A STUDY ON SPAM CLASSIFICATION USING MACHINE

LEARNING TECHNIQUES



A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Fellow Programme in Management

Indian Institute of Management Indore

By

Shrawan Kumar Trivedi

Submitted in May 2015

Thesis Advisory Committee:

Prof. Shubhamoy Dey (*Chair*)

Prof. Prabin K. Panigrahi (Member) (*Member*)

Prof. Sanjog Ray (*Member*)

Abstract

In today's automated world, to be competitive and sustainable in business, information sharing within the units of the organisation is necessary. Email is an essential and useful tool of rapid and cheap communication. It is now a popular medium to connect people with each other. On the other hand, Spam (also known as unsolicited bulk email) is a challenge for the organisations and the researcher because its size is increasing day by day. This rapid growth causes serious hitches, such as unnecessary filling of users' mailboxes, engulfing some important emails, consuming storage space and bandwidth as well as too much time consumption in sorting them.

Various email spam filtering systems have been implemented by different organisations and the Internet Service Providers (ISPs) but none is found perfect. The existing systems suffer from a number of problems (like installation cost with no guaranteed positive outcomes, high false positive rate, training and testing time etc.) which are directly and indirectly reflected in the cost incurred due to spam and inadequate spam filters.

Recently, content-based filters are gaining popularity in the spam classification domain. Various machine learning algorithms are used in this method to classify emails. This method works with the content of the documents that are extracted to distinguish unsolicited email and legitimate emails. A critical issue has been identified in this method i.e. misclassification of the legitimate emails. Sometimes legitimate emails carry valuable information for a user, and if such good emails misclassify as spam, it will create serious problems. To tackle this issue, False Positive rate is used that evaluate the rate of misclassified legitimate emails. For a robust and sensitive classifier, the False positive rate should be as low as possible (ideally zero).

The need of the researchers and developers is to construct such filtering system that can be acceptable for any organisation and the Internet service providers. Content-based spam filters are popular due to their customization capability where, pre-existing email content can be used to train such filters. The emailing pattern of each organisation differs hence they need to install such filtering system which can be trained by particular words/features of their own pre-existing corpus so that the performance accuracy can be maximised and the False Positive Rate can be minimised.

This research proposes a content-based email spam filtering system with a set of novel algorithms along with some existing algorithms at the levels of feature selection as well as learning. Various studies have been done in different chapters for achieving this goal where several comparative studies between Feature Selection Methods, Feature Subset Search Methods, and Machine Learning Classifiers have been performed, together with some novel approaches proposed. All the tests have been done on popular publically available corpuses. According to the analysis, Relief F is predicted to be the best Feature Selection Method amongst other methods compared whereas Greedy Stepwise Search was found to be the best

feature subset search method in terms of good performance accuracy and low False Positive Rate.

Further, among Machine Learning Classifiers, Support Vector Machine and Random Forest are identified to be excellent whereas Bayesian classifier proved its worth in this domain. Support Vector Machine together with Greedy Stepwise Feature Search was the best pair of the Machine Learning and Feature Subset Search Method. Results have shown that this pair was excellent in terms of good performance accuracy and low FP rate amongst other pairs.

For Improving the Performance of classifiers, various combining and ensemble-based techniques were also included in this research. For combining method, the best combination of classifiers (boosted Probabilistic classifiers and Support Vector Machine) has been used to construct a combined classifier with committee Selection Mechanisms.

A novel Ensemble based Approach with the Genetic Programming Classifier has been developed and tested together with the best classifiers. It has been identified that this Enhanced Genetic Programming (EGP) Classifier is promising from all the performance dimensions.

Finally, this research has achieved the objective that was proposed initially by developing two different filtering models that have a trade-off between Accuracy and Training Time. First model incorporates Enhanced Genetic Programming Classifier with Greedy Stepwise feature search method and proves to be robust, fast (in Testing Time), accurate, and sensitive with less false positive rate but with high Training Time compared to the other models. Second model, that has been developed with Boosted Bayesian classifier and Greedy Subset feature search method, is robust, fast (both in Training and Testing), and sensitive with less false positive rate but classification accuracy is less than the first model proposed. In addition, the proposed filtering models satisfactorily tackle the issue of customization so that organisations can install these models to train according to their need.

