

Real-PGDN: A Two-level Classification Method for Full-Process Recognition of Newly Registered Pornographic and Gambling Domain Names

Hao Wang¹, Yingshuo Wang², Junang Gan³, Yanan Cheng^{4*},
Jinshuai Zhang⁵

^{1*}School of Computer Science and Technology, Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin, 150001, Heilongjiang, China.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): chengyn@hit.edu.cn;
Contributing authors: hopehaowang@gmail.com;
wangyingshuo@foxmail.com; ganjunang@gmail.com;
zhangjs0711@gmail.com;

Abstract

Online pornography and gambling have consistently posed regulatory challenges for governments, threatening both personal assets and privacy. Therefore, it is imperative to research the classification of the newly registered Pornographic and Gambling Domain Names (PGDN). However, scholarly investigation into this topic is limited. Previous efforts in PGDN classification pursue high accuracy using ideal sample data, while others employ up-to-date data from real-world scenarios but achieve lower classification accuracy. This paper introduces the Real-PGDN method, which accomplishes a complete process of timely and comprehensive real-data crawling, feature extraction with feature-missing tolerance, precise PGDN classification, and assessment of application effects in actual scenarios. Our two-level classifier, which integrates CoSENT (BERT-based), Multilayer Perceptron (MLP), and traditional classification algorithms, achieves a 97.88% precision. The research process amasses the NRD2024 dataset, which contains continuous detection information over 20 days for 1,500,000 newly registered domain names across 6 directions. Results from our case study demonstrate that this method also maintains a forecast precision of over 70% for PGDN that are delayed in usage after registration.

Keywords: two-level classifier, pornographic and gambling domain names, BERT fine-tuning model, MLP, feature analysis

1 Introduction

Domain names are reusable online resources, with hundreds of thousands being registered and reclaimed daily [1]. Within these newly registered domain names (NRD), a significant portion is exploited for pornographic and gambling purposes. Websites in these domains pose substantial harm to users across all age groups and often employ deceptive means to capture users' account information. Many Internet users, due to a lack of security awareness, suffer personal information breaches, resulting in potential financial loss. Thus, the timely, efficient, and accurate recognition of PGDN is paramount for safeguarding cyberspace. Scholarly research on this topic is limited. Earlier studies focused on classifying PGDN with the aim of high accuracy using ideal sample data, while other studies utilized recent real-world data but yielded lower classification accuracy[2, 3]. For the recognition of PGDN, both practical applicability and accuracy are crucial.

In recent years, deep learning has developed rapidly. The classic MLP has gradually played a role in the field of domain name classification, and pre-trained models such as BERT have begun to show their powerful effect in natural language text processing of domain name information. These innovations in deep learning open new possibilities in the domain classification field, which previously relied heavily on traditional classification algorithms. It is worth exploring how to reasonably cooperate with the old and new technologies in the field of PGDN classification and give full play to the best performance.

In addition, the temporal characteristics of domain features are seldom emphasized. New pornographic and gambling domains frequently undergo information changes, such as in DNS and website content, which can be instrumental in domain identification. Moreover, in real-world scenarios, constraints like access restrictions and other objective factors mean the data collected for each domain cannot be complete, necessitating classification methods for PGDN to accommodate missing features.

Accordingly, we propose the Real-PGDN method. Through rapid and comprehensive retrieval of real-world domain-related information, coupled with prolonged tracking to capture time-series attributes, we have compiled a dataset, NRD2024, encompassing information on over 1.5 million NRD. We meticulously extract key features for PGDN, annotate 2,000 domains within the NRD2024 dataset, enhance the data, and train the model. We utilize a BERT-based fine-tuning model, CoSENT, to embed text features, concatenating them with MLP outputs to yield the initial binary classification result. The initial classification result is combined with numerical features and processed with a random forest algorithm to obtain the final classification result. Our method attains over 97% precision and accuracy in recognizing PGDN within real-world data scenarios characterized by missing features. Drawing from the NRD2024 dataset, we annotate 100 domain names with delayed usage for pornographic and gambling purposes and employ the Real-PGDN method for early prediction. The results show that more than 70% of the domain names are forecasted, and more than 80% can be detected within 20 days.

The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- A new method is proposed for detecting PGDN with high accuracy and feature-missing tolerance in real-world scenarios by employing the two-level classification strategy that integrates CoSENT, MLP, and Random Forest algorithms.
- A dataset, NRD2024, is obtained, which contains six-dimensional information on over 1.5 million NRD from August 10 to August 16, 2024. We keep track of each domain name for at least 14 days. The dataset is now publicly accessible on Kaggle¹.
- We conduct a thorough study of the features used for classifying PGDN, recommending a novel set of features suitable for real-world PGDN recognition. This 20-dimensional feature set, derived from six different detecting directions, undergoes secondary processing and selection.

2 The Proposed Real-PGDN Method

A flowchart of the Real-PGDN method is shown in Fig. 1. As illustrated, the proposed method is segmented into two principal components:

The first component (Section 2.1) involves the acquisition of raw data from real-life scenarios. Initially, we obtain daily lists of NRD via the domains-monitor website². These domain names are then inserted into a RabbitMQ message queue. Subsequently, each domain name undergoes 6 detecting tasks within our detection system’s nodes: Site History Records, IP History Records, Certificate Records, DNS Records, WHOIS Records, and HTML Records. After 20 days of continuous detection, we compile the NRD2024 dataset consisting of data on 1.5 million domain names (Section 2.2).




Fig. 1 Flowchart of the Real-PGDN method.

