

WhiteLie: A Robust System for Spoofing User Data in Android Platforms

Harish Yadav Vikas Maurya Abhilash Jindal Vireshwar Kumar

csy217544@iitd.ac.in

vikasmauryaphd@gmail.com

ajindal@cse.iitd.ac.in

viresh@cse.iitd.ac.in

Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

ABSTRACT

Android employs a permission framework that empowers users to either accept or deny sharing their private data (e.g., location) with an app. However, many apps tend to crash when they are denied permission, leaving users no choice but to allow access to their data in order to use the app. In this paper, we introduce a comprehensive and robust user data spoofing system, WhiteLie, that can spoof a variety of user data and feed it to target apps. Additionally, it detects privacy-violating behaviours, automatically responding by supplying spoofed data instead of the user’s real data, without crashing or disrupting the apps. Unlike prior approaches, WhiteLie requires neither device rooting nor altering the app’s binary, making it deployable on stock Android devices. Through experiments on more than 70 popular Android apps, we demonstrate that WhiteLie is able to deceive apps into accepting spoofed data without getting detected. Our evaluation further demonstrates that WhiteLie introduces negligible overhead in terms of battery usage, CPU consumption, and app execution latency. Our findings underscore the feasibility of implementing user-centric privacy-enhancing mechanisms within the existing Android ecosystem.

KEYWORDS

Android Security, Mobile Privacy, Data Spoofing, Permission Abuse, Side-Channel Attacks

1 INTRODUCTION

Android’s open-source nature and vast app ecosystem have contributed to its widespread adoption. For regulating access to sensitive user data, Android employs a permission framework that serves as a gatekeeper [1]. When using an app, the Android permission framework enables users to grant or deny permission for each type of data individually. Unfortunately, the study by Wagner et al. [2] reveals that only 17% of Android users pay attention to permissions while installing/using an app. Once a user grants permission to an app, the permission framework allows unrestricted access to sensitive data, endangering the user’s privacy [1]. If the user




Figure 1: Screenshots illustrating how a user can share spoofed location using WhiteLie with the Uber app.

pays attention to privacy concerns and denies a permission request, the app often blocks access not only to features related to the permission but also to other features that may not require that permission [1]. This leaves the user with no alternative but to provide access to their data.

To enhance user privacy without limiting the app’s functionality, users could be equipped with another option: feeding user-controlled, spoofed data to apps. Figure 1 shows such a case study. In Figure 1a, we observe that even though the user wants to take the cab from the pinned location, Uber encourages the user to share their original location, compromising their privacy. Figure 1b demonstrates how the user can hide their original location and feed the user-specified spoofed location as the current location. This safeguards the user’s privacy while still enabling them to utilize Uber’s service of finding a cab.

Existing approaches for spoofing user data typically rely on either modifying the Android OS [3–5] or rebuilding the target app’s binary [6, 7]. Both strategies suffer from significant usability and deployment limitations. OS-level modification requires rooting the device, a process inaccessible, insecure, and undesirable for most users [8]. Binary rewriting, on the other hand, is fragile and increasingly ineffective: repackaged apps are readily detected by Google’s

Play Integrity API [9], often causing the app to disable its services or refuse to run.

To equip users with a practical tool for preserving their privacy, we build WhiteLie, a comprehensive and robust user data spoofing system for non-rooted, stock Android devices. WhiteLie intercepts permission-protected API calls at runtime and can transparently supply spoofed values for any sensitive data, including location, sensors, microphone, camera metadata, and storage access, without modifying the OS or repackaging the app. Beyond user-configured spoofing, WhiteLie continuously monitors sensitive API usage to detect suspicious or privacy-violating behaviour (e.g., unexpected sensor sampling, background audio recording, covert file uploads) and automatically responds by feeding sanitized data or blocking malicious operations while preserving app functionality.

