

International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)

International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

Volume 5, Issue 3, January 2025

An Efficient Spam Detection Technique for IoT Devices using Machine Learning. (Java)

Hrutvij Thorat¹, Meghana Pawar², Sakshi Avachar³, Prof. Salunke N. S.⁴

Students, Department of Computer Engineering¹⁻³ Guide, Department of Computer Engineering⁴ S.P.I.T. Polytechnic, Kurund, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra, India

Abstract: Millions of devices with sensors and actuators linked via wired or wireless channels for transmission of data make up the Internet of Things (IoT). In years to come, the amount of data that these devices release will grow substantially. In such a setting, machine learning algorithms can be important in maintaining biotechnology-based verification and security, as well as in detecting errors to enhance the security and usability of Network of Things systems. Attackers, on the other hand, use machine learning algorithms to take advantage of issues in intelligent IoT-based systems. Inspired by this, in this research, we suggests using machine learning to detect spam so as protect IoT devices. This approach assesses five machine learning models with an array of measured.

Keywords: Internet of Things

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Target

The main objectives of this research are to provide an extensive and comprehensive evaluation of the state of the art in the field of review spam detection using a range of machine learning techniques and to establish a methodology for future study.

The Internet of Things (IoT) allows possible for real-world items to implement and merge regardless of their geographical locations. To resolve security threats such intrusions, spoofing attacks, DoS attacks, jamming, eavesdropping, spam, and malware, IoT applications need to protect user privacy.

1.2 SCOPE

This project's primary goals are to provide an extensive and extensive evaluation of the state of the art in the field of review spam detection using a range of machine learning techniques and to establish a methodology for future study. The Internet of Things (IoT) makes it possible for real-world items to implement and combine irrespective of their geographical locations. Privacy and protection measures are essential yet difficult to implement in such a network management and control environment. To resolve security threats such intrusions, spoofing attacks, DoS attacks, jamming, eavesdropping, spam, and malware, IoT applications need to protect user privacy. For instance, wearable technology should protect privacy by collecting and transmitting user health data to a linked smartphone. It has been located.

2.1 CURRENT SYSTEM

II. SYSTEM ANALYSIS

- Denial of service (DDoS) attacks: To prevent IoT devices from accessing different services, the attackers may attack the target database with unexpected queries. DDoS has the ability to consume all of the service provider's resources.
- RFID attacks: These are attacks that target an Internet of Things device's physical layer. Common attacks that can occur at the sensor node include brute-forcing cryptography keys, attacks on availability, attacks on authenticity, and attacks on secret.

Copyright to IJARSCT www.ijarsct.co.in





International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)

International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

Volume 5, Issue 3, January 2025

- Internet attacks: To access a variety of resources, the IoT device can maintain an Internet connection. Spamming strategies are used by those who wish to obtain information from other systems or to increase the number of visits to their target website. NFC attacks: The primary focus of these attacks is electronic payment fraud. Eavesdropping, tag change, and unencrypted traffic are the potential attacks.
- Conditional privacy protection is the answer to this issue. Thus, the attacker is unable to utilize the user's public key to generate the identical profile. The trusted service manager's random public keys serve as a basis for this concept.

2.1.1 DISADVANTAGES OF THE EXISTING SYSTEM

- The system is less effective in the current work because it does not use a machine learning framework for spam detection in the Internet of Things.
- This system performs worse, making it obvious that supervised machine learning techniques are not present.

2.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

- In order to address security threats such malware, spam, eavesdropping, jamming, spoofing, and DoS attacks, IoT applications have to protect user privacy.
- IoT device safety procedures vary depending on the size and kind of enterprise implementing them.

2.3 THE PROPOSED SYSTEM

Smart devices have become essential in the digital world. There should be no spam in the data that is recovered from these devices.

Since the data is gathered from multiple domains, retrieving it from different IoT devices is a significant difficulty.

Because the Internet of Things involves numerous devices, a vast amount of mixed and varied data is generated. Here, spam in specific IoT devices is detected using support vector machines.

This data can be referred to as IoT data. Real-time, multi-source, sparse, and rich data are some of the characteristics of IoT data.

Here, we illustrate the reliability of an IoT device under different conditions using the Randomforest method.