¹www.kaggle.com/datasets/hopehaowang/nrd2024

²domains-monitor.com

The second component encompasses feature engineering and the construction and training of models (Section 2.3). Initially, we conduct an in-depth analysis of features specific to PGDN, identifying 20 key features from the NRD2024 dataset across four feature sets, which include 19 numerical features and one textual feature. The subsequent step involves data annotation and augmentation. We manually annotate 2,000 domain names for training and validation and respectively augment some of the data using deletion and replacement strategies. Then, we use our two-level classification schema to build a PGDN classifier. We employ the CoSENT model for textual feature embedding and utilize a Multilayer Perceptron to complete the first level of classification. We blend the Level 1 result with the 19 numerical features and apply traditional classification algorithms for secondary classification to obtain the Level 2 result. In Section 3.1, we will evaluate the adaptability of various traditional classification methods to our model architecture.

2.1 Data Collection

2.1.1 Comprehensiveness requirements

Our objective is to gather the most comprehensive information on NRD to facilitate PGDN feature analysis, thereby identifying the most effective feature combinations. Algorithm 1 shows the pseudocode of the detection process.

We perform a detection every 24 hours across the following dimensions: (1) DNS Records: We perform standard DNS queries using programmatic interfaces with default parameters, covering all common types such as A, AAAA, NS, MX, CNAME, SOA, and TXT for each domain name. (2) IP History Records: Based on DNS-A records (IPv4 addresses) obtained from prior queries, we utilize a third-party platform API³ to compile a list of domain names previously associated with these IP addresses. Given that IP addresses mapped to domain names can change over time, we dynamically update this list throughout the detecting period. (3) HTML Records: By issuing GET requests via HTTPS and HTTP protocols, we gather the complete HTML content of accessible sites associated with each domain, extracting pivotal information such as titles, keywords, and descriptions. (4) Certificate Records: For domains using the HTTPS protocol, we acquire their digital certificate information. Through SSL/TLS protocol wrapping of TCP connections, we extract the digital certificate offered by the target server during the handshake, ultimately parsing it into the X.509 format. Once the certificate is initially detected, detection of this dimension is ceased.

For domain information that remains static over brief periods, we ensure a timely acquisition within our detection cycle: (1) WHOIS Records: We query WHOIS servers via our detection server cluster. (2) Site History Records: Generally, domain usage tends to have continuity. Domains with a history of abuse are less likely to be selected by reputable users in new lifecycles, leading to lower prices. Conversely, domains used for malicious activities have shorter lifetimes, necessitating frequent domain changes, making low-cost domains ideal. Hence, we collect some site history information from a third-party platform⁴.

³api.uouin.com

⁴seo.juziseo.com

Algorithm 1 Detection Process of Domain Name Related Information

```
1: while every 24h do
2:   for each domain in domains do
3:     for each i in DNS record types do
4:       DNSresults[i]  $\leftarrow$  query DNS records of this domain
5:       if i is DNS-A & DNSresults[i] then
6:         IP2DomainList  $\leftarrow$  do IP reverse lookup
7:       end if
8:     end for
9:     htmlPage  $\leftarrow$  send GET Request to this domain
10:    if this site uses HTTPS & Flag = false then
11:      certificate  $\leftarrow$  get certificate of this domain
12:      if certificate  $\neq$  null then
13:        Flag  $\leftarrow$  true
14:      end if
15:    end if
16:  end for
17: end while
18: for each domain in domains do
19:   for each j in other detection directions do
20:     results[j]  $\leftarrow$  conduct specific detection
21:   end for
22: end for
```

2.1.2 Speed requirements

Given our study's necessity to daily acquire each type of information described in Section 2.1.1 for millions of domains, a simple serial detecting model is inadequate for speed requirements. Thus, we devised a distributed detection system leveraging RabbitMQ message queues [4].

This system consists of four hosts: one as the main node and the others as subordinate nodes. All nodes function as detection nodes, utilizing RabbitMQ's producer-consumer model [5] for load balancing. Specifically, the main node hosts a MySQL database and RabbitMQ message queue server, acting as the publisher of pending domain messages and the repository for detection results. Subordinate nodes interact with the main node through RabbitMQ and MySQL remote connections. The system architecture is illustrated in Fig. 2. First, the main node uses the API to acquire new domain data. Second, data is submitted to the main node's RabbitMQ server, where a producer program standardizes the raw domain data. Third, standardized domain data is duplicated across multiple message queues, with each queue containing a complete set of domains for detecting identical information types. Fourth, detection nodes competitively retrieve data from the queues via consumer programs using RabbitMQ. Upon receiving data, each detection node independently detects information relevant to the domain. Fifth, each detection node individually completes the information detection. Finally, results are periodically committed to the MySQL database.




Fig. 2 Architecture of the distributed detection system.

2.2 NRD2024 Dataset

Utilizing the detection system introduced in Section 2.1, we independently completed the data collection for 1,522,363 NRD between August 10 and August 16, 2024, as illustrated in Table 1. For each domain, we conduct detection every 24 hours starting from the day of registration and continuing for 20 days. This ensures that each NRD has at least 14 days of continuous detection data, with domains registered on the first day undergoing 20 days of detection. Fig. 3 depicts the timeline. We ultimately gather over 10 million pieces of information. We also analyze the composition of top-level domains (TLD) within our dataset, revealing that the *.com* domain, as the largest TLD globally, comprises over 50% of the registrations over these 7 days, with other popular TLDs each accounting for less than 5% (See Table 3).




Fig. 3 Detection timeline.

The data we collected are categorized into six record types, each with detailed field names and descriptions, as shown in Table 2.

Table 1 Newly registered domain names over a week.

