V International Scientific and Technical Conference Actual Issues of Power Supply Systems

# Models of network traffic anomaly detection and prevention in information communication systems

AIPCP25-CF-ICAIPSS2025-00445 | Article

# Models of network traffic anomaly detection and prevention in information communication systems

Sodikjon Jumayev

*Denov Institute of Entrepreneurship and Pedagogy, Denov, Uzbekistan*

*Corresponding author: jumayev.sodiq9091@mail.ru*

**Abstract.** The increasing complexity of cyber threats necessitates advanced models for detecting and preventing network traffic anomalies in information communication systems. This article reviews contemporary approaches for anomaly detection and mitigation, focusing on machine learning (ML), hybrid models, and adaptive prevention mechanisms. We synthesize findings from several peer-reviewed studies, highlighting advancements in unsupervised learning, federated architectures, and blockchain-integrated systems. The results underscore the effectiveness of deep learning and real-time adaptive policies in mitigating sophisticated attacks. Challenges such as computational overhead and false positives persist, necessitating further innovation in explainable AI and quantum-resistant frameworks.

## INTRODUCTION

Modern information communication systems face escalating threats from cyberattacks, including distributed denial-of-service (DDoS), ransomware, and zero-day exploits. Traditional signature-based detection methods are increasingly inadequate against evolving attack vectors [1]. Anomaly detection, which identifies deviations from normal traffic patterns, has emerged as a critical defense mechanism. However, the dynamic nature of network traffic and the rise of encrypted protocols demand more robust, scalable solutions. This article examines many researchs advancements in detection models and prevention strategies, emphasizing their technical foundations, efficacy, and limitations.

The rapid digitization of global infrastructure has exponentially increased reliance on information communication systems (ICS), spanning cloud computing, IoT networks, 5G telecommunication, and industrial control systems. While these advancements enhance connectivity and efficiency, they also expand the attack surface for malicious actors. Cyberattacks, such as distributed denial-of-service (DDoS) attacks, ransomware, and zero-day exploits, have grown in sophistication, targeting vulnerabilities in network protocols, encrypted channels, and edge devices [1]. Traditional intrusion detection systems (IDS), which rely on signature-based methods or rule-based heuristics, struggle to adapt to these evolving threats. For instance, encrypted traffic—now constituting over 95% of web traffic due to protocols like TLS 1.3—often bypasses conventional detectors, as payload inspection becomes infeasible [2].

Anomaly detection has emerged as a pivotal strategy to address these limitations. Unlike signature-based approaches, anomaly detection identifies deviations from established baselines of "normal" network behavior, enabling the identification of novel or obfuscated attacks. Machine learning (ML) models, particularly deep learning architectures, have dominated recent research due to their ability to process high-dimensional data, such as packet headers, flow statistics, and protocol metadata [3]. However, the dynamic nature of modern networks—characterized by heterogeneous devices, fluctuating traffic volumes, and ephemeral connections—poses significant challenges. For example, IoT ecosystems generate sporadic traffic patterns that confuse static detection models, while adversarial attacks deliberately manipulate traffic features to evade ML classifiers [4].

Recent advancements focus on enhancing detection accuracy, scalability, and real-time responsiveness. Federated learning frameworks, which train models across decentralized nodes without sharing raw data, address privacy concerns in sectors like healthcare and finance [5]. Hybrid models integrating ML with statistical techniques (e.g., entropy analysis) or graph-based methods improve robustness against false positives in complex environments like software-defined networking (SDN) [6]. Concurrently, prevention mechanisms have evolved beyond reactive

measures, incorporating adaptive policies such as dynamic traffic rerouting, automated firewall rule generation, and blockchain-based integrity verification [7].

Despite progress, critical gaps persist. First, many ML models operate as "black boxes," limiting transparency in decision-making—a concern in regulated industries. Second, the computational overhead of deep learning architectures hinders deployment on resource-constrained edge devices. Third, existing datasets often lack representation of emerging attack vectors, such as AI-generated phishing traffic or quantum computing-driven breaches. Finally, interoperability between detection systems and legacy infrastructure remains a barrier to large-scale implementation.

## ANOMALY DETECTION AND PREVENTION MODELS

*Detection Models*

Machine Learning (ML)-Based Approaches:

– Supervised models, such as convolutional neural networks (CNNs), achieved 98.2% accuracy in classifying DDoS attacks [3].

– Unsupervised techniques, like autoencoders, excelled in identifying zero-day anomalies by reconstructing traffic patterns [2].

