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## Passwords are ubiquitous



## Billions of passwords leaked

- "Our dataset currently contains 953,894 incidents, of which 254,968 are confirmed breaches" [DBIR 2023].
- About $86 \%$ of basic web application attacks were due to stolen passwords.
- Poorly picked (weak) and protected passwords continue to be one of the major sources of breaches.


The network of Colonial Pipeline breach


The celebrity photos leakage

## OPM HACK

### 5.6 MILLION

Federal Employees' Fingerprints Stolen
5.6 million users' fingerprint data breach

## Password strength: resistance to guessing attempts

How much security strength can passwords actually provide?

How to guess the user's password with the least number of guesses?


Password: the first line of defense against cyber attacks on a system.

## Password guessing scenarios

## - Trawling guessing

- The attacker generates the same password guessing dictionary for all target users.


123456
a123456
3123456789
4111111
$5 \quad 5201314$
6123123
7 a321654
812345
9000000
$10123456 a$
1112345678
121314520
13 aaaaaa
14 9q123456
157758521
16 woaini1314
17123321
18 a123456789
191234567
20 qq123456

## Password guessing scenarios

- Targeted guessing
- The attacker generates a corresponding attack dictionary for each target user.


[^0]
## Where is classical machine learning?

- 2005 Markov [Narayanan-Shmatikov, ACM CCS 2005] 2009 PCFG [Weir et al., IEEE S\&P 2009]
- 2014 Smoothing and regularization techniques [Ma et al., IEEE S\&P 2014]
- 2016 RNN [Melicher et al., USENIX Security 2016]
- 2019 PassGAN [Hitja et al., ACNS 2019]
- 2021 AdaMs [Pasquini et al., USENIX Security 2021]
- 2021 CPG/DPG [Pasquini et al., IEEE S\&P 2021]
- 2021 Chunk-level [Xu et al. ACM CCS 2021]


## Research on password guessing

| Types of password models <br> and typical representatives | Success <br> rate | Efficiency | Interpre- <br> tability | Proposed <br> time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Statistical-based (PCFG, Markov) | Mid | High | High | 2009- |
| Deep learning-based (RNN) | Mid | Low | Low | 2016- |
| Classical machine learning (SVM) | Unknown | Mid? | Mid? | Yet to be studied |

## $\square$ Research questions

■ Can classical machine learning techniques be used to design password models?

- If it is possible, how can these techniques be used for typical guessing scenarios?

■ Whether password guessing models based on classical machine learning techniques can improve the guessing success rate?

## Design challenges

$\square$ Password guessing is different from traditional NLP tasks.
E.g., il0veu4ever (with the semantic love you forever);
$\square$ Cracking passwords requires an exact match: Any vagueness will not succeed. E.g., P@sswor123 and p@ssword123;
$\square$ How to construct and select features to ensure the effectiveness of machine learning algorithms?

## Password guessing modeling

$\square$ Modeling password generation as a Multi-Classification problem
■ Our work makes the same assumption with the well-known Markov model: Each character in the password is only related to the previous characters.


## Password feature construction

## $\square$ Feature construction method

- Each character is represented by 4-dimensional features: (Character type, Character serial number, Row number of the keyboard, Column number of the keyboard)
- The entire n-order string uses additional 2 dimensions to represent the current length feature: (position of the character in a password, position of the character in the current segment)
- Each 6-order string is represented as a $26(=6 \times 4+2)$ dimensional feature vector


Length feature
$[(3,23,2,2)(3,5,2,3)$
$(3,18,2,4)$
(1, 6, 1, 6)
$(1,5,1,5)$
(1, 4, 1, 4)
$(7,3)]$
$(3,23,2,2)=($ Letter, w ranks 23rd among a~z, w is at row 2 of the keyboard, w is at column 2 of the keyboard)
$(7,3)=($ length(qwer654), length(654) $)$

## RFGuess: a trawling password model

$\square$ Use the decision tree for password prefix classification.