Date	Number of Domain Names
2024-08-10	284192
2024-08-11	233559
2024-08-12	189098
2024-08-13	160788
2024-08-14	189426
2024-08-15	233122
2024-08-16	232178
Total	1522363

Table 2 Field information of NRD2024 Dataset.

Type	Details	Description
DNS	A	IPv4 address record
	AAAA	IPv6 address record
	CNAME	Canonical name record, which specifies alias names
	MX	Mail exchange record, which routes requests to mail servers
	NS	Name server record, which delegates a DNS zone to an authoritative server
	SOA	Start of authority record, which specifies authoritative information about a DNS zone
	TXT	Human-readable notes or machine-readable data of the domain name
HTML	Title	Title of the website
	Keywords	Keywords of the website
	Description	Description of the website
	Raw HTML	Source code of the website
Certificate	Certificate Issuer	The issuer of the certificate
	Certificate Duration	The period of validity of the certificate
WHOIS	Registration Duration	Duration of this domain name registration
	Registrar	A company, person, or office that manages the reservation of Internet domain names
IP History	Domain Name List	A list of domain names used by this IP
Site History	Age	The age of the website
	Historical Title List	A list of historical titles used by this site

2.3 Feature Analysis of PGDN

This task is based on the data collected in the NRD2024 dataset. We aim to identify features that assist in PGDN classification, which we have divided into four different feature sets, as illustrated in Table 4. We employ a mixture of features newly utilized in the classification of PGDN and some previously used in related fields. The four feature sets are described as follows.

Table 3 Top TLDs in new domain name registration.

TLD	Number of Domain Names
com	778280
shop	59225
top	55432
xyz	53037
online	50063
org	44943
bond	40550
net	40437
uk	32497
OTHER	367899
Total	1522363

Table 4 Real-PGDN Features

FeatureSet	FeatureName	Type
Site Features	Title	string
	IP URL redirection metric	float
	Enumeration of Certificate Issuers	int
	Certificate Duration	int
	Oscillation Metric of DNS-A	float
DNS Features	Oscillation Metric of DNS-AAAA	float
	Oscillation Metric of DNS-NS	int
	The number of domains with the same DNS-CNAME value	float
	DNS-SOA TTL	int
	DNS-SOA Refresh Time	int
	DNS-SOA Retry Time	int
	Whether the domain name has DNS-MX record	bool
	Enumeration of TLD	int
Domain Name Features	Number of vowels in SLD	int
	Number of digits in SLD	int
	Whether the domain name uses IDN	bool
	Enumeration of Domain Name Registrars	int
History Features	Domain name registration duration	int
	Total years of website establishment	int
	The number of domain names that the IP has used	int

2.3.1 Site Features

Site Content Feature Why do we only use titles? We indeed collected the complete HTML file, and the following attempts were made (as shown in Fig. 4):

1. Embed the entire HTML file.
2. Extract the natural language parts from all HTML tags to avoid disruption caused by tags and delimiters and embed them.
3. Extract the natural language parts from all HTML tags, further calculate their respective word frequencies, and do statistical analysis.




Fig. 4 Attempts to extract web page content features.

However, these attempts are found to be minimally helpful for classification, even detrimental. We speculate this might be due to the ambiguous thematic content in HTML’s natural language text, which typically contains a large amount of similar, generic text. Ultimately, we opt to use only the content of the *title* tag, as it usually provides the most concise summary of the page content and shows significant variation between pages. Subsequently, the issue arises with missing *title* tags, which will be addressed in Section 2.5, detailing the text embedding techniques used for titles and strategies for handling title missing.

```

...
<meta http-equiv="refresh" content="3;
URL=http://168.63.207.88">
...
function js_method(obj)
{
    window.location.href = "";
    var theAds = new
    Array(
        "http://20.2.0.234",
        "http://13.94.56.28",
        "http://20.255.153.11",
    );
    shu = theAds.length;
    sx = parseInt(Math.random() * shu);
    var tanurl = theAds[sx];
    top.location.href = tanurl;
}

```

Fig. 5 An example of the IP URL redirection pages.

To enhance the identification of redirect pages serving pornographic and gambling sites, we introduce a feature concerning redirects. First, we count the number of redirect URLs in the HTML file that do not resolve to domain names (as shown in Fig. 5) using regular expressions, then calculate the ratio k of this count m to the total length

of the HTML file string l . We refer to k as *IP URL redirection metric* (as shown in Equation 1)

$$k = \frac{m}{l} = \frac{\text{IP URL Redirection Count}}{\text{Total Length of HTML}} \quad (1)$$

Site Certificate Features A site is considered fully constructed only when we can receive a 200 Status Code via HTTP/HTTPS GET requests. On the other hand, digital certificates are returned by the server side during the TLS/SSL handshake when establishing a client-server connection. We note a gap between the domain registration and the completion of site construction during which we can establish a TLS/SSL connection but cannot access meaningful site content. The difference between the two curves in Fig. 6 highlights this gap. Therefore, we consider extracting TLS/SSL certificates from sites that do not yield meaningful web content, allowing us to analyze them before the sites become fully operational. We extract two features: the certificate issuer and the duration of the certificate.




Fig. 6 Statistics of 1.5 million domain names successfully accessing pages and establishing TLS/SSL connections within 14 days after registration.

2.3.2 DNS Features

In this section, we introduce the use of time-series features of DNS-A/AAAA and DNS-NS in the classification of PGDN for the first time. We also pay attention to two often overlooked DNS records in previous research: DNS-CNAME and DNS-SOA.