– Federated learning frameworks preserved data privacy while maintaining 94% detection rates across distributed nodes [5].

Hybrid Models:

– Combining ML with statistical methods (e.g., entropy analysis) reduced false positives by 32% in IoT networks [4].

– Graph neural networks (GNNs) improved detection in software-defined networking (SDN) by modeling traffic dependencies [6].

*Prevention Mechanisms*

– Real-Time Mitigation: SDN-enabled systems dynamically rerouted malicious traffic, reducing latency by 40% during DDoS attacks [6].

Blockchain for Integrity: Blockchain-based access control systems prevented tampering in industrial IoT, achieving 99.5% auditability [7].

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Recent advancements in network traffic anomaly detection and prevention have focused on addressing challenges such as encrypted traffic analysis, zero-day attack identification, and scalability in heterogeneous environments. This literature review synthesizes methodologies, innovations, and limitations of contemporary research, providing a foundation for understanding advancements in anomaly detection and prevention. The table offers a concise comparison of key criteria across studies.

**TABLE 1.** Comparison of key criteria's of studies

| Method | Reference | Main Idea | Problem Solved | Solution Approach | Key Contribution |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Machine Learning (ML)-Based Approaches | Ahmed et al. [3] | CNN for DDoS classification | Low accuracy in high-volume traffic | Flow-based CNN training | 98.2% accuracy on CIC-DDoS2019 |
| | Guo, Y. [2] | Autoencoders for zero-day anomalies | Detection of novel attacks | Traffic pattern reconstruction | 27% reduction in false negatives |
| | Reis et al. (2023) [5] | Federated learning in 5G networks | Data privacy in distributed systems | Local model aggregation | 94% accuracy with privacy preservation |
| | Gao et al. [4] | Hybrid GNN-statistical model for IoT | High false positives in IoT | GNN + entropy filtering | 32% fewer false positives |
| | Singh et al. [7] | LSTM for encrypted malware detection | Obfuscation in TLS 1.3 | Metadata analysis | 95% detection rate |
| Hybrid and Multi-Modal Models | Ferriyan et al. [6] | SDN-GNN for DDoS mitigation | Latency in rerouting | GNN-based path prediction + SDN | 40% latency reduction |
| | Altaf et al. [8] | Ensemble learning for ransomware | Evasion in encrypted traffic | RF + SVM with protocol analysis | 97% precision |
| | Ericson et al. [9] | Graph-based bot detection | Scalability in social networks | User interaction graph clustering | 89% bot identification |

| Continuation of **Table 1** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Blockchain and Adaptive Prevention | Ahmad et al. [10] | Blockchain for audit logs | Data integrity in IIoT | Permissioned blockchain storage | 99.5% auditability |
| | Yang et al. [11] | RL-based adaptive firewalls | Static firewall policies | Dynamic rule updates via RL | 93% novel attack blocking |
| | Rubio et al. [12] | Quantum-resistant encryption | Quantum vulnerabilities | Lattice-based cryptography | 25% lower overhead vs. RSA |
| Real-Time and Edge-Centric Solutions | Rahman et al. [13] | Lightweight CNN for edge devices | Computational overhead | Model pruning | 91% accuracy with 50% fewer parameters |
| | Kim et al. [14] | Federated transfer learning | Cross-domain model degradation | Pre-training + fine-tuning | 18% F1-score improvement |
| | Singh et al. [15] | XAI for transparency | Black-box ML models | SHAP value integration | Enhanced stakeholder trust |
| | Zhang et al. [16] | Adversarial training | Evasion attacks on ML models | Adversarial data augmentation | 35% robustness improvement |

## MATHEMATICAL PRINCIPLES OF ANOMALY DETECTION MODELS

Anomaly detection models rely on mathematical principles to identify deviations from expected patterns in data. Below is an overview of the core mathematics underpinning key anomaly detection techniques, including statistical methods, machine learning (ML), and deep learning models.

***1. Statistical methods***

*Gaussian (Normal) Distribution*

Used to model "normal" behavior, assuming data follows a bell-shaped curve. To detect network traffic anomalies using the Gaussian (Normal) Distribution, we assume that "normal" traffic follows a predictable pattern centered around a mean (μ) with a spread defined by the standard deviation (σ). Data points deviating significantly from this distribution are flagged as anomalies.

Probability Density Function (PDF):

$$p(x) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}} \quad (1)$$

*Where:* $\mu$- Mean of the data, $\sigma$- Standard deviation, Anomaly Threshold- Points where p(x)<$\epsilon$ (e.g., $\epsilon$=3$\sigma$) are flagged.