WhiteLie addresses two core privacy scenarios. First, in a user-driven scenario, privacy-aware users can explicitly configure spoofed values (e.g., fake location, sanitized sensor streams) to be fed to apps while retaining full functionality. Second, in a system-driven scenario, WhiteLie autonomously detects suspicious behaviours such as background audio recording, covert file uploads, or sensor-based side-channel attacks—and proactively protects the user by spoofing or constraining data exfiltration, even when the user is unaware of the ongoing violation.

In our broader study of 70 Android apps, we identify four representative classes of privacy-violating behaviour that WhiteLie successfully detects and mitigates by supplying spoofed data or constraining data exfiltration. A summary of representative use cases is presented in Table 1.

- **User-driven spoofing:** When a user feels uncomfortable sharing real data, they can explicitly invoke WhiteLie to supply spoofed data instead. In our case studies of Uber, Snapchat, and Truecaller, these apps request access to the user's location, images, and text messages, respectively. WhiteLie successfully injects user-configured spoofed data in each case without interrupting or degrading the apps' normal functionality.
- **Unexpected data usage:** In a Facebook case study, WhiteLie detects the app passively recording microphone audio while the user is only scrolling the news feed. WhiteLie mitigates this by supplying benign spoofed audio, preserving privacy. Prior research [13, 14] has reported such audio-based privacy risks, yet users have limited control. Our demonstration video is available on YouTube¹. Other banned apps (Table 4) exhibit similar behaviours, all effectively mitigated by WhiteLie.

- **Side-channel attacks:** While a user interacts with a sensitive app (e.g., a banking application), a concurrently running malicious app can sample motion and other sensors to infer sensitive information such as keyboard input or screen touch positions. We show that WhiteLie can detect and mitigate such sensor-based side-channel attacks by intercepting and supplying spoofed sensor readings to untrusted apps. In a case study with the banned app Gyrosys [12], the touch-position prediction accuracy drops from 81.22% to just 5.36% when WhiteLie is enabled, effectively neutralizing the attack.
- **Protection from malicious apps:** We collectively analyse the various malicious apps (see Table 4). WhiteLie is able to detect the malicious behaviour. WhiteLie is also effective against apps that directly exfiltrate private data. For example, while experimenting with the "All Good PDF Scanner" Android app (later banned by Google), WhiteLie detected that the app was uploading users' private files to the internet. In response, WhiteLie blocked the app's network access for the offending operations without crashing the app or disabling its benign features, thereby protecting the user's private information in a fine-grained manner.

Across the 70 popular pre-installed and user-installed Android apps we evaluated, WhiteLie successfully spoofed 78.32% of all permission-protected data accesses while remaining fully undetected and causing no crashes or functional regressions. This demonstrates that practical and fine-grained privacy protection, which are traditionally achievable only through rooting, OS modification, or brittle app repackaging—can instead be realised on stock Android devices. Notably, WhiteLie preserves full app functionality even when supplying spoofed data, mitigates a wide range of privacy-violating behaviours (including background audio capture, covert file exfiltration, and sensor-based side-channel attacks), and operates without triggering Play Integrity checks. Together, these results show that WhiteLie offers a deployable, comprehensive, and user-centric privacy mechanism within the existing Android ecosystem.

In addition to analysing policy-violating behaviours of apps, we also perform an extensive evaluation of the runtime overhead introduced by WhiteLie. We systematically measure its impact in both user-driven spoofing scenarios and automatic mitigation of passive privacy violations. Our results show that spoofing sensitive user data with WhiteLie incurs only a minimal average overhead of 2.52% in battery drain and 5.2 MB of additional memory during app execution. Each spoofed API call adds, on average, 1.64 ms of latency, which does not cause any noticeable performance degradation or UI lag in the apps we tested. Across all experiments,