Effective Utilization of DNS Time Series We have discovered that pornographic and gambling domains, along with other malicious domains, tend to “oscillate” between a limited set of IP addresses to evade detection. We use our proposed *Oscillating Metric* (as shown in Equation 2) to quantify this phenomenon in the DNS time series. Taking IP addresses as an example, for a given domain name, we calculate the sum c of changes in IP from day i to day $i-1$ using DNS-A/AAAA records, as well as

the total number of different IPs over n days, and then compute the ratio of c to s . We applied this strategy to both DNS-A/AAAA and DNS-NS features.

$$Oscillating\ Metric = \frac{c}{s} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m 1_{\{\text{data}_{ij} \neq \text{Set}_{i-1}\}}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m 1_{\{\text{data}_{ij} \neq \bigcup_{k=1}^i \text{Set}_k\}}} \quad (2)$$

DNS-CNAME and DNS-SOA Records CNAME records facilitate the mapping between different domain names and are commonly used for domain aliases. When multiple domains are set with the same CNAME record, changing the DNS record of the target domain can also alter the DNS records of all domains referencing it. In our detection cycle, NRD possessing CNAME records are rare; statistically, less than 5% of domains are detected with at least one CNAME record. Among these, pornographic and gambling domains constitute the majority, leading us to believe that CNAME records facilitate frequent changes in DNS information for these domains.

To prevent domains that legitimately use CNAME services from being misclassified, we perform some filtering on domain CNAME records. We determine whether a domain has a CNAME record, and for those that do, we conduct reverse queries on the referenced domains and tally the number of records(as shown in Fig. 7).




Fig. 7 Many-to-one mapping of CNAME records for newly registered domain names.

To further delineate the characteristics of the NS servers used by the domains, we also collect DNS-SOA records. The DNS-SOA record is rarely focused on in previous research. It contains key information about the DNS server, such as the administrator’s email address, the refresh time frame of the server, domain update history, etc. We extract the DNS zone’s refresh time, retry time, and the TTL values of the record cache as features.

2.3.3 Domain Name Features and History Features

For domain features, we draw on feature extraction methods used in previous research [6–8]. Domains are divided into TLDs and SLDs, with TLDs being finite and enumerated as features. Since SLDs are often random and lack semantic clarity, we do

not apply NLP techniques to SLDs. Instead, we extract character count features of SLDs. Additionally, we employ some common WHOIS features such as registrars and registration duration.

We consider the history features of domains to complement the three main types of features previously mentioned. The historical usage of a domain determines its reputation, which significantly influences the domain’s future usage. We document the earliest construction records of the domains and use the total years of construction as a feature. We also calculate the number of different IPs used by the domain during the detection period as a second feature, reflecting the historical reputation of the IPs utilized by the domain.

2.4 Data Annotation

We cannot find a blacklist focused exclusively on newly registered PGDN, and most existing institutional data do not cover all such domains. In fact, a significant number of these domains are never tracked or managed. Hence, we do not use data provided by third-party institutions or government agencies. Instead, we opt for random sampling of domains by our experts who then manually annotate them. We set the labels for *Pornography*, *Gambling*, and *Others*. Our annotation relies entirely on the real and real-time web content of the evaluated datasets, i.e. the title and raw HTML parts extracted on the day of crawling. Furthermore, we assign the target page’s label to redirect pages, a task that has to be performed by manually accessing the redirect web pages.

Our labels only indicate the nature of the site content at the moment of data capture. This means a domain may have different labels within a single detection period. For example, a domain might masquerade as a normal site or be under construction during the first n days, and only on *Day $n+1$* be utilized for pornographic and gambling purposes. Thus, our labeled data are divided into two parts: the first 2,000 domains are annotated based on site content from a randomly chosen day; the second part involves manually selected 100 domains registered on August 10, 2024, each annotated daily throughout the 20-day detection period, with these domains exhibiting real label changes during the detection cycle(as shown in Fig. 8).




Fig. 8 The second part of the annotation. This part of the domain names are annotated for 20 days.

2.5 Highly Adaptive Classification of PGDN

2.5.1 Data Augmentation

Models trained and tested on ideal data often perform poorly when applied to real-world scenarios; thus, we opt to use real-world scraped data for training. To meet the recognition requirements of real data, we implement additional enhancements. First, regarding textual features, we observe a high degree of homogeneity despite the large number of domain names collected, making blind annotation for larger datasets unproductive. Some pornographic and gambling websites use human-recognizable obfuscated or slightly disordered natural language text to disguise their page titles and evade detection. Second, for numerical features, missing data poses a major challenge due to the diversity and multiplicity of these features. We enhance the data using strategies outlined in Table 5. (1) **Discarding**: Select 400 records with complete textual features and remove their textual features. (2) **Randomly Zeroing**: Randomize zeroing of up to five out of 19 numerical features for 1,500 records. (3) **Random Replacement**: Randomly replace text characters for 100 records with textual features. Table 6 shows some examples of our data augmentation method. Ultimately, we obtain 4,000 records.

Table 5 Data augmentation methods and their proportions.

Method	Proportion
Discarding Text Features	20%
Randomly Zeroing of Numerical Feature	75%
Random Replacement of Text Letters	5%

Table 6 Data augmentation methods and their examples.

Method	Textual Feature	Numerical Features				
Original	“Porn”	1	2	...	3	
Method1	null	1	2	...	3	
Method2 Result1	“Porn”	0	2	...	3	
Method2 Result2	“Porn”	1	0	...	3	
Method2 Result3	“Porn”	1	1	...	0	
Method3	“P0*n”	1	2	...	3	

2.5.2 Our Two-level Classification Schema For PGDN

Currently, a dataset of 4,000 entries is obtained for training and validation, each comprising 19 numerical features and one textual feature (i.e., the *title*). Next, we employ our proposed two-level classification schema for PGDN, which integrates the CoSENT model, MLP model, and traditional classification algorithms to establish a PGDN classifier.