The Proposed Models will cater the need of Organisations and Internet Service Providers (ISPs) where after installation they can minimize the cost related to spam and spam filtering system.

This research has contributed in the literature of spam classification by the following way:

- 1. Observed and validated RF (Relief F) as a best feature selection method.
- 2. Observed and validated Greedy Stepwise search as a best feature subset search method.
- 3. Observed and validated NP (Normalised Polynomial) as a best kernel for SVM (Support Vector Machine).
- 4. Observed and validated AdaBoost as best boosting method.
- 5. Observed and validated SVM (Support Vector Machine) as a best machine learning classifier.

- 6. Observed and validated SVM and Greedy Stepwise search as a best combination of machine learning and feature subset search methods.
- 7. Developed and validated a novel combining classifier with committee selection method.
- 8. Developed and validated a novel EGP (Enhanced Genetic Programming) machine learning classifier.
- 9. Two new models have been proposed:
 - EGP with Greedy Stepwise search.
 - Bayesian with Greedy Stepwise search.

Keywords: Spam Classification, Machine Learning Classifiers, Feature Selection Methods, Feature Subset Search Methods, Ensemble of Classifiers, Enhanced Genetic Programming Classifier, Combining Classifiers, Performance Accuracy, F-Value, False Positive Rate, Training Time, Testing Time.

Acknowledgements

Though this dissertation belongs to me but a great many people have contributed to its production. I owe my gratitude to all those people who have made this dissertation possible and because of whom my FPM experience has been one that I will cherish forever.

Foremost, I want to offer this endeavour to our God Almighty for the wisdom he bestowed upon me, the strength, peace of my mind and good health in order to finish this research.

My deepest gratitude is to my advisor, Prof. Shubhamoy Dey. I have been amazingly fortunate to have an advisor who gave me the freedom to explore on my own and at the same time the guidance to recover when my steps faltered. Prof. Dey taught me how to question thoughts and express ideas. His patience and support helped me to overcome many crisis situations and finish this dissertation. I am thankful to him for encouraging the use of correct grammar and consistent notation in my writings and for carefully reading and commenting on countless revisions of this Thesis. I am grateful to him for holding me to a high research standard and enforcing strict validations for each research result, and thus teaching me how to do research. I hope that one day I would become as good as an advisor to my students as Prof. Dey has been to me.

My co-advisors, Prof. Prabin Kumar Panigrahi and Prof. Sanjog Ray, have been always there to listen and give advice. I am deeply grateful to both of them for the long discussions that helped me sort out the technical details of my work. Prof. Panigrahi's insightful comments and constructive criticisms at different stages of my research were thought-provoking and they helped me to focus my ideas.

I am grateful to Prof. Rajhans Mishra, Prof. Saini Das and Prof. Madhukar Dayal for their encouragement and practical advice. I am also thankful to them for reading my research, commenting on my views and helping me understand and enrich my ideas.

I would like to mention some other names like FPM Chair Prof. Ranjeet Nambudari, Prof. Ganesh Kumar, Prof. Prashant Salwan, Prof.Abha Chatterjee for the many valuable discussions, suggestions and guidance about my writing and research that helped me to improve myself.

I am also grateful to the following former or current staff of FPM at IIM Indore, for their various forms of support during my doctoral study—Mr. Mukesh, Mr. Sandeep Das and Ms. Monika Mandloi.

I would like to acknowledge my friends, Asit Acharya, Anuj Sharma, Sriranga Vishnu, Ankit Sharma, Hemant Shrivastava, Arun Giri, Avik Sinha, Kapil Kaushik, Baljeet Alok, Sripad Sudhir, and many more, have helped me to stay sane through these difficult years. Their support and care helped me to overcome setbacks and stay focused on my studies. I greatly value their friendship and I deeply appreciate their belief in me.

Most importantly, none of this would have been possible without the love and patience of my wife Ankita. My loving wife, to whom this dissertation is dedicated to, has been a constant source of love, concern, support and strength in my difficult situations. I would like to express my heart-felt gratitude to my wife for being with me at my toughest time.