¹<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sXiGUoqFLmk>

Use Case	Example(s)
Bypassing Continuous Authentication	MGRA [10] (Sec 3.3) utilizes the accelerometer data and VoiceLive [11] (Sec 3.3) utilizes the smartphone's two different microphones to authenticate users. But WhiteLie proves to be capable of bypassing these authentication mechanisms by spoofing the input data.
Protection from Malicious Apps	All Good PDF Scanner (Sec 6.1) was granted permissions like Storage and Camera but was detected to be uploading data on the internet in the background, hence its internet access was blocked by WhiteLie. Unique Keyboard (Sec 6.1) was found to be accessing the sensor data while running in the background, therefore WhiteLie fed deceived data when app is running in the background.
Side-Channel Attack Mitigation	Gyrosec [12] (Sec 6.2) records the sensor data while running in the background, and uploads it over the internet. This was mitigated by deceiving the sensor data received by the apps.
Unexpected Sensor Usage Detection	Facebook (Sec 7.1) requested for Audio permission. But it was found (using WhiteLie) to be recording the microphone data when no activity requiring microphone was being used by the user.
User Privacy Protection	Snapchat (Sec 7.2) and Truecaller (Sec 7.3) provide great features to users but at the cost of sharing private information like Location, Contacts and Messages. WhiteLie enables users to enjoy the provided features without compromising private information.

Table 1: Various use cases of WhiteLie and their respective real-world example(s)

target apps continued to function normally and did not detect the presence of WhiteLie, confirming that our approach is efficient for real-world deployment.

Overall, we make the following key contributions.

- We design and implement WhiteLie, a comprehensive user data spoofing system for non-rooted, commodity Android devices that requires neither OS nor app-binary modification, and unifies (i) user-driven spoofing of sensitive data (e.g., location, sensors, microphone) with (ii) automatic privacy-abuse detection and response over sensitive APIs.
- We show that WhiteLie exposes and mitigates four representative classes of real-world privacy violations, including active user spoofing, unexpected microphone recording, motion-sensor-based side-channel attacks, and direct private file exfiltration, and we demonstrate its effectiveness on widely used apps such as Facebook, Snapchat, Truecaller, Uber, Gyrosec, All Good PDF Scanner, and other policy-violating apps.
- We perform a comprehensive evaluation of WhiteLie on 70 popular pre-installed and user-installed Android apps and show that it effectively preserves user privacy without causing crashes or being detected, while incurring only 2.52% additional battery drain, 5.2 MB memory overhead, and 1.64 ms added latency per spoofed API call, demonstrating its practicality as a user-centric privacy mechanism within the existing Android ecosystem.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews prior approaches. Section 3 motivates the need for a system capable of spoofing user data. Section 4 describes the methodology used by WhiteLie to intercept and spoof sensitive data, and Section 5 details its system architecture. Sections 6 and 7 demonstrate how WhiteLie mitigates privacy attacks from malicious apps and empowers users to

control their privacy in real-world applications. Section 8 presents the performance evaluation and overhead analysis, and Section 9 concludes the paper.

2 RELATED WORK

Mobile privacy has been addressed through several classes of approaches, including modifying the OS or app code [5, 6], revoking permissions [15, 16], completely or selectively blocking permission data [17–20], rule-based or context-aware data filtering [21, 22], and permission-usage labelling mechanisms [23, 24]. Each category provides partial protections with different trade-offs in usability, functionality, and deployment practicality. Table 2 summarises these approaches and contrasts them with the comprehensive capabilities offered by WhiteLie.

Several systems control or spoof data access by modifying either the Android OS [5, 6] or the target app binaries [3, 7]. For example, Boxify [6] intercepts Binder calls by altering the OS, and BinderFilter [5] enforces contextual constraints by modifying system components. App-rewriting solutions such as MrHide [7] and PrivateEye [3] rebuild app binaries to interpose on sensitive API calls. Although effective in controlled environments, these techniques require rooting, system-level modifications, or repackaging apps—steps that are impractical for average users and often lead to crashes, incompatibility with Play Store apps.