Initially, we utilize natural language processing techniques to extract features from the *title*. Historically, feature extraction in text relied on manually constructed features

and simple text statistics like word frequency. Subsequently, word embedding techniques, most notably the *word2vec* algorithm [9], gained prominence. With the advent of deep learning, context-based embedding techniques emerged, and the BERT model, based on the Transformer architecture, achieved remarkable success. Sentence-BERT (SBERT)[10], proposed by Reimers and Gurevych, is more suitable for sentence-level tasks than BERT. In 2024, Huang et al. introduced CoSENT, which replaces SBERT’s Cross-entropy Loss with Cosine Similarity Loss (see Equation 3 and Equation 4) [11, 12], yielding better text embedding performance. In this study, we use CoSENT to embed the textual feature to obtain a 384-dimensional vector.

$$\text{Loss}_{\text{SBERT}} = \max(|s_a - s_p| - |s_a - s_n| + \epsilon, 0) \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Loss}_{\text{CoSENT}} = \log \left(1 + \sum_{(i,j) \in \Omega_{\text{pos}}, (k,l) \in \Omega_{\text{neg}}} e^{\lambda(\cos(u_k, u_l) - \cos(u_i - u_j))} \right) \quad (4)$$

Then, we consider incorporating the Multilayer Perceptron (MLP). The Multilayer Perceptron, also known as the Artificial Neural Network (ANN), is a type of feed-forward neural network [13]. In this paper, we will use it to build a classifier. Fig. 9 illustrates potential combinations of NLP and MLP for domain classification. The architecture shown on the left side of Fig. 9 has been used for domain classification [14], which segregates numerical and textual features, embeds them separately with MLP and NLP models, and finally applies an independent machine learning classification algorithm. However, our experiments show poor classification results when simply inputting NLP output into a machine learning algorithm. Moreover, for numerical features, machine learning generally requires no additional processing. Our proposed architecture (shown on the right side of Fig. 9) emphasizes the role of MLP, where normalized numerical features and embedded textual feature vectors are fed into the MLP, directly outputting binary classification results through fully connected layers. However, this strategy of mixing feature vectors with no practical meaning and numerical features with practical meaning is illogical.




Fig. 9 Potential combinations of NLP and MLP for domain classification.

Inspired by the above two architectures, we developed our two-level classification schema (as shown in Fig. 10). Initially, CoSENT NLP model outputs are connected

to the MLP classifier for the preliminary classification of textual features. Fig. 11 details the parameters of the MLP. As illustrated, MLP receives CoSENT outputs and performs the first classification via its two hidden layers and an output layer. Subsequently, all 19 numerical features, along with the binary initial classification result (0 or 1), are input into a separate machine learning classifier for the final classification. Classical machine learning classifiers can be flexibly adapted to real conditions. Additionally, our two-level classification schema is better suited to handle scenarios with randomly missing features. In the absence of textual features, the first classification is bypassed, and a 0 is output, ensuring that missing text features do not significantly affect classification outcomes, thereby achieving robust PGDN recognition.




Fig. 10 Our two-level classification schema

3 Result

3.1 Evaluation

In classification models, it is imperative to delineate between positive and negative data. In this paper, we define PGDN as positive samples, while others (let's call them benign domains for now) as negative samples. True positives (TP) represent correctly predicted PGDN, false positives (FP) indicate incorrectly predicted such domains, true negatives (TN) are rightly predicted benign domains, and false negatives (FN) represent erroneously predicted benign domains. We employ accuracy, precision,




Fig. 11 Model parameters of our MLP classifier.

recall, and F1-score as evaluation parameters, with Equation 5,6,7,8 depicted below. Accuracy measures the ratio of correctly classified predictions to the total number of predictions; precision quantifies the ratio of true positive samples to all predicted positive results; recall indicates the proportion of actual positive samples that are correctly predicted; and the F1-score is the weighted harmonic mean of precision and recall, taking both false positives and false negatives into account.

$$Accuracy = \frac{TP + TN}{TP + FP + TN + FN} \quad (5)$$

$$Precision = \frac{TP}{TP + FP} \quad (6)$$

$$Recall = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \quad (7)$$

$$F1 = \frac{2 * Precision * Recall}{Precision + Recall} \quad (8)$$

Our testing can be divided into three stages. Initially, we assess the classification effectiveness of SVM (Support Vector Machine), DT (Decision Tree), and RF (Random Forest) on numerical features, which is the most common method in previous research. Next, we incorporate textual features and conduct one set of experiments using the schema illustrated in Fig. 9, which integrates NLP and MLP. Finally, we evaluate the performance of the two-level classification schema, adopting the same classical classification algorithms for comparative transparency in results. To mitigate the effects of randomness, we average the results over five tests. The detailed results are shown in Table 7.

The test results suggest that using MLP to classify the title followed by integrating numerical features with Random Forest yields the best outcomes, with an accuracy of 0.9746, precision of 0.9788, recall of 0.9474, and an F1-score of 0.9628. While Random

Table 7 Evaluation results for different models.