Table of Contents

1.1. Spa	m Emails		5
1.2. Evo	lution of Spam Emails		7
1.2.1.	The Early Year (Manual Spam	mining)	7
1.2.2.	The Second Phase (Machines f	for Spamming)	7
1.2.3.	Third Phase (Machine against	Machine)	8
1.3. Typ	es of Spam		8
1.3.1.	Advertisement Spam		9
1.3.2.	Financial Spam		.14
1.3.3.	Phishing		.16
1.3.4.	Image Spam		.17
1.4. Spa	m Consequences		.17
1.5. Spa	m Filters		.19
1.6.1.	Non Technical Solutions		.20
	1.6.1.1. Recipient Revolts		.20
	1.6.1.2. Customer Revolts		.21
	1.6.1.3. Vigilante Attack		.21
	1.6.1.4. Hiding the Address	es	.21
		s and Limiting Trial Accounts	
1.6.2.			
		ls	
1.7. Mo	ivation		.25
Chapter 2. Li	terature Survey		.29
	•		
2.2.1.	* *		
2.2.2.	White Listing		.31
2.2.3.			
2.2.4.	Collaborative approach		.31
2.2.5.			
2.3. Cor	tent based Methods		.33
2.3.1.	Ad-hoc Rule Based Approach		.33
2.3.2.			
2.4. Mac			
2.4.1.	Bayesian Classifiers		.34
2.4.2.	•		
2.4.3.			
2.4.4.	* *		
2.4.5.	<u>o</u>		
		on Tree	

	2.4.5.3. Reduced Error Pruning	47
2.4.6.	Random Forest.	
2.5. Ap	proaches to Create a Better Classifier	50
2.5.1.	Boosting Algorithms	51
	2.5.1.1. Bagging	51
	2.5.1.2. Boosting with Re-Sampling	52
	2.5.1.1. Adaptive Boosting	
2.5.2.	Combining Classifiers	
2.5.3.	J	
	2.5.3.1. Genetic Algorithm based classifiers	
	2.5.3.2. Genetic Programming based classifiers	
2.5.4.	Research on Different Part of Spam	
	rrent Anti-Spam Systems	
2.6.1.	Government Intiatives for Anti-Spam	
2.6.2.	J 1	
	experimental Design	
	ucture of Spam Filter ferent Types of Attacks on Email	
3.2. DII	Tokenisation	
3.2.1.	Obfuscation	
3.2.3.	Weak Statistical	
3.2.4.	Strong Statistical	
	rpora	
3.3.1.	Most Complex Enron Corpus	
3.3.2.	SpamAssassin	
3.3.3.	LingSpam	
3.3.4.	Training with Enron (5, 6) and Testing with Enron (All Version)	
3.4. Pre	-processing	
3.4.1.	Feature Extraction	72
3.4.2.	Dimensionality Reduction	
3.4.3.	Feature Selection Process	
	3.4.3.1. Document Frequency	
	3.4.3.2. Information Gain	
	3.4.3.3. Gain Ratio	
	3.4.3.4. Chi-Square	
	3.4.3.5. Relief F	
2.4.4	3.4.3.6. One Rule	
3.4.4.	Feature Subset Search	
	3.4.4.1. Genetic Search	
	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	3.4.4.3. Best First Search	
3.4.5.	Re-parameterisation	
3.4.3.	3.4.5.1. Latent Semantic Indexing.	
3.5. Fea	ature Representation	
	aluation Parameters	
	scussion	
	eature Selection and Subset Search Methods	
	ction 1: Evaluation of Best Feature Selection Technique	
4.1.1.	Aim of This Study	
	-	

