on graph?
- The cross-modality interactions between the network structure and node attribute?

## **Problem Statement**

#### Problem

Given  $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathbf{X}\}$ , learn a score function  $f: \mathcal{V}_i \mapsto y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ , to classify sample  $x_i$  based on the threshold  $\lambda$ :

 $y_i = \{ \begin{matrix} 1, & if f(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_i) \geq \lambda, \\ 0, & otherwise. \end{matrix} \}$ 

where  $y_i$  denotes the label of sample  $x_i$ , with 0 being the normal class and 1 the anomalous class.

#### Notations

- *G* : Attributed network
- v : Set of nodes in network.
- $\mathcal{E}$  : Set of edges in network.
- *M* : Number of nodes.
- *N* : Dimension of attribute.
- $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$ : Adjacency matrix
- of a network.
- $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ : Attribute matrix of all nodes.



Attribute Autoencoder

### **AnomalyDAE**



Structure-level and attribute-level anomaly score



**Neighbor-attention Mechanism in Structure Autoencoder Initial feature transformation:**  $\mathbf{Z}^{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}} = \sigma(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{W}^{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}(1)} + \mathbf{b}^{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}(1)})$ X, A **Importance** weights:  $e_{i,j} = attn\left(\mathbf{Z}_i^{\boldsymbol{v}}, \mathbf{Z}_j^{\boldsymbol{v}}\right)$ **Feature Transform**  $= \sigma(\mathbf{a}^{\mathrm{T}} \cdot [\mathbf{W}^{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_{(2)}} \mathbf{Z}_{i}^{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}} || \mathbf{W}^{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_{(2)}} \mathbf{Z}_{i}^{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}])$  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ **Normalization:**  $\gamma_{i,j} = \frac{\exp(e_{i,j})}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_i} \exp(e_{i,k})}$ **Graph Attention** Neighbor-attention aware feature aggregation:  $\mathbf{Z}^{\mathcal{V}}$  $\mathbf{Z}_{i}^{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_{i}} \gamma_{i,k} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_{k}^{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}$ 

#### **Cross-modality Interactions Capturing in Attribute Autoencoder**



#### **Loss and Anomaly Score**



#### **Loss and Anomaly Score**



## **Experiment**

#### **Datasets**

<b>Iddie 2.</b> Statistics of the used iteal world databets.						
Database	# $\mathcal{V}$	# <i>E</i>	$\# \mathcal{A}$	# Anomalies		
BlogCatalog	5,196	171,743	8,189	300		
Flickr	7,575	239,738	12,047	450		
ACM	16,484	71,980	8,337	600		

Table 2. Statistics of the used Real-World datasets.

#### **Baselines**

LOF <u>Breunig et al. 2000</u> SCAN <u>Xu et al. 2007</u> AMEN <u>Perozzi et al. 2016</u> Radar <u>Li et al. 2017</u> ANOMALOUS <u>Peng et al. 2018</u> Dominant <u>Ding et al. 2019</u>

### **Evaluation Metric**

**AUC** (Area Under a receiver operating characteristic **C**urve)

## **Experiment**

#### **Results**

#### Table 3. AUC scores of all methods on three datasets.

Method	BlogCatalog	Flickr	ACM	
LOF [18]	49.15	48.81	47.38	]
SCAN [19]	27.27	26.86	35.99	
AMEN [8]	53.37	60.47	72.62	
Radar [12]	71.04	72.86	69.36	
Anomalous [13]		22.32%	/715.11	% 
Dominant [14]	78.13	74.9	74.94	
AnomalyDAE	97.81	97.22	90.05	

#### At least 15.11% ~ 22.32% AUC improvement!

## **Experiment**

#### **Results**



(a) Embedding dimension

(b) Parameter  $\alpha$ 

**Robust and Effective!** 

1

## Conclusion

- Traditional machine learning based methods perform poor for feature learning on large graph.
- Traditional deep graph model cannot effectively capture the cross-modality interactions between the network structure and node attribute.
- We propose a deep joint representation learning framework via a dual autoencoder to capture the complex cross-modality interactions between the network structure and node attribute.

## Reference

- **[LOF]** Breunig, Markus M., et al. "LOF: identifying density-based local outliers." **KDD. 2000**.
- **[SCAN]** Xu, Xiaowei, et al. "Scan: a structural clustering algorithm for networks." **KDD. 2007**.
- [FocusCO] Perozzi, Bryan, et al. "Focused clustering and outlier detection in large attributed graphs." KDD. 2014.
- **[AMEN]** Perozzi, Bryan, and Leman Akoglu. "Scalable anomaly ranking of attributed neighborhoods." **SIAM, 2016**.
- **[Radar]** Li, Jundong, et al. "Radar: Residual Analysis for Anomaly Detection in Attributed Networks." **IJCAI. 2017**.
- [GAT] Veličković, Petar, et al. "Graph attention networks." ICLR. 2018.
- **[ANOMALOUS]** Peng, Zhen, et al. "ANOMALOUS: A Joint Modeling Approach for Anomaly Detection on Attributed Networks." **IJCAI. 2018**.
- [Dominant] Ding, Kaize, et al. "Deep anomaly detection on attributed networks." SIAM, 2019.



## **Thanks for listening!**

Contact: <u>isfanhy@hrbust.edu.cn</u> Home Page: <u>https://haoyfan.github.io/</u>