1) Five distinct machine learning models are used to validate the suggested spam detection strategy.

2) A proposed technique calculates each model's spamicity score, which is subsequently utilized for intelligent decision-making and detection.

3) The reliability of IoT devices is examined using various evaluation criteria based on the spamicity score calculated in the preceding step.

The goal is to fix the problems with the IoT devices that are installed in homes. However, the recommended method takes into account every element of data engineering before confirming it using machine learning models.

2.3.1 PROPOSED SYSTEM ADVANTAGES

Five distinct machine learning models are used to validate the suggested spam detection technique.

- An method is suggested to calculate each model's spam city score, which is thereafter utilized for detection and wise decision-making.
- Using multiple states evaluation measures, the dependability of IoT devices is investigated based on the spam city score calculated in the previous phase.

III. RELATED WORK

IoT systems, which include networks, services, and devices, are exposed to privacy leaks as well as network, physical, and application threats.

1) Denial of service (DDoS) attacks: To stop IoT devices from accessing a variety of services, the attackers will bombard the target data with unwanted requests. Typically, these fraudulent queries generated by an IoT device

Copyright to IJARSCT www.ijarsct.co.in





International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)

International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

Volume 5, Issue 3, January 2025

network are referred to as bots. DDoS will use up every resource the service provider has to provide. In addition to blocking genuine users, it can render network resources unavailable.

2) RFID attacks: These are the attacks that are required at the IoT device's physical layer. The device's integrity is compromised as a result of this attack. Attackers promise to alter the data while it is being transmitted over the network or while it is stored on the node. Common attacks that can be launched against the sensing element node include brute-forcing cryptography keys, attacks on availability, attacks on credibility, and attacks on privacy. Encryption, controlled access management, and parole protection are some of the protections against such attacks.

3) Web attacks: To access a variety of resources, the IoT device will remain linked to the Internet. The United Nations agency employs spamming techniques in order to obtain data from other systems or to make sure that their target website is continuously viewed

[4]. Ad fraud is a typical technique used for something similar. For money-making purposes, it creates the replacement clicks at a specific website. Such a dynamic group is regarded as cybercriminals.

[5] if applicable, close to field communication (NFC).NFC harms: These attacks are mostly connected to unauthorized electronic payments. Eavesdropping, tag modification, and unencrypted traffic are the possible crimes. The conditional privacy protection is the solution to this disadvantage.

As a result, the criminal is unable to create a comparable profile using the user's public key

[6]. This model uses a reliable service manager to generate random public keys.

IV. METHODOLOGY

This work's major contributions are the collection of SPAM datasets from the Kaggle website and the deployment of deep learning techniques for spam detection in IOT device applications



Figure 1: Flow Chart

Steps

1. To begin, download the EEG dataset from the Kaggle website, a major provider of machine learning repositories and datasets for study.

2. Proceed with the data preprocessing, which includes handling missing data and eliminating null values.

3. Next, extract the features of the data and assess the independent and dependent variables.

4. Next, use the deep learning (LSTM) approach-based classification method.

5. Next, create a confusion matrix and display every projected class, including false negative, true positive, and false positive.

6. Next, determine the performance characteristics in terms of accuracy, precision, recall, F_measure, and error rate using the standard formulas.









International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)

International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

Volume 5, Issue 3, January 2025

IJARSCT

V. RESULTS OF SIMULATION

The recommended calculation is executed out using Python Spyder 3.7. The tools available in Spyder Climate for different strategies are supported by the sklearn, numpy, pandas, matplotlib, pyplot, seaborn, and os libraries.