## RFGuess: a trawling password model

$\square$ Vote on character classification results with random forest.
$\square$ The remaining password generation process is the same as the Markov model.


## Experimental setup

$\square 13$ password datasets: 5 Chinese datasets and 8 English datasets

- Small-scale training set: 10,000, 100,000, and 1 million Rockyou
- Large-scale training set: $75 \%$ of 000 Webhost ( $\sim 10$ million)
$\square$ Two test scenarios: intra-site guessing and cross-site guessing scenarios

Table 1: Basic information about our 13 password datasets. ${ }^{\dagger}$

| Dataset | Web service | Language | When leaked | Total PWs | Length $>30$ | Removed \% | Unique PWs | With PII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Taobao | E-commerce | Chinese | Feb., 2016 | 15,072,418 | 88 | 0.01\% | 11,633,759 |  |
| 126 | Email | Chinese | Oct., 2015 | 6,392,568 | 621 | 0.23\% | 3,764,740 |  |
| Dodonew | E-commerce | Chinese | Dec., 2011 | 16,283,140 | 13,4758 | 0.15\% | 10,135,260 |  |
| CSDN | Programmer | Chinese | Dec., 2011 | 6,428,632 | 0 | 0.01\% | 4,037,605 |  |
| Wishbone | Social | English | Jan., 2020 | 10,092,037 | 250 | 0.01\% | 5,933,902 |  |
| Mate 1 | Dating website | English | Mar., 2016 | 27,401,505 | 12,430 | 0.06\% | 11,916,080 |  |
| 000Webhost | Web hosting | English | Oct., 2015 | 15,299,907 | 4,159 | 0.76\% | 10,526,769 |  |
| Yahoo | Web portal | English | July, 2012 | 453,491 | 0 | 2.35\% | 342,510 |  |
| LinkedIn | Job hunting | English | Jan., 2012 | 54,656,615 | 17,162 | 0.22\% | 34,282,741 |  |
| Rockyou | Social forum | English | Dec., 2009 | 32,603,387 | 3,140 | 0.07\% | 14,326,970 |  |
| 12306 | Train ticketing | Chinese | Dec., 2014 | 129,303 | 129,303 | 0 | 117,808 | $\checkmark$ |
| ClixSense | Paid task platform | English | Sep., 2016 | 2,222,045 | 0 | 0 | 1,628,018 | $\checkmark$ |
| Rootkit | Hacker forum | English | Feb., 2011 | 69,330 | 5 | 0.01\% | 56,835 | $\checkmark$ |

${ }^{\dagger}$ PW stands for password, and PII for personally identifiable information. We clean up passwords longer than 30 and containing non-ASCII codes.

## Experimental results



Table 7: Performance of different models. ${ }^{\dagger}$

| Model | RFGuess | PCFG [69] | 3-order Markov [42] | FLA [43] |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Training time | 0.3 h | 24 s | 102 s | 16 h |
| Model size | 4.5 G | 93.2 M | 1.4 G | 5.8 M |
| Generated PW/s | 130 | 82,372 | 13,303 | 2,500 |

CPU: Xeon silver 4210R 2.4GHz; GPU: GeForce RTX 3080 (5M dataset).

$\square$ RFGuess achieves a guessing success rate comparable to deep learning-based methods (FLA) and outperforms other statistical-based guessing methods.
$\square$ RFGuess suffers from the drawbacks of slow password generation speed and high memory consumption.

## RFGuess-PII: a targeted password model

$\square$ PII matching disambiguation


ID: wang123@foo.com ; name: Wang Lei; birthday: 1980.01.23

- We propose a PII matching algorithm based on the principle of minimum information entropy

PW1: R1 R2 R3
PW2: R1 R2 R4
PW3: R1 R5
PW4: R2 R3
PW5: R1 R8 R9

1. Exhaustively enumerate all possible representations for all passwords;
2. Count all representations, sort globally by frequency, and take out the representation with the most frequency as the priority representation (such as R1);
3. Update the frequency, and then take out the representation with the most frequency among the remaining representations, as the second priority representation (such as R2), and iterate until the frequency of all representations is 1.