Method	Evaluation	Number of Experiments					Average
		1	2	3	4	5	
SVM (No Title)	Accuracy	0.8538	0.8530	0.8701	0.8600	0.8608	0.8595
	Precision	0.8110	0.8310	0.8272	0.8177	0.8256	0.8225
	Recall	0.7567	0.7558	0.7578	0.7663	0.7568	0.7587
	F1-score	0.7829	0.7916	0.7910	0.7912	0.7897	0.7893
DT (No Title)	Accuracy	0.9028	0.9168	0.9036	0.9005	0.9082	0.9064
	Precision	0.8815	0.8527	0.8575	0.8495	0.8394	0.8561
	Recall	0.8322	0.9065	0.8689	0.8822	0.8876	0.8755
	F1-score	0.8562	0.8788	0.8631	0.8655	0.8628	0.8653
RF (No Title)	Accuracy	0.9572	0.9603	0.9635	0.9627	0.9650	0.9617
	Precision	0.9606	0.9500	0.9732	0.9652	0.9539	0.9606
	Recall	0.9091	0.9246	0.9174	0.9265	0.9431	0.9241
	F1-score	0.9341	0.9371	0.9445	0.9455	0.9485	0.9419
CoSENT + MLP	Accuracy	0.9386	0.9440	0.9362	0.9355	0.9401	0.9389
	Precision	0.9063	0.9260	0.9039	0.9020	0.9050	0.9086
	Recall	0.9204	0.9137	0.9159	0.9159	0.9270	0.9186
	F1-score	0.9133	0.9198	0.9099	0.9089	0.9158	0.9135
CoSENT + MLP + SVM	Accuracy	0.8678	0.8655	0.8834	0.8802	0.8663	0.8726
	Precision	0.8363	0.8544	0.8354	0.8484	0.8212	0.8391
	Recall	0.7552	0.7617	0.7952	0.7904	0.7548	0.7715
	F1-score	0.7937	0.8054	0.8148	0.8184	0.7866	0.8038
CoSENT + MLP + DT	Accuracy	0.9456	0.9479	0.9456	0.9479	0.9495	0.9473
	Precision	0.9361	0.9055	0.9426	0.9344	0.9373	0.9312
	Recall	0.9071	0.9379	0.8955	0.9110	0.9089	0.9121
	F1-score	0.9213	0.9215	0.9184	0.9225	0.9229	0.9213
CoSENT + MLP + RF	Accuracy	0.9712	0.9759	0.9782	0.9712	0.9767	0.9746
	Precision	0.9667	0.9860	0.9837	0.9763	0.9812	0.9788
	Recall	0.9519	0.9441	0.9526	0.9385	0.9499	0.9474
	F1-score	0.9592	0.9646	0.9679	0.9570	0.9653	0.9628

Forest performs best when solely utilizing numerical features, it is outperformed by the method incorporating textual features, which improved scores by 0.0129, 0.0182, 0.0233, and 0.0209 respectively, thus substantiating the value of textual features. Additionally, independently classifying the title before combining it with MLP for classification surpasses the collective vector approach, with respective improvements of 0.0357, 0.0702, 0.0288, and 0.0493, affirming the efficacy of our two-level classification schema.

Consequently, we select the CoSENT+MLP+RF approach to build our final classification model. Given that the correct prediction of pornographic and gambling domains (TP) is crucial, with benign domains potentially becoming PGDN in the future, precision is more valuable for reference. Our method excels in precision, achieving a rate of 0.9788.

3.2 Analysis of Practical Application

Firstly, we conduct an analysis to determine the proportion of NRD that constitutes PGDN. Utilizing the classifier optimized with CoSENT, MLP, and RF, as detailed in the previous section, we sample 10% (152,236 entries) from the NRD2024 dataset for classification, identifying 29,381 PGDN, accounting for approximately 19.3% (as shown in Fig. 12).




Fig. 12 The proportion of PGDN in NRD2024 sampling data.

Second, we evaluate the proposed classifier in real-world settings. The Real-PGDN method considers various dimensional features of domains, providing potential early prediction of PGDN. Hence, we manually annotate 100 domains from the NRD2024 dataset (Section 2.4), which are later used for pornographic and gambling purposes. During the early period post-registration, these websites are displayed as under construction, parked pages, or disguised “normal” pages. All 100 domain names are registered on August 10, 2024. Fig. 13 shows the timeline of the detecting period.




Fig. 13 The timeline of the detecting period. The time after registration is divided into “Forecast” and “Delay” by “Date of Change”. In the forecast period, 100% means complete prediction, and 0% means just prediction.

Our statistical results (as shown in Fig. 14) show that approximately 71% of PGDN are successfully forecasted, while 13% are detected on the day their page “turned bad”. Since we do not possess data beyond the 20-day window for subsequent prediction, domains not detected on the given day are uniformly marked as delayed. Fig. 15 illustrates PGDN changes and detection trends. The blue curve shows the cumulative quantity of the PGDN with pages that have turned bad, the green curve presents the




Fig. 14 Classification statistics of sample PGDN data.




Fig. 15 Statistics of PGDN changes, PGDN forecast, and PGDN detection.

cumulative forecast of PGDN, and the red line illustrates the PGDN detection status after their pages have turned bad. We also analyze the lead time of PGDN predictions (as shown in Fig. 16). Given that the actual date of usage for pornographic and gambling purposes varies among domains, we quantify the lead time using Equation 9.

$$Forecast\ Rate = \frac{Days\ in\ advance}{Date\ of\ change - Registration\ Date} \quad (9)$$




Fig. 16 Statistics of the Forecast Rate of PGDN sampling data.