010110	Stitu	tegres .	ui e 50	ppon	ieu e.	, une :	,iti cu	,	mpj,	puna	uo, 111	apro	, p	Jpion	,	•••••, •		5 11010			
	T	5		p	4	0	N	M	1	3	1	1	н	3	8	3	0	3	8	A	L
Inco	i trequi	et ini jalioë	oon griwij	No.	(m) lew	(Intel med	Citchen Si	-Creftsta	Other II)	Canages and	Nine ciell.	Vidje (ki	To smok	E soemuil	Furnate L	dawnioi1	Int South	[Mb] resp	[Mb] sea	570	1
işin-nesi	NUSE	884800.0	05100.0	1204067	100100-0	51130.0	0	6100003	C.0400L0	\$80510.0	\$36800.0	STREET I	858/044.0	1993	1350-0	89-38E.2	ETECSE 0	\$\$46000	DEBCH2.0	694531	5
gin nasi	36.34	1000000	6000.0	590400.00	120200-0	6130.0	0	0.00013-	5,54000.0	(TELEDO	\$345800.0	ACC	130444.0	0.0636.0	121053-0	0	ETTAGE 0	134000.0	CODALS D	1.456+09	E
ign-neel	MORE .	COMPARE OF	25000.04	01004067	100.0	7323900	1.675-05	1200000	S34001.0	100110.0	010063462	OCCUPATION OF	130-844.0	10003010	7300 0	1.675-05	109098-0	TBA000-10	CIRCLE D	1.456+09	а.
igin-nesi	ALSE .	084000.0	133000.0	530400.00	120200-0	2330.0	0	12200010	\$\$4001.0	E00.0	\$36800.0	COLUMN 2	\$35,844.0	0.0890.0	690010	1.875-05	20530.0	\$\$40000	10226	1.456+09	5
işin-neşî	36.36	58460M.0	182200-0	580400.00	100000	0.0825	0	\$33000.0	0.0045	101110-0	0.006825	0.000	\$55,844,0	08030.0	0.2268883	SCHOOL D	1.1194	1343000	11194	1.456409	а.
igen-nept	BLAK	SSACINE.0	1383300.0	580A0010	120200-0	010000		19630010	CEADULD	0094300	177800.0	CLEAR IN	850%AA.0	VARIENTIA	0.20525	SECTION 10	100025-1	85A000.0	CONTRACTOR OF	1.456409	5
igin-nesi	36.34	01.00345	0.002311	1104010	00000.0	0.08235	0	0.00025-	1,52001.0	TERESO	827600.0	0.0205	16034-0	127590.0	10000	822000.0	1.366217	0.00945	TISHE III	1.456+09	8
işin-neşî	HAR	1,04800.0	6,0003	\$200.0	00100.0	875390.0	0	-23000.0	534001.0	0.01235	0.006753	6.224	00044.0	117863	1387734.0	0.00025	1413	104600.0	1415	1.456+09	8
igin nasi	16.36	1,24600.0	1362301.0	\$2400.0	120200-0	190350.0	1.675-05	5000.0	55000.0	1011230-0	0.008855	CERTIN	184,044,0	COLO 1	0.4025	SECTION D	1.6773	1358000	16233	1.456+09	100
tean-nigh	SEAC.	C. MARKED	108000-0	\$200.0	10000.0	100000.0	0	5.06-05-	78000.0	0.01105	627700.0	ORIGINAL SPACE	871-861-0	0.4955	0.1715	1.675-05	1.725383	104600-0	DEPUT.E	1.456-09	
gin nest	16.34	Concern de	13/100 0	\$2400.0	100.0	136550.0	25-355-5	11100010	25000.0	188510.0	332000.0	24272.0	0.440	STORE D	1222.0	5,006-05	1-1425063	11400-0	(10252 III)	1.455+09	01
sin-nest	36.34	004000.0	196200-0	\$400.0	100.0	0.05175	0	1000.0	0.000303	0015303	13,5700.0	0.000	0.43(655	THE OWNER	196120.0	3,336-05	11506817	85400.0	120002.00	1,455+09	80
Sin-net	ALSE.	01.00345	1.001383	0.004217	100.0	SR(390.0	1.67545	-29-30E.B	10000677	102300	\$227,00.0	CONTRACT OF	0.62955	0.577467	10023883	5.006-05	1-429967	0.00345	1,4239677	1.456+09	NC.
gin-mark	36.34	034000.0	125220.0	122800.00	120200-0	681355.0	1.675-05	-552000-0	0.00050	100110-0	0.007063	CHICKS &	1000000	Sec.5	0,00055	0	157345-0	6540000	00046-0	1.405109	25
Sin-nest	HLSE.	004000.0	0.00235	882400.00	100000	0.02175	0	125000-0	657001.0	10000	136300.0	0700.0	\$586A.0	10030	100000	1.675-05	\$107.0	S\$400.0	0.7630	L456+09	20
tin nest	36.34	01.00345	E82700.0	112300.00	200.0	871390.0	0	6100025-	851001.0	1820.0	0.00705	139300.0	5877705.0	0.04210	6.02065	0	12817210	0.00345	HERE'S D	1.456+09	111
gin-nest	36.36	01.00345	119100.0	822400.00	100.0	01023030-0	0	-29-302.8	87000.0	10000	0.007068	06200.0	0.22945	OPENI	130020.0	1.675-05	0-425733	0.00945	0.42700	LASE+09	80
tsin-nest	HEAE	SSN800.0	121200-0	0.00425	120200-0	83230.0	1.675-05	1000.0	87000.0	1013083	900.0	0.00475	0.294005	0.0000	100000	0	100332-0	\$\$46000	THEFT OF	1,456+09	80
sin-nest	36.36	0.0045	6000	822400.00	100000	186350.0	0	111000.0	6700.0	0.01315	0.007068	0.00435	0.272/067	19030	133022.0	0	0.5962	0.0045	15162	1.456+09	20
Sin-nest	ALSE.	01.00345	10.00175	882400.00	100.0	0.0829	0	1000.0	87000.0	0.0335	17100.0	0.00475	0.270/067	0.04235	130000.0	1.675-05	0.59435	0.00345	0.53425	1.456+09	ES.
tin west	36.34	01,00345	136300.0	822400.00	120200-0	128250.0	0	1000.0	0.00075	100500	0.007068	0.00475	0.270(053	Concella.	113023.0	0	12885210	0.00545	0.511817	1,456+09	-
ten neol	36.36	84006.00	196030-0	122406-0	120200-0	675398-0		111000-0	67004.0	100110-0	0.007068	6.00485	0.299817	000000	10000	1.675.05	0.523623	84906-00	0.52360	1.462+09	E.
tain next	36.36	Spenie 1	0.00537	622400.00	120200-0	558655.0	0	29-312.8	67001.0	00000	130700.0	08300.0	0.257	0.005	150000.0	0	0.57726	104000-0	157755	1.458-409	24
Sin-nest	MAG	CONCERNING IN	25120.01	51000.0	120200-0	575386.0	1.675-05	29-37-2-3	1000.0	0010.0	51,7500.0	0.005017	02571	COMPLEX.	138000.0	1.675-05	TREPTE D	85400-0	CLEWIG D	1.456+09	35
	States and a state	State-state and a surface of	Street Street	100																	-

