



Human in-the-Loop Learning for Anomaly Detection

Jana Doppa

Huie-Rogers Endowed Chair Associate Professor
School of EECS, Washington State University



@janadoppa

Joint work w/ Rakibul Islam and Shubhomoy Das




Motivating App #1: Credit Card Fraud



- ▶ Unusual transactions
- ▶ False alarms are common
- ▶ High false positive rate → wasted human effort



Motivating App #2: ICU Patient Monitoring



- ▶ Monitor patients' condition
- ▶ False alarms are common
- ▶ High cost of wrong decisions

Normal Heartbeat



Irregular Heartbeat





Photo credit: stock.adobe.com



Motivating App #3: Android Malware




Anti-Malware Industry

Malwares can potentially


- ▶ Spy
- ▶ Steal person information
- ▶ Make fake calls
- ▶



Anomaly Detection: The Problem



Anomaly Detection: Challenges



- ▶ # of anomalies \ll # of nominals
- ▶ Knowledge discovery task involving humans
- ▶ High false-positive rate \rightarrow wasted human effort



Prior work on Anomaly Detection: Unsupervised Methods

► Density-Based Approaches

- RKDE: Robust Kernel Density Estimation (Kim & Scott, 2008)
- EGMM: Ensemble Gaussian Mixture Model

► Quantile-Based Methods

- OCSVM: One-class SVM (Schoelkopf, et al., 1999)
- SVDD: Support Vector Data Description (Tax & Duin, 2004)

► Neighbor-Based Methods

- LOF: Local Outlier Factor (Breunig, et al., 2000)
- ABOD: kNN Angle-Based Outlier Detector (Kriegel, et al., 2008)

► Projection-Based Methods

- **IFOR: Isolation Forest** (Liu, et al., 2008)
- LODA: Lightweight Online Detector of Anomalies (Pevny, 2016)



Unsupervised methods: when they may not work?

- ▶ Underlying model assumptions are violated
- ▶ Nature/type of anomalies is not known beforehand (unknown unknowns)
- ▶ Only a subset of identified anomalies are relevant for real-world task




High false positive rate and wasted effort from human analysts



Key Research Question

- ▶ How can we use human analyst efficiently to improve anomaly detection rate of unsupervised approaches?






Discover all the anomalies with very small number of queries to human analyst (minimize human effort)




Aside: Isolation Tree

- ▶ Key Idea
 - ▶ Anomalies can be easily Isolated from nominals
 - ▶ Degree of anomaly is inversely proportional to depth






Partitioned subspaces



Depth Colored subspaces



Aside: Isolation Forest




Isolation Forest

- ▶ State of the art unsupervised approach
- ▶ Assumptions
 - ▶ # of anomalies are small
 - ▶ Features are distinguishable
- ▶ Assigns uniform weights for subspace score



Isolation Forest


Random feature
and random split
point







Deeper leaf

Shallow leaf

Isolation Tree



Isolation Forest



Space partition for 100 Trees

Contour Plot for 100 Trees



Model Definition

- ▶ Isolation forest generates high number of subspaces/leaves (say m)
- ▶ We can map each data instance to this representation
 - ▶ $x \mapsto IFor(x) \in R^m$
 - ▶ If the data point falls in a leaf, its feature value is equal to the adjusted depth based score. Otherwise, its feature value is zero
- ▶ All subspaces are equally weighted (m weights)
 - ▶ $w_1 = w_2 = \dots = w_m$




Making Predictions

- ▶ Score all the data points
 - ▶ $\text{score}(x) = w \cdot \mathbf{IFor}(x)$
- ▶ Rank them based on the scores
- ▶ Pick top τ candidates as anomalies

Anomaly detection accuracy depends on the weights of the model.
How can we learn the optimal weights?



HiLAD: Overview




Use human feedback to improve the anomaly detection performance



Isolation Forest with Human Feedback


- ▶ Anomalies are pushed higher in score space




Greedily select the highest scoring unlabeled example for feedback




Query strategy to discover diverse anomalies



Candidate Regions



Selecting the Top



Diverse Selection

- ▶ What if we want diverse anomalies?
 - ▶ The inherent structure of Isolation Forest can be exploited
 - ▶ Subspaces are selected to produce diverse queries
- ▶ Optimally pick queries from the most relevant compact subspaces
 - ▶ related to set covering problem



Model Update via Online Optimization

► Learning Goal

- Learn weights so that **anomalies** are ranked higher than the **nominals**
- $\text{Score}(\text{anomaly}) > \text{Score}(\text{nominal})$




► Optimization to Update weights

- After feedback, nominals are ranked lower than top most τ fraction
- A small change in the weights to satisfy the constraints



Framework Illustration



Experimental Setup

► Baselines




Approach	Feedback	Prior	Influence Of prior
Unsupervised	NO	N/A	N/A
HiLAD (no prior-rand)	YES	Random	NO
HiLAD (no prior-uniform)	YES	Uniform	NO
HiLAD (Adaptive Prior)	YES	Uniform	YES

► Metrics

- What percentage of anomalies are discovered as a function of the number of queries?
- AUC (Area Under ROC Curve)





Results for Single Queries



- ▶ Small amount of feedback significantly improves the accuracy
 - ▶ Updating weights help in finding new anomalies



Results for Batch Queries




- ▶ Higher diversity
 - ▶ # of unique classes in query is higher than regular
- ▶ Little or no loss in anomaly detection accuracy



Streaming Anomaly Detection

- ▶ Goal: Identify “**anomalies**” from the continuous stream of data




Streaming Anomaly Detection: Challenges

- ▶ Detecting concept drift?
- ▶ When and how to update the model?
- ▶ Memory constraints to store data?




Streaming Anomaly Detection: Illustration




Streaming AD via Drift Detection


- ▶ Identify the data distribution of current window from ensembles
- ▶ Compare it with the data distribution of new window (via KL divergence)



Abalone



ANN-Thyroid-1v3



Covtype

Not much drift was observed

Drift detected



Updating Ensemble of Trees for Streaming Data

- ▶ Limited memory and **minor concept drift**
 - ▶ Same as batch data setting and only requires retraining
- ▶ Limited memory with **major concept drift**
 - ▶ Replace a fraction of older trees
 - ▶ Include new trees from current window
 - ▶ Initialize the weights for the new trees with default (uniform) weights



Experimental Setup



- ▶ When there is no concept drift
- ▶ Baselines

Approach	Feedback	Prior	Query Strategy
Unsupervised	NO	N/A	Select Top
HiLAD-Batch	YES	Uniform	Select Top
HiLAD-Stream	YES	Uniform	Select Top
HiLAD-Stream-D	YES	Uniform	Select Diversified



Results for “No Drift”

- ▶ Limited memory settings




- ▶ With feedback, HiLAD-Batch is consistently the best performer
- ▶ Performance of HiLAD-Stream is close to HiLAD-Batch (**upper-bound**)




Results for

- ▶ Updating ensemble of trees in a principled manner
 - ▶ Fixed threshold (10%, 20%, ...)



Streaming AD with drift detection



HiLAD-Stream(KL adaptive) model update is stable without knowing the drift amount prior.



Summary

- ▶ Unsupervised ensembles and Isolation Forest in particular is a state-of-the-art approach for anomaly detection
 - ▶ High false-positive rate => wasted effort from human analyst
- ▶ Human feedback can be used to tune ensembles to reduce false-positives
 - ▶ Exploit the structure of Isolation forest to discover diverse anomalies
 - ▶ Handle streaming data via drift detection and updating ensembles