4.1.2.	Corpora For This Study	85
4.1.3.	Feature Selection Techniques	85
4.1.4.	Classifier for This Study	85
4.1.5.	System Design	85
4.1.6.	Evalution Metrics	85
4.1.7.	Results and Analysis	85
4.2. Sec	tion 2: Feature Subset Search	96
4.2.1.	Aim of This Study	96
4.2.2.	Corpora For This Study	96
4.2.3.	Feature Subset Search Techniques	96
4.2.4.	Classifiers for This Study	96
4.2.5.	System Design	97
4.2.6.	Evalution Metrics	97
4.2.7.	Results and Analysis	97
4.3. Dis	cussion	100
Chapter 5. M	Sachine Learning Classifier	102
	lluation of Best Machine Learning	
5.1.1.	Aim of This Study	
5.1.2.	Corpora For This Study	
5.1.3.	Feature Subset Search Techniques	
5.1.4.	Classifiers for This Study	103
5.1.5.	System Design	103
5.1.6.	Evalution Metrics	
5.1.7.	Results and Analysis	103
5.2. Dis	cussion	
Chapter 6. M	Sachine Learning with Excellent Features	108
	Combination of Machine Learning and Features Subset Selection	
6.1.1.	Aim of This Study	
6.1.2.	Corpora For This Study	108
6.1.3.	Feature Subset Search Techniques	108
6.1.4.	Classifiers for This Study	
6.1.5.	System Design	
6.1.6.	Evalution Metrics	
6.1.7.	Results and Analysis	109
6.2. Dis	cussion	115
Chapter 7. C	ombining and Ensemble Based Classifiers	116
	tion 1: Combining Classifiers with Committee Selection	
7.1.1.	Aim of This Study	
7.1.2.	Corpora For This Study	
7.1.3.	Feature Subset Search Techniques	
7.1.4.	Classifiers for This Study.	
7.1.5.	System Design	
7.1.6.	Evalution Metrics	
7.1.7.	Results and Analysis	
7.2. Dis	cussion	
	tion 2: Enhanced Genetic Programming Classifier	
7.3.1.	Aim of This Study	
7.3.2.	Corpora For This Study	
7.3.3.	Feature Subset Search Techniques	
7.3.4.	Classifiers for This Study	
	•	

7.3.5.	System Design	13
7.3.6.	Evalution Metrics	13
7.3.7.	Results and Analysis	13
7.4. Dis	scussion	14
	raining, and Testing Time	
8.1. Ev	aluation of Robust Email Filtering Models	14
8.1.1.	Aim of This Study	14
8.1.2.	Corpora For This Study	14
8.1.3.	Feature Subset Search Techniques	14
8.1.4.	Classifiers for This Study	14
8.1.5.	System Design	14
8.1.6.	Evalution Metrics	
8.1.7.	Results and Analysis	14
3.4. Dis	scussion	15
Chapter 9. C	Conclusion, Business Implication and Limitation	15
9.1. Bu	siness Implications	1:
9.2. Co	ntribution of this Research	15
9.3. Fut	ture Work	15
9.4. Lir	nitations	15
References		
Appendix A	: Features selected by Re-Parametrization Methods	1′
	: Features selected by Feature Selection Method (Relief F)	
	: Features selected by Feature Subset Search Method (Greedy Ste	

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction	
Table 1. Statistics of Spam	18
Table 2. Categories of Spam	18
Chapter 2: Literature Survey	29
Table 3. Research work Related to Manual Inspection Methods	30
Table 4. Research work Related to System Response based Approaches	33
Table 5. Research work Related to Probabilistic Classifiers	
Table 6. Research work Related to Perceptron based Algorithms	
Table 7. Kernel Functions	41
Table 8. Research work Related to Support Vector Machine	
Table 9. Research work Related to Neural Network based Classifiers	
Table 10. Research work Related to Tree based Algorithms	
Table 11. Research work Related to Stacking and Combining Classifiers	
Table 12. Research work Related to Evolutionary Algorithms	59
Table 13. Research work Related to different part of an Email filebased Algorithms	
Table 14. Current Spam filtering systems	
Chapter 3. Experimental Design	
Table 15. Corpora Descriptions	
Table 16. Term Document Binary Representation	
Table 17. Performance Metrics	
Chapter 4. Feature Selection and Subset Search Methods	
Section 1.Evaluation of best Feature Selection Methods.	
Table 18. Percentage Accuracy for Enron corpus	
Table 19. Percentage F-Value for Enron corpus	
Table 20. Percentage Accuracy for SpamAssassin corpus	
Table 21. Percentage F-Value for SpamAssassin corpus	
Table 22. Percentage Accuracy for LingSpam corpus	
Table 23. Percentage F-Value for LingSpam corpus	
Table 24. Percentage FP-Rate for Enron corpus	
Table 25. Percentage FP for SpamAssassin corpus	
Table 26. Percentage FP Rate for LingSpam corpus	
Section 2.Evaluation of best Feature Subset Search Methods	
Table 27. Percentage Accuracy and F-Value for all corpuses	
Table 28. Percentage False Positive Rate for all corpuses	
Chapter 5. Machine Learning Classifiers	
Table 29. Percentage Accuracy and F-Value for all corpuses	
Table 30. Percentage False Positive Rate for all corpuses	
Chapter 6. Machine Learning with Excellent Features.	
Table 31. Percentage Accuracy and F-Value for Enron corpus	
Table 32. Percentage Accuracy and F-Value for SpamAssassin corpus	
Table 33. Percentage Accuracy and FP-Rate for LingSpam corpus	
Table 34. Percentage FP Rate for all corpuses	
Chapter 7. Combining and Ensemble based Classifiers	
Section 2. Combining Classifiers with committee selection	
Study 1 st . Boosting of the Probabilistic Classifiers	
Table 35. Accuracy and F-Value of Probabilistic Classifiers	
Table 36. FP Rate (Ham and all emails) of Probabilistic Classifiers	
Study 2 nd . Kernel Selection for Support Vector Machine (SVM)	118