Approaches such as Pegasus [15] and SweetDroid [16] dynamically revoke permissions based on contextual triggers or user-defined policies. While revocation provides fine-grained control, many apps assume granted permissions remain available and crash or disable core features when permissions are

Table 2: Comparison of WhiteLie with related approaches based on supported capabilities

Approach	No source modification	Not Re-vokes Perm.	Blocks Perm. Data	Filters Perm. Data	Prompts on Perm. Use	Deceives Perm. Data	Works without Rooting	User Driven Control	Preserve App Func.
OS/App Code Mods. [5, 6]	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Revoking Perm. [15, 16]	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗
Complete Data Blocking [17, 18]	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Selective Data Blocking [19, 20]	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗
Rule-based Data Filtering [21]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗
Context-aware Data Filtering [22]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗
Labelling Perm. Usage [23, 24]	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓
Proposed Framework (WhiteLie)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

revoked. As a result, revocation-based systems often compromise usability and do not offer a seamless privacy-preserving experience.

Complete data-blocking solutions such as XPrivacy [17] and PINPOINT [18] prevent apps from accessing sensitive data altogether, whereas selective blocking approaches like AppFence [19] and Slogger [20] attempt to suppress only specific data flows. Rule-based data filtering (e.g., XPrivacyLua [21]) and context-aware filtering mechanisms [22] extend this idea by shaping data access based on policies or runtime context. However, these systems still disrupt normal app behavior, do not deceive apps into accepting fabricated data, and may break functionality when essential data is suppressed.

Systems like ProtectMyPrivacy [23] and TurtleGuard [24] notify users when apps access sensitive resources, improving transparency but not preventing privacy violations once permission is granted. These tools lack the ability to block, filter, or spoof data, limiting their effectiveness when apps behave maliciously or unexpectedly.

As summarised in Table 2, existing approaches each address only a subset of the privacy problem. Many require source code modification, revoke permissions that break app functionality, or fail to deceive apps—making them unsuitable for everyday users on stock Android devices. Critically, no prior work simultaneously offers: (i) no OS or binary modification, (ii) no permission revocation, (iii) support for blocking, filtering, prompting, and spoofing permission data, (iv) preservation of app functionality, and (v) operation on

non-rooted devices. In contrast, WhiteLie integrates all these capabilities within a single deployable system. Additionally, it supports user-driven spoofing as well as automatic detection and mitigation of privacy-violating behaviours. This unique combination makes WhiteLie a practical, comprehensive, and real-world-deployable mobile privacy solution.

3 MOTIVATION

The motivation for our work stems from the realization that current approaches for protecting user data in the Android ecosystem are insufficient leaving user data exposed to privacy violations from the installed apps.

3.1 Inadequate Android Permission Framework

The Android platform provides a permission framework that enables the user to control the data access privileges granted to individual apps. It aims to safeguard sensitive user data by restricting unauthorized access. However, it has been found to be inadequate failing to prevent apps from collecting sensitive data. Researchers [12, 25–28] have shown that non-runtime permissions, also referred to as “normal permissions”, like those related to the inertial measurement unit, can contain sensitive information, but the Android permission framework grants access to them without notifying the user.

For runtime permissions, also referred to as “dangerous permissions”, like location, requested by apps, the user is presented with a binary choice to either grant or deny each permission. Granting a requested permission can result in a privacy breach while denying it triggers a `SecurityException` in the app. If the exception is not handled properly, the app crashes. Even if the exception is handled correctly, due to a lack of permission, the app limits its services. Further, Wagner et al.[29] noted that only 17% of users pay attention to permissions during installation. Recently added options, such as “*Only this time*” and “*While using the app*”, in the permission framework aim to protect user privacy by preventing background permission usage. Hence, the existing permission framework lacks flexibility, leaving users with limited choices.