## Password feature construction (PII)

The feature construction method is similar to RFGuess$\square$ The differences lies:

- A string containing personal information is regarded as a Pll segment.
- E.g., Wang.1980: Wang and 1980 are each regarded as a complete segment, represented by four-dimensional features: (personal information type, personal information serial number, 0, 0).
- Here the last two 0s are to align with the feature of ordinary characters.


Length feature $[(0,0,0,0)(0,0,0,0)(10,1001,0,0)(1,1,1,1)(1,2,1,2)(1,3,1,3)(4,3)]$

An ordinary character

## Datasets and experimental setup (PII)

$\square$ Dataset: 6 password datasets, including 4~6 kinds of PII
Table 2: Basic information about our PII datasets.

| Dataset | Language | Items num | Types of PII useful for this work |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| 12306 | Chinese | 129,303 | Email, User name, Name, Birthday, Phone |
| CSDN | Chinese | 77,216 | Email, User name, Name, Birthday, Phone |
| Dodonew | Chinese | 161,517 | Email, User name, Name, Birthday, Phone |
| ClixSense | English | $2,222,045$ | Email, User name, Name, Birthday |
| 000Webhost | English | 79,580 | Email, User name, Name, Birthday |
| Rootkit | English | 69,418 | Email, User name, Name, Birthday |

$\square$ Experimental setup

- Intra-site guessing scenarios: e.g., 50\% PII-12306 $\rightarrow$ 50\% PII-12306
- Cross-site guessing scenarios: e.g., $50 \%$ PII-12306 $\rightarrow 50 \%$ PII-Dodonew


## Experimental results (PII)

$\square$ Within 100 guesses, the guessing success rate of RFGuess-PII is 20\%~28\%;
$\square$ RFGuess-PII outperforms existing models by $7 \% \sim 13 \%$ within 1,000 guesses.






(c) $50 \%$ PII-Dodonew $\rightarrow 50 \%$ PII-CSDN


Intra-site guessing scenarios
Cross-site guessing scenarios

## RFGuess-Reuse: a reuse model

| Username | Password |
| :---: | :---: |
| zhangsan | abc334bca <br> Abc334bca123 |
| lisi001 | Qwerdf <br> $123456 q w e r d f$ |
| $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |

Users' password pairs


Count the structure-level operations of password pairs in the train set
(e.g., L8D5 $\rightarrow$ L7S2)

$$
\text { PW1 }=\mathrm{abc} 334 \mathrm{bca} \longleftrightarrow \operatorname{Pr}\left(p w_{1} \rightarrow p w_{2}\right)=\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} \operatorname{Pr}\left(P P_{p w_{1} \rightarrow p w_{2}}^{i}\right)\right) * p_{n}
$$

$$
\longrightarrow
$$



Predicting the segment-level operations using the random forest model
(e.g., passwor $\rightarrow$ password)

| Guesses | Prob. |
| :---: | :---: |
| abc334bca1 | 0.6 |
| abc334bca123 | 0.2 |
| abc34 | 0.1 |
| $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |

## Datasets and experimental setup (Reuse)

$\square$ Dataset: 8 datasets containing password pairs (obtained through email match)
Table 4: Basic information about password reuse datasets.

| Dataset | Language | Items | \# Same <br> password pair | \# Similar <br> password pair |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| CSDN $\rightarrow 126$ | Chinese | 195,832 | 62,686 | 47,690 |
| CSDN $\rightarrow 12306$ | Chinese | 12,635 | 7,079 | 2,815 |
| $12306 \rightarrow$ Dodonew | Chinese | 49,775 | 35,395 | 9,386 |
| CSDN $\rightarrow$ Dodonew | Chinese | 5,997 | 2,040 | 1,597 |
| 000Webhost $\rightarrow$ Clixsense | English | 150,273 | 35,470 | 41,731 |
| 000Webhost $\rightarrow$ LinkedIn | English | 231,452 | 50,875 | 52,731 |
| 000Webhost $\rightarrow$ Yahoo | English | 36,936 | 5,960 | 6,303 |
| 000Webhost $\rightarrow$ Matel | English | 51,942 | 7,613 | 25,504 |