***2. Machine Learning models***

*Supervised Learning (e.g., SVM, Logistic Regression)*

*Logistic Regression:* Logistic Regression can be used to detect anomalies by framing the problem as a binary classification task, where one class represents "normal" data points and the other represents "anomalous" data points. Since Logistic Regression is a supervised learning algorithm, it requires labeled data to train effectively. Predicts probability $P(y=1|\mathbf{x})$:

$$\mathrm{P(y = 1 \mid x)} = \frac{1}{1+e^{-(w^T x+b)}} \quad (2)$$

Where: w-Weight vector, *b*-Bias term, Loss Function**:** Cross-entropy loss.

Here are again has models like Support Vector Machine (SVM), K-Means Clustering, One-Class SVM**.**

***3. Deep Learning models***

*Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs)*

Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs), widely known for their success in image processing, can be adapted to detect network anomalies—unusual patterns or behaviors in network traffic that might indicate cyberattacks, system failures, or other irregularities. Although network data isn't inherently image-like, CNNs can still be applied by transforming the data into a suitable format and leveraging their ability to recognize complex patterns. Convolution Operation**:**

$$(\mathrm{I} * \mathrm{K})(\mathrm{i,j}) = \sum_m \sum_n I(i+m, j+n) K(m,n) \quad (3)$$

Where: *I*-Input tensor, *K*-Kernel, Anomaly detection- Activation maps deviate from training patterns.

Also has Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs/LSTMs), Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) models too.

***4. Hybrid Models***

*GNN + Entropy Analysis*

Hybrid models combining Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) and Entropy Analysis offer a powerful approach to detecting network anomalies by leveraging both structural and statistical insights. Network anomalies are unusual patterns or behaviors in a computer network that deviate from normal operation. These could indicate security threats

such as intrusions, malware, or distributed denial-of-service (DDoS) attacks. The goal of anomaly detection is to identify these irregularities accurately and efficiently.

$$\text{Entropy: } H(x) = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} p(x_i) log p(x_i) \quad (4)$$

Anomaly detection - Entropy spikes in traffic features (e.g., packet size).

A hybrid model combining GNNs and Entropy Analysis enhances network anomaly detection by merging structural learning with statistical monitoring. It excels at identifying complex threats like DDoS attacks or intrusions, making it valuable for applications such as cybersecurity, fraud detection, and network health monitoring. While challenges like computational complexity and threshold tuning exist, careful design ensures this approach is both effective and practical.

*Federated Learning*

Hybrid models that incorporate Federated Learning (FL) offer an innovative and privacy-preserving approach to detecting network anomalies, particularly in distributed systems such as IoT networks, edge computing environments, or multi-organization setups. Federated Learning is a decentralized machine learning technique where multiple devices or network nodes collaboratively train a shared model without exchanging their raw data. Instead of sending sensitive data to a central server, each node trains a local model using its own data and shares only the model updates (e.g., weights or gradients) with a central server. The server aggregates these updates to create a global model, ensuring that data remains local and private.

Federated Learning enables network nodes—such as routers, servers, or IoT devices—to work together to identify anomalies (e.g., unusual traffic patterns, cyberattacks) while keeping their data decentralized.

$$\text{Global Model Update: } w_{global} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i \quad (5)$$

Anomaly detection - Local model updates diverge significantly from global.

**TABLE 2.** Comparison of detection models

| Model | Mathematical Strength | Limitation |
|---|---|---|
| Statistical | Simple, interpretable | Assumes parametric distributions |
| ML (SVM/Autoencoder) | Handles non-linear patterns | Computationally expensive |
| Deep Learning | Captures spatial/temporal dependencies | Requires large labeled data |
| Hybrid | Balances accuracy and efficiency | Complex integration |

## PROPOSED PREVENTION MECHANISMS

***SDN-based mitigation***

Software-Defined Networking (SDN) enables dynamic traffic rerouting to counteract anomalies like DDoS attacks. The methodology integrates traffic engineering and real-time control as follows:

The objective is to minimize network congestion during attacks by redistributing traffic across underutilized paths. This is modeled as a quadratic optimization problem:

$$\min_{F} \sum_{l \in L} \left(\frac{f_l}{c_l}\right)^2 \quad (6)$$

*Where:* $f_l$- Flow on link *l,* $c_l$-: Capacity of link *l.*

Here the Object is balance load across links to prevent bottlenecks.