3.2 Limitations of Existing User Data Spoofing Mechanisms

The aforementioned inadequacy of the Android permission framework has motivated researchers to look for an alternative option, i.e., to deceive the user data fed to the apps. While modifying the source code of the Android OS or target apps [3–7] might seem like a solution, this approach necessitates the creation of a custom ROM. However, installing custom ROMs on Android devices requires root privileges, making it impractical for most users. Additionally, modifying the source code of each target app is not a scalable solution. This mechanism can also be easily detected if Google’s Play Integrity API is utilized in the target app [9].

3.3 Achilles Heel of Continuous User Authentication

The conventional knowledge-based authentication approaches require a user to provide information like passwords to access their device. While these methods are simple to implement, they suffer from drawbacks such as the need for frequent re-entering and the possibility of reuse by an attacker. To mitigate these limitations, continuous authentication mechanisms have been implemented that verify the user’s identity based on their behavioral biometrics such as keystroke dynamics, touch gestures, motion, and voice. By leveraging such inherent biometric signatures of the user, this approach aims to prevent unauthorized access. Table 3 offers an overview of different continuous authentication mechanisms across five widely used modalities.

The user’s biometric signatures are captured implicitly through various data streams, including interaction, environmental information, and sensory data. Hence, the underlying assumption to justify the security of these mechanisms is that these biometric signatures are unique to the user and difficult for attackers to replicate. Upon analyzing these approaches,

Modality	Framework	User Data	Accuracy
Gait	[30–33]	Ac, Ca, Gy, Mg	91-95%
Gesture			
Flick	[34, 35]	Ac, Gy	92.8-98%
Swipe	[36, 37]	Ac, Or, To	
Touch	[38, 39]	To	89%
Motion			
Free	[40–42]	Ac, Gy, Mg	96.7-97.5%
Shake	[43]	Ac, Gy	96.87%
Eye	[44]	Ca	88.73%
IaH	[45]	Ac, Gy	32.8%
Gesture	[10, 46]	Ac	92.2-95.8%
Voice	[11, 47–49]	Mi	93.5-99.3%
Multimodal			
Ge, Mo	[50, 51]	Ac, Gy, Or, To	65%
Ga, Ge, Mo	[52]	Ac, Gy, To	
Be, Ga, Ge	[53, 54]	Ac, Nw, Tk, To	85-97.1%
Ga, Ge	[55, 56]	Ac, Gy, Li, Mg	95.6-98.1%

Ac: Accelerometer, Ca: Camera, Gr: Gravity Sensor, Gy: Gyroscope, Li: Light Sensor, Mg: Magnetometer, Mi: Microphone, Nw: Network, Or: Orientation, To: Touch, Tr: Tracking

Be: Behaviour, Ga: Gait, Ge: Gesture, IaH: In-air Handwriting, Mo: Motion

Table 3: Existing continuous authentication methods.

we determined that the majority of them rely on user data (specifically, sensor data) as the primary data source for user authentication. Hence, these authentication mechanisms can be bypassed by manipulating the user data (especially sensor data) fed into them. The attacker can simply present false sensor data replicating the data recorded when the authentic user was utilizing the device. This can lead the authentication mechanism to erroneously conclude that the genuine user is using the device and allow the attacker to gain unauthorized access to sensitive data or perform actions on behalf of the legitimate user.

However, we note that since there is no robust mechanism for spoofing the user data in the existing literature, the aforementioned attack on the continuous authentication mechanisms is difficult to realize in the real world. The absence of such a strong attack has resulted in the wide acceptance of weak continuous authentication methods [10, 11, 30–56].

To mitigate the insufficiency of the Android permission framework and to establish a practical benchmark for continuous authentication mechanisms, there is a need for a more robust and comprehensive approach to spoof user data in the Android ecosystem. This paper aims to address this

critical gap by identifying and addressing the limitations of existing data spoofing mechanisms.

4 WHITELIE METHODOLOGY

We now provide the methodology to achieve the goal of deceiving user data fed to the apps without rooting the device or altering the source of the apps.