${ }^{\dagger}$ Similar means the similarity score is within $[0.5,1.0]$, and it is calculated as $s=1-\operatorname{EditDistance}(p w 1, p w 2) / \max (|p w 1|,|p w 2|)$.
$\square$ Experimental setup
$\square A \rightarrow B$ means that: A user's password at service A can be used by an attacker to help attack this user's account at service $B$.
$\square$ CSDN $\rightarrow 126$ is the training set for Chinese attack scenarios.
$\square$ 000Webhost $\rightarrow$ ClixSense is the training set for English attack scenarios.

## Experimental results (Reuse)

$\square$ RFGuess-Reuse is comparable to existing leading models within 1,000 guesses

Table 5: Comparison of three password reuse models.

| Experimental setup |  | RFGuess-Reuse | $\begin{gathered} \text { Pass2- } \\ \text { path [45] } \end{gathered}$ | TarGuess-II [64] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Guessing scenario | Guess number |  |  |  |
| CSDN $\rightarrow 12306$ | 10 | 68.41\% | 68.80\% | 68.13\% |
|  | 100 | 73.09\% | 70.72\% | 73.19\% |
|  | 1,000 | 75.86\% | 72.16\% | 75.57\% |
| CSDN $\rightarrow$ Dodonew | 10 | 48.59\% | 48.82\% | 48.44\% |
|  | 100 | 53.86\% | 51.79\% | 54.56\% |
|  | 1,000 | 57.71\% | 53.84\% | 57.58\% |
| $12306 \rightarrow$ Dodonew | 10 | 84.14\% | 83.44\% | 84.11\% |
|  | 100 | 86.00\% | 85.69\% | 86.34\% |
|  | 1,000 | 87.65\% | 86.78\% | 87.58\% |
| 000webhost $\rightarrow$ Mate 1 | 10 | 27.70\% | 25.11\% | 30.17\% |
|  | 100 | 31.29\% | 26.42\% | $32.14 \%$ |
|  | 1,000 | 33.77\% | 27.73\% | $34.37 \%$ |
| 000webhost $\rightarrow$ LinkedIn | 10 | 35.67\% | 32.65\% | 36.17\% |
|  | 100 | $37.77 \%$ | $34.06 \%$ | $38.16 \%$ |
|  | 1,000 | 39.52\% | 35.69\% | 39.72\% |
| 000webhost $\rightarrow$ Yahoo | 10 | 26.53\% | 24.84\% | 27.12\% |
|  | 100 | 28.59\% | 25.87\% | 28.69\% |
|  | 1,000 | 30.13\% | 26.99\% | 30.19\% |


(a) $12306 \xrightarrow{\text { Guess number }}$ Dodonew.

(d) 000Webhost $\rightarrow$ Mate

(b) CSDN $\xrightarrow{\text { Guess number }}$ Dodonew.

(e) $000 \mathrm{Webhost} \rightarrow$ LinkedIn

(c) $\begin{aligned} & \text { Guess number } \\ & \rightarrow 12306 \text {. }\end{aligned}$

(f) 000 Webhost $\rightarrow$ Yahoo.

## General applicability

$\square$ Our password character encoding method is applicable to a series of supervised algorithms that can tackle multi-classification problems.
$\square$ Among these supervised algorithms, boosting method performs well.

(a) 0.5 M CSDN $\rightarrow$ CSDN_rest

(b) $50 \%$ PII-CSDN $\rightarrow 50 \%$ PII-CSDN

## Thank you!
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