Table 37. Accuracy and F-Value of SVM with different Kernels	124
Table 38. FP Rate (Ham and all emails) of SVM with different Kernels	125
Study 3 rd . Combining classifiers with committee selection	128
Table 39. Accuracy and F-Value of Combining Classifier	128
Table 40. FP Rate (Ham and all emails) of Combining Classifier	128
Section 2: Enhanced Genetic Programming Classifier	133
Table 41. Parameters' Value for Novel EGP Classifier	135
Table 42. Accuracy and F-Value for all corpuses	136
Table 43. False Positive Rate for all corpuses	139
Chapter 8: Training and Testing Time	141
Table 44. Percentage Accuracy for Machine Learning Classifiers	143
Table 45. Percentage F-Value for Machine Learning Classifiers	144
Table 46. False Positive Rate for Machine Learning Classifiers	146
Table 47. Training Time for Machine Learning Classifiers	147
Table 48. Testing Time for Machine Learning Classifiers	149

List of Figures

Chapter 1: In	ntroduction	
Fig 1.	Different Kinds of Spam Sets	
Fig 2.	Marketing Spam	9
Fig 3.	Online Pharmacy Spam	10
Fig 4.	Stock Encouraging Spam	
Fig 5.	Porno graphic or (Sex-) Dating Spam	
Fig 6.	Pirate Software Spam	11
Fig 7.	Online Casino Spam	12
Fig 8.	Fake Degree Spam	12
Fig 9.	Mule Job Spam	13
Fig 10.	Cause Promotions Spam	
Fig 11.	Fraud based Spam	
Fig 12.	Lottery Spam	
Fig 13.	Virus Spam	15
Fig 14.	Phishing Spam	16
Fig 15.	Image Spam	
Chapter 2: L	iterature Survey	29
Fig 16.	Structure of an Email message	60
	kperimental Design	
	Structure of an Email message and Spsm Filter	
Chapter 4. Fe	eature Selection and Subset Search Methods	84
	raluation of best Feature Selection Methods	
Fig 18.	Percentage Accuracy for Enron corpus	87
Fig 19.	Percentage F-Value for Enron corpus	
Fig 20.	Percentage Accuracy for SpamAssassin corpus	
Fig 21.	Percentage F-Value for SpamAssassin corpus	89
Fig 22.	Percentage Accuracy for LingSpam corpus	
Fig 23.	Percentage F-Value for LingSpam corpus	91
Fig 24.	Percentage FP-Rate for Enron corpus	
Fig 25.	Percentage FP for SpamAssassin corpus	
Fig 26.	Percentage FP Rate for LingSpam corpus	93
Section 2. Ev	raluation of best Feature Subset Search Methods	
Fig 27.	Percentage Accuracy for all corpuses	
Fig 28.	Percentage F-Value for all corpuses	
Fig 29.	Percentage False Positive Rate for all corpuses	
Chapter 5. M	Machine Learning Classifiers	
Fig 30.	Percentage Accuracy and F-Value for all corpuses	105
Fig 31.	Percentage False Positive Rate for all corpuses	
Chapter 6. M	Sachine Learning with Excellent Features	
	Percentage Accuracy and F-Value for Enron corpus	
Fig 33.	Percentage Accuracy and F-Value for SpamAssassin corpus	
Fig 34.	Percentage Accuracy and FP-Rate for LingSpam corpus	
Fig 35.	Percentage FP Rate for all corpuses	
_	ombining and Ensemble based Classifiers	
	Combining Classifiers with committee selection	
	oosting of the Probabilistic Classifiers	
Fig 36.	Accuracy and F-Value of Probabilistic Classifiers (Enron)	
Fig 37.	FP Rate of Probabilistic Classifiers (Enron)	
9	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	