4.1 Background on Hooking

In Android, a typical user does not have permission to modify the apps or OS behaviour. However, *hooking* into OS and apps is one of the most practical options to alter the behaviour of an app. Hooking is a technique of code modification that changes the behaviour of the original code running sequence by inserting instructions into the code segment.


Hooking can be performed in two ways: statically and dynamically. The static hooking technique injects hooks before app execution by altering the byte code of the app or by injecting custom shared libraries. However, static hooking causes permanent alteration and can be detected by an app using a digital signature.

Dynamic hooking technique applies “hooks” at runtime by modifying the code stored in volatile memory (temporary modification), allowing hooking decisions based on the runtime environment. Android’s Dalvik VM utilizes Dynamic Linkers’ “virtual method table” to jump to the memory location on a method call, hence *Call Diversion* can be employed to inject hooks in the hooked method lookup table entry.


In Figure 2, we present an overview of dynamic hooking in Android using the `Location.getLatitude()` method. Figure 2a illustrates the conventional process of method call jumps. The virtual memory of the target app encompasses the heap space and various files loaded by the *Zygote* process to initiate the app process. *Zygote* is a process started by the Android Framework during the OS boot. It is a template process preloaded with Java-shared libraries in memory, responsible for launching apps and services.

The `boot.oat` and `boot.art` files serve as boot images to speed up the boot process containing frequently used class source code and the pre-initialized heap respectively. The heap of the target class is stored in the `boot.art` file. The Dalvik Executable code of the app and the shared libraries are stored in the `app.dex` and `libart.so` respectively. When the target method is invoked by the app, the existence of the target class is checked in the `boot.art` file. If the class is found, the addresses of the target methods are determined using the virtual tables stored in the heap. Consequently, the execution jumps to the identified address.

Figure 2b depicts the process of hooking. The hooked application’s virtual memory is loaded with the `libhook.so` so



(a) Original method call.



(b) Method call with WhiteLie.

Figure 2: Example illustrating how the Xposed module class method hijacks the original method call.

shared library by the hooking module, facilitating the hooking operations. Subsequently, the hooks defined by the hooking app (hook.dex) are loaded by the hooking module as Dalvik Executables (same as app code). Upon completion, `libhook.so` intervenes and loads the hooking classes into the app’s heap space, modifying the entries of the target class virtual tables with the addresses of the hooking class methods. Consequently, when the app calls the hooked methods, the calls are redirected to the hooking class methods instead of the original methods. Finally, the original method is invoked by storing its address at the end of the hooking method.

4.2 Hooking on Non-Rooted Device

We found that the most suitable solution to deceive user data is app hooking. However, on non-rooted devices, users are restricted from accessing the root and hooking various processes within the system. To gain hooking capabilities, root access to the *Zygote* process is required.

For this, we utilize *adb* (Android Debug Bridge), a command-line tool typically utilised for debugging apps, but also capable of controlling Android devices and executing shell commands. *adb* provides user-installed apps with privileged access to the system APIs. This access is limited till the device is in an active connection with the *adb* tool. This limitation is further tackled by the Shizuku service by exploiting *adb*


```

1 class SpoofingModule: IXposedHookLoadPackage {
2     companion object {
3         fun getClass(clsName: String): Class<*> = Class.forName(clsName, false, lpparam.classLoader)
4     }
5
6     @Throws(Throwable::class)
7     override fun handleLoadPackage(lpparam: XC_LoadPackage.LoadPackageParam) {
8         hookAllMethods(getClass(ClipData.CREATOR.javaClass.name), "createFromParcel", XC_MethodHook() {
9             @Throws(Throwable::class)
10             override fun beforeHookedMethod(param: MethodHookParam) {
11                 val uri = Uri.parse("content://com.xposedmodule.provider/deceitSettings")
12                 val cursor = context.contentResolver.query(uri, null, null, null, null) ?: return
13                 val blockClipboard = cursor.getInt(cursor.getColumnIndex("blockClipboard"))
14                 cursor.close()
15                 if(blockClipboard) param.result = null
16             }
17
18             @Throws(Throwable::class)
19             override fun afterHookedMethod(param: MethodHookParam) {
20                 param.result ?: return
21                 val uri = Uri.parse("content://com.xposedmodule.provider/deceits")
22                 val cursor = context.contentResolver.query(uri, null, null, null, null) ?: return
23                 val clipboardLabel = cursor.getString(cursor.getColumnIndex("clipboardLabel")) ?: "dummyLabel"
24                 val clipboardText = cursor.getString(cursor.getColumnIndex("clipboardText")) ?: "dummyText"
25                 cursor.close()
26                 param.result = ClipData.newPlainText(clipboardLabel, clipboardText)
27             }
28         })
29     }
30 }