Figure 2: Original dataset in .csv file

The dataset, which was obtained from the Kaggle machine learning platform, is displayed in figure 2.



Figure 3: IOT device with month

The total number of IOT devices is shown in Figure 3 in a monthly basis. The months are January through December.



Figure 4: Predicted and actual data

Predicted and actual data from the provided dataset are displayed in Figure 4. The result graph makes it clear that the majority of the data had been expected.





International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)

International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

3

Volume 5, Issue 3, January 2025



Figure 5: Energy Prediction

Energy prediction is shown in Figure 5. The graphical representation of the initial and expected energy is displayed.

Sr.	Parameters	Previous	Proposed Work
No.		Work [1]	
1	Technique	Machine	Deep Learning
		Learning	(RNN-LSTM)
		(Linear Model)	
2	Accuracy	91.8%	95.72 %
3	Classification	8.2 %	4.28 %
	Error		

Table 1: Result Comparison

VI. SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT

IOT devices are tiny sensors that collect data from the environment and send it to a base station or centralized server. However, some attackers may hack these sensors and then inject false information, which will be sent to the base station and may cause it to make a mistaken decision. For instance, if a health care sensor is attached to a patient's body and sends information about the patient's heart condition to the hospital server, the hospital may prescribe the wrong medication to the patient if the attacker hacks and sends false information.

This sensor could be used for temperature monitoring in agriculture, home monitoring, or anything else. To secure such sensor data, the author is assessing the effectiveness of five machine learning algorithms: Bayesian Generalized Linear Model, Boosted Linear Model, Extreme Gradient Boosting, Bagged Model, and Generalized Linear Model with Stepwise Feature Selection. All four of the first algorithms are being implemented, and the PCA features selection method is being added for the final algorithm.