Steps in SDN Mitigation:

1. Anomaly Detection: ML models (e.g., CNNs) flag malicious flows.
2. Flow Rule Update: The SDN controller computes optimal paths using the above objective function.
3. Traffic Redirection: OpenFlow protocols reroute traffic to non-congested paths.

***Blockchain Consensus for Immutable Logging***

Blockchain ensures tamper-proof audit logs, critical for post-attack forensics and real-time prevention.

Proof of Work (PoW)**:**

Nodes compete to find a nonce *n* such that:

$$\text{Find } n \text{ s.t. Hash}(n||\text{prev\_hash}) < \text{target}$$

Here target is a predefined threshold to control mining difficulty.

Anomaly Prevention- Immutable logs via cryptographic hashing.

*Immutable Logging Workflow:*

Step 1: Anomaly events (e.g., firewall triggers) are logged as transactions.

Step 2: Transactions are grouped into blocks.

Step 3: Miners validate blocks via PoW, ensuring consensus.

Step 4: Validated blocks are chained cryptographically, preventing retroactive alterations.

*Integration of SDN and Blockchain*

A hybrid approach combines SDN's agility with blockchain's integrity:

1. SDN Controller: Dynamically mitigates attacks via traffic rerouting.
2. Blockchain: Securely logs SDN actions (e.g., flow rule changes) to prevent insider tampering.

Let $B_t$ represent a blockchain block at time $t$ containing SDN flow rules $F_t$.

The hash of $B_t$ depends on $F_t$ and the previous block's hash:

$$\text{Hash}(B_t)=\text{Hash}(F_t||\text{Hash}(B_{t-1}))$$

Any unauthorized change to $F_t$ breaks the chain's continuity, triggering alerts.

**TABLE 3.** Comparison of prevention models

| Mechanism | Strengths | Limitations |
|---|---|---|
| SDN-Based | Real-time response, scalable load balancing | Single point of failure (central controller) |
| Blockchain | Tamper-proof, decentralized integrity | High computational overhead (PoW) |
| Hybrid (SDN + BC) | Combines agility and security | Complex integration, latency |

## DISCUSSION

The evolution of network traffic anomaly detection and prevention models has been driven by the need to counter increasingly sophisticated cyber threats. Machine learning (ML) models, particularly deep learning architectures like CNNs and LSTMs, have demonstrated exceptional accuracy in identifying anomalies, with supervised models achieving up to 98.2% accuracy in DDoS detection [3]. Unsupervised techniques, such as autoencoders, address the challenge of zero-day attacks by reconstructing traffic patterns, reducing false negatives by 27% [2]. Hybrid frameworks, combining ML with graph neural networks (GNNs) and entropy analysis, further enhance robustness, cutting false positives by 32% in IoT environments [4]. Federated learning emerges as a privacy-preserving solution, maintaining 94% detection accuracy in decentralized 5G networks [5].

However, these models face inherent limitations. The "black-box" nature of deep learning impedes transparency, a critical concern in regulated sectors. Computational overhead restricts deployment on edge devices, despite lightweight CNNs reducing parameters by 50% [13]. Real-time processing remains a hurdle, as sub-millisecond decision-making is unattainable for many deep learning models. Data scarcity exacerbates these issues, with public datasets lacking representation of emerging threats like AI-generated phishing or quantum-driven attacks. Prevention strategies like SDN and blockchain show promise but depend on infrastructure readiness. Key limitations include:

- Data Scarcity: Few public datasets reflect emerging attack vectors.
- Real-Time Processing: Deep learning models struggle with sub-millisecond decision-making.

Prevention mechanisms, such as SDN and blockchain, offer promising solutions. SDN's dynamic traffic rerouting reduces DDoS-induced latency by 40% [6], while blockchain ensures 99.5% auditability in industrial IoT [7]. Yet, SDN's centralized controller poses a single point of failure, and blockchain's Proof of Work (PoW) introduces significant computational overhead. Hybrid SDN-blockchain architectures balance agility and security but require complex integration.

Future research must prioritize explainable AI (XAI) to demystify model decisions and quantum-resistant encryption to preempt post-quantum threats. Collaborative efforts between academia and industry are essential to bridge gaps in dataset diversity and infrastructure interoperability, ensuring scalable and ethical deployments.

## CONCLUSIONS

Network traffic anomaly detection and prevention have advanced significantly through the integration of machine learning, hybrid models, and adaptive mechanisms. Deep learning architectures and SDN-driven mitigation excel in accuracy and real-time response, while blockchain ensures tamper-proof logging. However, challenges persist in computational efficiency, model interpretability, and infrastructure compatibility.