```

Listing 1: Kotlin code to deceive Clipboard permission data with the data defined by user in *Deceit* policies.

shell access. Shizuku provides privileged access to system APIs to user-installed apps by running a dedicated process with shell-level permissions, acting as a proxy between the apps and the OS. This level of access is sufficient for hooking the target apps to spoof the user data.

Employing the Shizuku service, we use LSPatch, an Xposed framework for non-rooted devices, for hooking the target apps by injecting the hooks into app processes. This allows users to define the required app behaviour within the Xposed module to make the target app execute their desired actions. Both the Shizuku service and LSPatch are open-source and user-controlled, they only grant root privileges to the modules and apps chosen by the user, ensuring that the attack surface remains unchanged.

4.3 Spoofing User Data with Hooking

In Listing 1, we present the approach employed to spoof the Clipboard data with custom spoofed data by hooking. Typically, the app retrieves clipboard data by calling the `ClipboardManager.getPrimaryClip()` method. However, to modify the result of this method, multiple other methods

need to be hooked. Alternatively, a more efficient approach involves hooking `ClipData.CREATOR.createFromParcel()` method, as ultimately, this method is called by the former method to return the clipboard data. To hook this method, we utilise Xposed's `handleLoadPackage()` in Line 7.

Using this mechanism, the Clipboard data can either be blocked or modified before feeding into the target apps. In the before hook, Line 11-15 lists the code for blocking the clipboard data from feeding into the target apps. Using *ContentProvider* the Xposed module is gathering the user's choice on blocking the clipboard data in Line 11-13. And then in Line 15, if the user opts for blocking the clipboard data, then the resultant part of the function call is updated with null object. This blocks the original method call and execution returns back to the method from where the call for the hooked method is made.

Similarly, in the after hook, i.e. Lines 20-26, the clipboard data is deceived as plain text data as per the user policy. The user-defined deceived data is fetched from the *ContentProvider* in Line 21-24. And then in Line 26, the result of

the method call is updated with a new ClipData object initialised with fetched deceived result.

WhiteLie offers diverse policies for deceiving various permissions. For instance, one policy for spoofing camera permission involves blurring the image when the app is operating in the background. In this scenario, WhiteLie utilizes the ActivityManager to determine whether the target app is running in the background or not. If it is found to be running in the background while accessing the camera permission, WhiteLie blurs the frames supplied to the app by manipulating the pixels. Another intriguing policy employed by WhiteLie involves providing a noise audio feed if an app unnecessarily requests Audio permission.

4.4 WhiteLie and its Robustness

In this section, we present WhiteLie's mechanism to achieve the functionality of spoofing the user data fed into other apps and discuss its performance against real-world apps highlighting its robust nature.

4.4.1 Robust Mechanism. By utilising dynamic hooking, WhiteLie effectively manipulates user data in other apps by modifying the source code stored in volatile memory, thus avoiding permanent alterations on disk. As a result, the injected hooks cannot be detected using APK signatures or Google's Play Integrity API, making WhiteLie resilient against these security measures. Moreover, WhiteLie follows a methodology of spoofing user data instead of outright revoking permissions based on context. This approach ensures that WhiteLie remains crash-proof, providing a reliable and robust solution.