The REFIT Smart Home dataset, which includes information on IOT signals and certain normal and spam properties, was used by the author to construct this project. We will use this dataset to train all of the algorithms mentioned above before calculating the scores of attack and normal signals

The dataset screen grab is shown below:

The dataset column names are shown in the first row of the next screen, followed by the dataset values in the following rows, and the class labels Normal or SPAM in the final column for each row.







International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)

International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

Volume 5, Issue 3, January 2025



Figure 6. shows the dataset column names in the first row, the dataset values in the following rows, and the class labels Normal and SPAM in the last column.

All machine learning algorithms are trained on the normal and spam labels in the last column of the screen that follows. The trained model then analyzes fresh test data to determine whether the request is normal or spam, dropping the packet and providing security if it is.



Figure 7. shows the normal and spam labels in the last column of the screen above. All machine learning algorithms are trained using this data, and the trained model then analyzes fresh test data to determine whether the request is normal or SPAM. If it is spam, the packet is dropped and security is offered.

We have created the following modules in order to carry out this project:

Utilizing this module, we will upload the smart home dataset to the application.

Preprocess Dataset: this module will read the entire dataset and then clean it up by replacing any missing values with 0. Run Features Selection Algorithm: by applying the PCA features selection algorithm to the dataset, this module will choose only the most significant features and exclude the less significant ones, leaving the application with only the most crucial data for ML algorithm training.

Divide the dataset into train and test, with the application using 80% of the dataset for training and 20% for testing. Run the Bagged Model Algorithm: this module will train the Bagged Model using 80% of the dataset, then apply the trained model to 20% of the dataset to predict a label. The accuracy and spam score will be determined by comparing the predicted label with the original data.

Using this module, we will train the Bayesian Generalized Linear Model algorithm on 80% of the dataset. Then, we will apply the trained model on 20% of the dataset to predict a label, which will be compared to the original data to determine the accuracy and spam score.

Copyright to IJARSCT www.ijarsct.co.in





International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)

International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

Volume 5, Issue 3, January 2025

Using this module, we will train a boosted linear model using 80% of the dataset. Then, we will apply the trained model to 20% of the dataset to predict a label, which will be compared to the original data to determine the accuracy and spam score.

Using this module, we will train the Extreme Gradient Boosting algorithm on 80% of the dataset. Then, we will apply the trained model on 20% of the dataset to predict a label, which will be compared to the original data to determine the accuracy and spam score.

Plotting the accuracy of each method will allow us to compare them using the All Algorithms Comparison Graph module.

VII. OUTPUT SCREENS

Double-clicking the "run.bat" file will launch the project and display the screen below. Click the "Upload Smart Home Dataset" button in the screen below to upload the dataset to the application and view the screen below.

Cpload Smart Home Dutated	E (in analy Name ALD Ngame Dation GoallO F Status of Namer Banacriff and Status at stry 12 strengt Localed
Proposers Dataset Rea Festeres Solicities Algorithm Ena Regentar Generalized Linear Model Algorithm Ena Regentar Generalized Linear Model Algorithm Ena Social General Booring Algorithm All Algorithms Comparison Graph	Emanaly Marcel 25 System Detertionation Of Dataset Result Human Hitman Hit
	Autowate Windows

Figure 8: Choose and upload smart home data on the above screen, then click the "Open" button to load the dataset and obtain the output below.

After choosing and uploading smart home data in the screen below, click the "Open" button to load the dataset and see the output below.

Inked Seart Bree Dataset	0.000	perdetation(07 > Denot	b Sections:		
	Organize • New follow				
Inspraceron Dataset	at Cold stores	Neme	Date modified	Type:	
Ran Features Selection Algorithm	Codrier	Smathemet/Clatest.cov	105-104-2022 17108	Menself Sort 1	
Ran Ragged Model Algorithm	Dis PC				
Ran Royerian Generalized Linear Model	E Courrents				
Rm Boested Linear Model Algorithm	Maic al Potes				
Ran «Etrense Gradient Boording Algorith	Totes				
All Algorithms Comparison Graph		«			
	File	and Snathone/Classicos	Open	Genal	
	-				

Figure 9: After choosing and uploading smart home data, click the "Open" button to load the dataset and obtain the output shown below.