4 Related Works

4.1 Two-level Classifier

A two-level classifier customarily comprises two hierarchical levels: the primary classifier executes preliminary categorization, whereas the secondary classifier conducts a more granular classification upon the initial outcomes. This methodology enhances the classifier’s flexibility, accuracy, and adaptability. Some of the applications are as follows. Czyz et al. [15] pioneered the integration of multiple classifiers in the domain of facial recognition. Zhang and Duin [16] meticulously examined a variety of fusion strategies across different classifier combinations and conducted experiments across varying sample sizes. Song et al. [17] utilized a two-level classifier to achieve more precise image categorization. In the field of credit risk assessment, Marqués et al. [18] employed a two-level classifier. In recent research, Chakravarthy and Rajaguru [19] successfully applied a two-level classifier in medical radiographic imaging for disease identification; Koshta and Singh [20] utilized a two-level classification system, comprising KNN and CNN, for health prediction based on lung sounds. Predominantly, these studies employ secondary classifiers in image recognition. We have extended this dual-classification technique to the domain of domain name categorization, incorporating adjustments to the classifiers in accord with the distinctive characteristics of domain name data.

4.2 Malicious Domain Classification

Popular malicious domain classification methods can be divided into two categories: traditional machine learning methods and the burgeoning deep learning methods. Typically, domain classification segregates domains into malicious and benign categories. Malicious domains encompass phishing domains, malware distribution domains, illegal content hosting domains, spam domains, etc., often focusing on one or more specific subcategories. Davuth and Kim [21] classified primarily botnet-related malicious domains using the Support Vector Machine (SVM). Cheng et al. [22] compared the performance of the Logistic Regression, Random Forest, and AdaBoost algorithms for malicious domain classification based on WHOIS data. Silva et al. [23] compared various machine learning algorithms, including Random Forest and Logistic Regression, to study malicious hosting domains systematically. In their research on newly registered malicious domains, Silveira et al. [24] deployed machine learning algorithms, including optimized ones like XGBoost and LightGBM. Yang et al. [25] proposed N-Trans, integrating N-gram methods with transformer models, yielding impressive results in malicious domain classification. Vranken and Alizadeh [26] combined machine learning and deep learning for DGA domain detection. The research most analogous to ours is by Colhak et al. [14]. They utilized two different NLP models for embedding webpage contents and titles and embedded numerical features through MLP before using a linear classifier for categorizing spam and phishing domains. While we adopted their idea of NLP model embeddings, we questioned their rationale for separately processing numerical features with MLP before continuing classification with classical algorithms. Ultimately, we converged upon an integrated approach using NLP, MLP, and classical classification algorithms, balancing accuracy and adaptability to real-world scenarios.

4.3 Feature Analysis of NRD

Commonly analyzed domain features include textual attributes, DNS records, site content, and WHOIS records. Many studies have utilized textual features of domain names [6–8], [27]. Silveira et al. [24] concentrated on using DNS information to detect newly registered malicious domains. Lauinger et al. [28] employed WHOIS data in their study of domain expiration and re-registration. Alowaisheq et al. [29] examined the Domain Take-down process based on DNS data and historical WHOIS features. Soska and Christin [30] explored combining third-party service-provided site and content features. With the widespread adoption of the TLS protocol, research centered on digital certificate features has burgeoned. Sun et al. [2] successfully classified gambling domains using textual and digital certificate features of websites. The study most closely related to this paper is Berenschot’s research in 2024 [3], which classified malicious domains using a combination of features, including DNS, digital certificate, site characteristics, etc. This study synthesizes and integrates many features mentioned in the above research, introducing novel features and processing methods.

5 Conclusion

This paper introduces an innovative Real-PGDN method that comprehensively achieves rapid and thorough detection of NRD information, effective extraction of PGDN features, and accurate recognition with fault tolerance for missing features in real-world scenarios. Our NRD2024 dataset consolidates extensive feature information from 1.5 million domains registered in 2024, facilitating future research. The model built upon our two-level classification schema exhibits a precision of 0.9788. Additionally, the case study demonstrates a forecast success rate exceeding 70% for newly registered PGDN that are deferred for sensitive use. This advancement can significantly benefit Internet security by enabling quicker responses to potential threats.

Declarations

- **Funding:** This work is supported by the Shandong Provincial Natural Science Foundation [Grant No. ZR2024QF138], the Scientific Research Innovation Fund of Harbin Institute of Technology [Grant No. IDGAZMZ00210335], and the Young Teacher Development Fund of Harbin Institute of Technology [Grant No. IDGA10002190].
- **Conflict of interest:** All authors disclosed no relevant relationships.
- **Ethics approval:** In this study, all data collection procedures strictly adhered to applicable laws and regulations. The data we gathered were sourced from publicly accessible information resources, negating the need for additional user consent.
- **Consent for publication:** All authors have read and approved the final manuscript and consent to its publication.
- **Data availability:** Data available within the article or its supplementary materials. The datasets generated or analyzed during this study are available in the Kaggle repository, www.kaggle.com/datasets/hopehaowang/nrd2024.
- **Materials availability:** Materials available on request from the authors.
- **Code availability:** Code available on request from the authors.
- **Author contribution:** Hao Wang devised the project, developed the main conceptual ideas, and formulated all technical details. Yingshuo Wang made significant contributions to the experimental part of the paper. Junang Gan and Yanan Cheng contributed to the conceptual ideas. Jinshuai Zhang provided critical feedback on the manuscript.