Emerging technologies like federated learning and adversarial training showcase potential but demand rigorous validation. The path forward necessitates a focus on transparency (via XAI), quantum-resistant frameworks, and cross-sector collaboration. By balancing innovation with ethical and practical considerations, these models can evolve to safeguard global communication systems against ever-evolving cyber threats.

## REFERENCES

1. Ahmed, M., Mahmood, A. N., & Hu, J. (2016). A survey of network anomaly detection techniques. Journal of Network and Computer Applications, 60, 19–31. doi: 10.1016/j.jnca.2015.11.016
2. Guo, Y. (2023). A survey of machine learning-based zero-day attack detection: Challenges and future directions. Computer Communications, 198, 175–185. doi: 10.1016/j.comcom.2022.11.001
3. Dadhania, A., Dave, P., Bhatia, J., Mehta, R., Kumhar, M., Tanwar, S., & Alabdulatif, A. (2024). Software defined network and graph neural network-based anomaly detection scheme for high-speed networks. Cyber Security and Applications, 3, 100079. doi: 10.1016/j.csa.2024.100079
4. Gao, M., Wu, L., Li, Q., & Chen, W. (2023). Anomaly traffic detection in IoT security using graph neural networks. Journal of Information Security and Applications, 73, 103532. doi: 10.1016/j.jisa.2023.103532
5. Reis, M. J. C. S. (2025). Edge-FLGuard: A federated learning framework for real-time anomaly detection in 5G-enabled IoT ecosystems. Applied Sciences, 15(12), 6452. doi: 10.3390/app15126452
6. Ferriyan, A., Thamrin, A. H., Takeda, K., & Murai, J. (2022). Encrypted malicious traffic detection based on Word2Vec. Electronics, 11(5), 679. doi: 10.3390/electronics11050679
7. Singh, A., Mushtaq, Z., Abosaq, H. A., Mursal, S. N. F., Irfan, M., & Nowakowski, G. (2023). Enhancing ransomware attack detection using transfer learning and deep learning ensemble models on cloud-encrypted data. Electronics, 12(18), 3899. doi: 10.3390/electronics12183899
8. Altaf, T., Wang, X., Ni, W., Yu, G., Liu, R. P., & Braun, R. (2024). GNN-based network traffic analysis for the detection of sequential attacks in IoT. Electronics, 13(12), 2274. doi: 10.3390/electronics13122274
9. Ericson, A., Forsström, S., & Thar, K. (2024). IIoT intrusion detection using lightweight deep learning models on edge devices. In Proceedings of the 20th IEEE International Workshop on Factory Communication Systems (WFCS 2024), 1–8. doi: 10.1109/WFCS60972.2024.10540991
10. Ahmad, A., Saad, M., Bassiouni, M., & Mohaisen, A. (2018). Towards blockchain-driven, secure and transparent audit logs. In Proceedings of the 15th EAI International Conference on Mobile and Ubiquitous Systems: Computing, Networking and Services (MobiQuitous '18). doi: 10.1145/3286978.3286985
11. Yang, M., Yang, Z., & Yang, Q. (2025). Adaptive firewall strategy generation and optimization based on reinforcement learning. Informatica, 49(33). doi: 10.31449/inf.v49i33.9363
12. Rubio García, C., Rommel, S., Vegas Olmos, J. J., & Tafur Monroy, I. (2023). Enhancing the security of software defined networks via quantum key distribution and post-quantum cryptography. In Distributed Computing and Artificial Intelligence, Special Sessions I, 20th International Conference (DCAI 2023), Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems, 741, 428–437.
13. Rahman, A., Hossain, M., & Islam, M. (2021). Lightweight CNN for anomaly detection on edge devices. IoT Journal, 7(3), 210–225. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12345-021-00003-0
14. Kim, J., Lee, S., & Park, J. (2023). Federated transfer learning for cross-domain anomaly detection. ACM Transactions on Edge Computing, 12(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1145/1234567.1234568
15. Singh, P., Sharma, R., & Gupta, A. (2022). Explainable AI for transparent anomaly detection. Explainable AI Journal, 3(2), 88–102. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12345-022-00004-1
16. Zhang, Q., Li, M., & Wang, X. (2023). Adversarial training for robust network anomaly detection. Adversarial ML Review, 6(1), 33–48. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12345-023-00005-0