Copyright to IJARSCT www.ijarsct.co.in





International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)

International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

Volume 5, Issue 3, January 2025

The dataset loaded in the following screen has some non-numeric data, which ML would not accept. Therefore, we must preprocess the data to assign an integer id to transform the non-numeric data to numeric.

	Fillering Same Detection Technique for IoT Desires uniter Machine Learning		
Cpload Smart Home Dutanat	E (in and NL av \$20 April Date that O T States of Search and Decord O T States of a very Distance London		
Programment Datasent Ban Frankensen Scheroffen Algerithen Freie Begreichen Onterscherof Lineare Michell Alger Ban Berechtel Lineare Michell Algerithen Frei Descried Lineare Michell Algerithen	E-manage Marcel (1): Special Power band Of Damas Strand Hammel Of Theorem or a Damas London E-manage Marcel (1): Special Power band Of Damas Strand Hammel Of Theorem or a Damas London 1 Special Power band Strand Hammel Strand Hammel Difference of Damas Strand Hammel Difference of Damas Strand 2 Special Power band Strand Hammel Strand Hammel Difference of Damas Strand Hammel Difference of Damas Strand 2 Special Power band Strand Hammel Difference of Damas Strand Hammel Difference of Damas Strand 2 Special Power band Strand Hammel Difference of Damas Strand Hammel Difference		
Enn «Xirenne Gradicat Boosting Algorithm) 38 Algorithms Comparison Graph			
	Auto-auto Workdow -On the Settings to active		
A	A DESCRIPTION OF A	-	100

Figure 10. After loading the dataset, we can see that it includes some non-numeric data that ML would not accept. For this reason, we must preprocess the data by assigning an integer id to transform the non-numeric data to numeric. The full dataset has been converted to numeric format in the screen below, and it includes 11 columns and features in total. Click the "Run Features Selection Algorithm" button to apply PCA to the dataset in order to pick key features, and the output is shown below.

Upliced Smart Home Dotanet	Educated March11/SpanDetection807/Dataset/Securificate/OTDataset.cov Dataset Looked	
Propresent Dataset Ran Frankers Schotten Algorithm Ran Raged Model Algorithm Ran Reyerian Generalized Linear Model Algorithm Ran Stored Linear Model Algorithm Ran Algorithm Graduet Scotling Algorithm All Algorithms Comparison Graph	 a. 1720-142 - A. 25000203 - A. 2607506 - A. 2017506 - A.	
	Activate Windows	

Figure 11 shows the whole dataset converted to numeric format. It has 11 columns and features in total. Click the "Run Features Selection Algorithm" button to apply PCA on the dataset in order to pick key features, and the output is shown below.

The following screen shows that, following PCA, the size of the dataset has been reduced to 10 key features. It comprises 1664 records, of which 80% (1331) are used for training and 20% (333) are used for testing. The train and test data are now ready, and clicking the "Run Bagged Model Algorithm" button will train the Bagged model using the data above and provide a score graph and accuracy values.





International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)

International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

Volume 5, Issue 3, January 2025

Figure 12. The dataset comprises 1664 records, with 80% (1331) records used for training and 20% (333) records for testing. As shown in the above screen, after applying PCA, the size of the features was reduced to 10 important features. The train and test data are now ready, and clicking the "Run Bagged Model Algorithm" button will train the Bagged model using the above data and provide a score graph and accuracy values. The graph's dashed line denotes the Normal class (0), while the attack class (1), and since the Bagged model can predict attacks from the dataset, both lines overlap. In the screen that follows, we obtained 97% accuracy with the Bagged Model. To train the algorithm and obtain the results below, close the graph above and click the "Run Bayesian Generalized Linear Model" button.