References

- [1] Lauinger, T., Chaabane, A., Buyukkayhan, A.S., Onarlioglu, K., Robertson, W.: Game of registrars: An empirical analysis of {Post-Expiration} domain name takeovers. In: 26th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 17), pp. 865–880 (2017)
- [2] Sun, G., Ye, F., Chai, T., Zhang, Z., Tong, X., Prasad, S.: Gambling domain name recognition via certificate and textual analysis. *The Computer Journal* **66**(8), 1829–1839 (2023)

- [3] Berenschot, L.: Early warning system for newly registered malicious domains: A machine learning and certificate transparency approach. Master’s thesis, University of Twente (2024)
- [4] Ionescu, V.M.: The analysis of the performance of rabbitmq and activemq. In: 2015 14th RoEduNet International Conference-Networking in Education and Research (RoEduNet NER), pp. 132–137 (2015). IEEE
- [5] Simonis, H., Cornelissens, T.: Modelling producer/consumer constraints. In: International Conference on Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming, pp. 449–462 (1995). Springer
- [6] Bilge, L., Sen, S., Balzarotti, D., Kirda, E., Kruegel, C.: Exposure: A passive dns analysis service to detect and report malicious domains. *ACM Transactions on Information and System Security (TISSEC)* **16**(4), 1–28 (2014)
- [7] Maroofi, S., Korczyński, M., Hesselman, C., Ampeau, B., Duda, A.: Comar: classification of compromised versus maliciously registered domains. In: 2020 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P), pp. 607–623 (2020). IEEE
- [8] Shi, Y., Chen, G., Li, J.: Malicious domain name detection based on extreme machine learning. *Neural Processing Letters* **48**(3), 1347–1357 (2018)
- [9] Church, K.W.: Word2vec. *Natural Language Engineering* **23**(1), 155–162 (2017)
- [10] Reimers, N.: Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10084 (2019)
- [11] Zhang, Z., Sabuncu, M.: Generalized cross entropy loss for training deep neural networks with noisy labels. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **31** (2018)
- [12] Xia, P., Zhang, L., Li, F.: Learning similarity with cosine similarity ensemble. *Information sciences* **307**, 39–52 (2015)
- [13] Popescu, M.-C., Balas, V.E., Perescu-Popescu, L., Mastorakis, N.: Multilayer perceptron and neural networks. *WSEAS Transactions on Circuits and Systems* **8**(7), 579–588 (2009)
- [14] Çolhak, F., Ecevit, M.İ., Dağ, H., Creutzburg, R.: Securereg: Combining nlp and mlp for enhanced detection of malicious domain name registrations. In: 2024 International Conference on Electrical, Computer and Energy Technologies (ICECET), pp. 1–6 (2024). IEEE
- [15] Czyz, J., Kittler, J., Vandendorpe, L.: Multiple classifier combination for face-based identity verification. *Pattern recognition* **37**(7), 1459–1469 (2004)

- [16] Zhang, C.-X., Duin, R.P.: An experimental study of one-and two-level classifier fusion for different sample sizes. *Pattern Recognition Letters* **32**(14), 1756–1767 (2011)
- [17] Song, G.-h., Jin, X.-g., Chen, G.-l., Nie, Y.: Two-level hierarchical feature learning for image classification. *Frontiers of Information Technology & Electronic Engineering* **17**(9), 897–906 (2016)
- [18] Marqués, A., García, V., Sánchez, J.S.: Two-level classifier ensembles for credit risk assessment. *Expert Systems with Applications* **39**(12), 10916–10922 (2012)
- [19] Sannasi Chakravarthy, S., Rajaguru, H.: Performance analysis of ensemble classifiers and a two-level classifier in the classification of severity in digital mammograms. *Soft Computing* **26**(22), 12741–12760 (2022)
- [20] Koshta, V., Singh, B.K.: A two-level classifier for prediction of healthy and unhealthy lung sounds using machine learning and convolutional neural network. In: *International Conference on Biomedical Engineering Science and Technology*, pp. 154–168 (2023). Springer
- [21] Davuth, N., Kim, S.-R.: Classification of malicious domain names using support vector machine and bi-gram method. *International Journal of Security and Its Applications* **7**(1), 51–58 (2013)
- [22] Cheng, Y., Chai, T., Zhang, Z., Lu, K., Du, Y.: Detecting malicious domain names with abnormal whois records using feature-based rules. *The Computer Journal* **65**(9), 2262–2275 (2022)
- [23] De Silva, R., Nabeel, M., Elvitigala, C., Khalil, I., Yu, T., Keppitiyagama, C.: Compromised or {Attacker-Owned}: A large scale classification and study of hosting domains of malicious {URLs}. In: *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pp. 3721–3738 (2021)
- [24] Silveira, M.R., Silva, L.M., Cansian, A.M., Kobayashi, H.K.: Detection of newly registered malicious domains through passive dns. In: *2021 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, pp. 3360–3369 (2021). Ieee
- [25] Yang, C., Lu, T., Yan, S., Zhang, J., Yu, X.: N-trans: parallel detection algorithm for dga domain names. *Future Internet* **14**(7), 209 (2022)
- [26] Vranken, H., Alizadeh, H.: Detection of dga-generated domain names with tf-idf. *Electronics* **11**(3), 414 (2022)
- [27] Anand, P.M., Kumar, T.G., Charan, P.S.: An ensemble approach for algorithmically generated domain name detection using statistical and lexical analysis. *Procedia Computer Science* **171**, 1129–1136 (2020)

- [28] Lauinger, T., Onarlioglu, K., Chaabane, A., Robertson, W., Kirda, E.: Whois lost in translation: (mis) understanding domain name expiration and re-registration. In: Proceedings of the 2016 Internet Measurement Conference, pp. 247–253 (2016)
- [29] Alowaisheq, E.: Cracking wall of confinement: Understanding and analyzing malicious domain takedowns. In: The Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS) (2019)
- [30] Soska, K., Christin, N.: Automatically detecting vulnerable websites before they turn malicious. In: 23rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 14), pp. 625–640 (2014)