Fig 38.	Accuracy and F-Value of Probabilistic Classifiers (SpamAssassin)	121
Fig 39.	FP Rate of Probabilistic Classifiers (SpamAssassin)	
Fig 40.	Accuracy and F-Value of Probabilistic Classifiers (LingSpam)	123
Fig 41.	FP Rate of Probabilistic Classifiers (LingSpam)	
Study 2^{nd} .	Kernel Selection for Support Vector Machine (SVM)	118
Fig 42.	Accuracy and F-Value of SVM with different Kernels (Enron)	124
Fig 43.	FP Rate of SVM with different Kernels (Enron)	
Fig 44.	Accuracy and F-Value of SVM with different Kernels (SpamAssassin)	126
Fig 45.	FP Rate of SVM with different Kernels (SpamAssassin)	126
Fig 46.	Accuracy and F-Value of SVM with different Kernels (LingSpam)	127
Fig 47.	FP Rate of SVM with different Kernels (LingSpam)	
Study 3 rd .	Combining classifiers with committee selection	128
Fig 48.	Accuracy and F-Value of Combining Classifier (Enron)	129
Fig 49.	FP Rate (Ham and all emails) of Combining Classifier (Enron)	129
Fig 50.	Accuracy and F-Value of Combining Classifier (SpamAssassin)	
Fig 51.	FP Rate (Ham and all emails) of Combining Classifier (SpamAssassin)	
Fig 52.	Accuracy and F-Value of Combining Classifier (LingSpam)	131
Fig 53.	FP Rate (Ham and all emails) of Combining Classifier (LingSpam)	131
Section 2:	Enhanced Genetic Programming Classifier	133
Fig 54.	Percentage Accuracy for all corpuses	
Fig 55.	Percentage F-Value for all corpuses	137
Fig 56.	False Positive Rate for all corpuses	139
Chapter 8:	Training and Testing Time	141
Fig 57.	Percentage Accuracy for Machine Learning Classifiers	144
Fig 58.		
Fig 59.	False Positive Rate for Machine Learning Classifiers	
Fig 60.	Training Time for Machine Learning Classifiers	
Fig61.	Testing Time for Machine Learning Classifiers	149

List of Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Meaning
AdaBoost	Adaptive Boosting
AD Tree	Alternative Decision Tree
ANN	Artificial Neural Network
BB	Boosted Bayesian
BF	Best First
BNB	Boosted Naive Bayes
CLX	Commercial Internet Exchange Association
CS	Chi-Square
DF	Document Frequency
DS	Decision Stump
EGP	Enhanced Genetic Programming
FP	False Positive
GA	Genetic Algorithms
GP	Genetic Programming
GR	Gain Ratio
GS	Genetic Search
GSS	Greedy Stepwise Search
IDS	Intrusion Detection Systems
IG	Information Gain
IPS	Intrusion Protection Systems
IS	Information Systems
ISP	Internet Service Provider
KNN	k-Nearest Neighbors
M3AAWG	Messaging Malware Mobile Anti Abuse
	Working Group
MAAWG	Messaging Anti Abuse Working Group
ML	Machine Learning
MTA	Mail Transfer Agent
MUA	Mail User Agent
NA	Not Applicable
NB	Naive Bayes
NN	Nearest Neighbors
NP	Normalized Polynomial Kernel
OR	One Rule
PK	Polynomial Kernel
PUK	Pearson VII function based Universal Kernel
RBF	Radial Basis Function Kernel
REP	Reduced Error Pruning
RF	Random Forest
RF	Relief F
RS	Rank Search
	0

Support Vector Machine

SVM