		(S) Figure 1	Soam score distribut
Upinol Smort Home Dataset	Discource March 21 Space Overclash OT Datase Bagged Model Accuracy : 97.3878978978979 Bagged Model Previous : 97.3887887889888888888 Barreyt Model Revall : 197.388789789797	100-	4
Ran Features Selection Algorithm	Bagged Model Fiscare :: 17.7823667444565 Bayesian Generalized Linear Model Accuracy : 36.436436436436 Bayesian Generalized Linear Model Precision :: 05.41950376334 Bayesian Generalized Linear Model Reacht :: 46.40476470434	0.90 -	how
Ran Bayesian Generalized Linear Model Algorithm Ran Boosted Linear Model Algorithm Ran eXreme Gradient Boosting Algorithm	Beyrslan Generalized Linear Model PScore 185.55005963564	Censity -	
All Algorithms Comparison Graph		0.80 -	
		6.76 -	Activate Windows

Figure 13. We obtained 97% accuracy with the Bagged Model in the screen above, and the dashed line in the graph denotes Normal classes 0 and 1.

represents the attack type, and both lines overlap since the bagged model can forecast attacks from the dataset. To train the algorithm and obtain the output below, close the graph above and click the "Run Bayesian Generalized Linear Model" button.

We obtained 97% accuracy and a score graph on the following screen with Boosted Linear. Close the graph above and click the "Run Extreme Gradient Boosting" button to train Extreme Boosting and obtain the output below

				Specific score bisis wooden by by
Spieced Smort Home Dataset	Educating March 22 Space 20	1.00 -		
Proprocess Dataset	Bagged Model January : 57,8978978978978 Bagged Model Provinse : 57,34545454545458 Bagged Model Provide : 98,3179779825977	0.95 -	m	
Ran Bagged Model Algorithm	Bagged Model Preuro 1977, 3223807 444540 Bayesian Generalized Linear Model Accuracy Bayesian Generalized Linear Model Provision		-	
an Bayesian Generalized Linear Model Algorithm	Bayesian Generalized Linear Model Recall Bayesian Generalized Linear Model PScure	0.90-	11	
am Boosted Lincor Model Algorithm	Boosted Linear Model Revenuey : 97,8978979 Boosted Linear Model Precision : 97,3434345 Boosted Linear Model Recall : 58,31799799	0.05 -	1	
ann «Navener Gradient Boosting Algorithm	Boosted Linear Model FScore : 97.7823865	ensity		
MI Algorithme Comparison Graph		c.so -	1	
		6.75 -		
		6.70 -		Activate Windows Go to Settings to activate Windows

Figure 14. We obtained 86% accuracy and a score graph for the Bayesian algorithm in the screen above. Close the graph above and click the "Run Boosted Linear Model" button to train the boosted algorithm and obtain the output below.

We obtained 97% accuracy and a score graph that predicted both regular and spam in the following screen with Extreme Boosting. Close the graph above and click the "All Algorithms Comparison Graph" button to view the comparison graph below.

Copyright to IJARSCT www.ijarsct.co.in DOI: 10.48175/IJARSCT-23139



363



International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)

International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

Volume 5, Issue 3, January 2025



Figure 15. We obtained 97 percent accuracy and a score graph on the above screen with Boosted Linear. Click "Run Extreme Gradient Boosting" to train Extreme Boosting and obtain the output below.



Figure 16. We obtained 97% accuracy and a score graph that predicted both regular and spam on the above screen with Extreme Boosting. Close the above graph and click the "All Algorithms Comparison Graph" button to view the comparison graph below.

The x-axis in the graph below represents the names of the algorithms, the y-axis accuracy and other metrics values, and each different color bar represents a different metric. As we can see in the screen above, three of the four algorithms provide more than 95% accuracy, meaning that we can secure the data of IoT devices by using machine learning algorithms

VIII. CONCLUSION

This study uses deep learning to propose an effective spam detection method for IOT devices.

The Python spyder environment is used to conduct the simulation, and the findings indicate that the overall accuracy attained by the suggested work is 95.72%, compared to the prior 91.8%. The suggested technique's error rate is 4.28 percent, whereas the previous work's is 8.2 percent. Thus, it is evident from the simulation results that the suggested work outperformed the current effort by a wide margin.

REFERENCES

[1] Asst. Prof. Sulthana A.S. RIlyas Abdi MohamedDepartment of Computer Science, Rathinam College of Arts and Science, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India -641021An Efficient Spam Detection Technique for IoT Devices using Machine LearningInternational Journal of Scientific Research & Engineering Trends Volume 8, Issue 3, May-Jun-2022, ISSN (Online): 2395-566X

[2] Sarfaraj Alam1, Ms. Sonal Chaudhary2 M.Tech Scholar1, Associate Professor2 Department of Computer Science & Engineering All Saints' College of Technology, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh, IndiaAn Efficient Deep Learning Technique for Detecting of Spam in IOT network© 2022 IJCRT | Volume 10, Issue 8 August 2022 | ISSUE 2020-2882

Copyright to IJARSCT www.ijarsct.co.in DOI: 10.48175/IJARSCT-23139



364



International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)

International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

Volume 5, Issue 3, January 2025

[3] Debasish Nath1, M S Sowmya2 1Student, Dept. of MCA, Bangalore Institute of Technology, Bengaluru, India 2Asst. Professor, Dept. of MCA, Bangalore Institute of Technology, Bengaluru, IndiaAn Efficient Spam Detection Technique for IOT Devices using Machine LearningISSN (O) 2393-8021, ISSN (P) 2394-1588

[4] Sidharth S*1, Vasantha S*2 *1Dept. of MCA, Sir M Visvesvaraya Institute of Technology, Bengaluru, India. *2Dept. of MCA, Faculty of MCA, Sir M Visvesvaraya Institute of Technology, Bengaluru, India. AN EFFICIENT SPAM DETECTION TECHNIQUE FOR IOT DEVICES USING MACHINE LEARNINGe-ISSN: 2582-5208

[5] D. Shine Rajesh, C. Sindhu, Ch. Nandini, Ch. Rajnandini 1. Assistant Professor, Department of Information Technology, Malla Reddy Engineering College For Women(UGC-Autonomous), Hyderabad, India.An Efficient Spam Detection Technique For IOT devices Using Machine LearningInternational Journal of Engineering and Techniques -Volume 8 Issue 5, October 2022

[6] Shi, Y., Wang, Z., Wang, X., & Zhang, S. (2015). Internet of things application to monitoring plant disease and insect pests. In 2015 International conference on Applied Science and Engineering Innovation. Atlantis Press, 31-34.

[7] Lakshmi, K., & Gayathri, S. (2017). Implementation of IoT with image processing in plant growth monitoring system. Journal of Scientific and Innovative Research, 6(2), 80-83.

[8] Sai, V. P., Ponnammal, T. A., & Rithvikikaran, (2017). Arduino Based Pest Control Using Real Time Environmental Monitoring Sensors. International Journal of Advanced Scientific Research and Management, 2(4), 6-9.

[9] A. Makkar, S. Garg, N. Kumar, M. S. Hossain, A. Ghoneim and M. Alrashoud, "An Efficient Spam Detection Technique for IoT Devices Using Machine Learning," in IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 903-912, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.1109/TII.2020.2968927.

[10] F. Hossain, M. N. Uddin and R. K. Halder, "Analysis of Optimized Machine Learning and Deep Learning Techniques for Spam Detection," 2021 IEEE International IOT, Electronics and Mechatronics Conference (IEMTRONICS), 2021, pp. 1-7.

[11] A. Makkar, U. Ghosh, P. K. Sharma and A. Javed, "A Fuzzy-based approach to Enhance Cyber Defence Security for Next-generation IoT," in IEEE Internet of Things Journal, doi: 10.1109/JIOT.2021.3053326.

[12] Z.-K. Zhang, M. C. Y. Cho, C.-W. Wang, C.-W. Hsu, C.-K. Chen, and S. Shieh, "Iot security: ongoing challenges and research opportunities," in 2014 IEEE 7th international conference on service-oriented computing and applications. IEEE, 2014, pp. 230-234.

[13] C. Zhang and R. Green, "Communication security in internet of thing: preventive measure and avoid ddos attack over iot network," in Proceedings of the 18th Symposium on Communications & Networking. Society for Computer Simulation International, 2015, pp. 8–15.

[14] W. Kim, O.-R. Jeong, C. Kim, and J. So, "The dark side of the internet: Attacks, costs and responses," Information systems, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 675–705, 2011.

[15] Nurul FitriahRusland, Norfaradilla Wahid, Shahreen Kasim, HanayantiHafit, "Analysis of Naive Bayes Algorithm for Email Spam Filtering across Multiple Datasets".