4.4.2 Spoofing Real-world Apps. The capability of WhiteLie against real-world apps in protecting user privacy by spoofing was explored using 50 real-world apps downloaded from the Google Play Store, and 20 pre-installed Android apps. All permissions requested by the apps were granted beforehand, and the apps were subjected to 20 minutes of manual usage. All experiments were conducted on a *Samsung Galaxy M21* smartphone with a 2.3 GHz octa-core processor and 4 GB of RAM running Android 12. The outcomes were documented for each permission, taking into account visual confirmation of spoofed user data and the logs captured by WhiteLie.

The heatmap depicted in Figure 3 provides an overview of the WhiteLie's performance when applied to the most popular apps on the Google Play Store. The dark green region of the heatmap signifies the successful deception of permissions for corresponding Android apps. The light green, orange, and red regions indicate permissions that were not requested, not utilized, and could not be deceived, respectively.

Out of the 678 permissions requested by 70 apps, the WhiteLie achieved a **78.32%** success rate in spoofing user




Figure 3: Heatmap illustrating status of user data deceived for various popular apps by WhiteLie.

data. We could not ascertain the deception for 21.68% of the permissions because although they were granted to the app, they were not explicitly requested during the experiments. These encouraging results demonstrate the robustness of the WhiteLie's mechanism and design in real-world scenarios as none of the apps crashed and functioned as expected.

4.4.3 Hooking Hidden APIs. Certain permissions such as sensors, involve method calls returning instances of *Android Non-SDK Interfaces* classes also known as *Hidden APIs* like *InputSensorInfo*. Accessing these Hidden APIs is restricted for *JNI* and *Java Reflections*. WhiteLie's hooks corresponding to Hidden APIs bypass these restrictions and instantiate classes with deceived data using the *LSPlant*. Out of 78.32% successfully deceived user data, 23.16% were deceived by hooking hidden APIs.





Figure 4: WhiteLie architecture.

4.4.4 Isolation. WhiteLie requests the *Query All Packages* permission to facilitate and simplify its privacy protection functionalities which is a non-runtime (normal) permission and the only permission requested by WhiteLie. Notably, WhiteLie operates offline, severing any external connections and isolating itself from the internet, establishing a secure and trustworthy environment.

5 IMPLEMENTATION

WhiteLie comprises of four essential components: the *Packages Permission Manager*, *Policy Configurator*, *Resource Access Log Reporter*, and *Deceiving Module*. An overview of WhiteLie's architecture is illustrated in Figure 4. WhiteLie accomplishes its tasks through a series of essential functions: listing installed packages on the device along with their requested permissions, configuring user-defined policies to deceive targeted apps, hooking into the processes of selected packages, and providing detailed resource access reports for manual investigation and action.

① To deceive the user data in the target apps, the user interacts with the *Package-Permission Manager* to review the permissions requested and granted to the target package, listed by WhiteLie using *Query All Packages* permission (sole permission requested by WhiteLie). The installed packages are fetched using `getInstalledApplication()` method configured for gathering metadata of installed applications. Then the user creates policies for the deceiving the user data associated with each permission. Figure 5a presents the UI of WhiteLie's *Policy Configurator* while defining the



(a) Configuring policies

(b) Deception logs

Figure 5: Screenshots of WhiteLie app UI while performing experiments to deceive location data for Uber.

new deceit data for spoofing the location permission. Configuring policies enhances user's control over the spoofed data fed to apps by customizing the data, avoiding potential privacy compromises.

WhiteLie also streamlines the configuration of privacy policies by providing predefined yet configurable set of meaningful real-world values and randomly selects to efficiently safeguard user data. For example, for Contacts permission, WhiteLie has a set of 100 predefined real-world contacts, that are randomly fed to the target app when requested. ② The *Package-Permission Manager* and the *Policy Configurator* stores the metadata and policies defined by the user in the database.

When the target app is launched and its process is created, the *XposedBridge* class is loaded along side in the process which makes the active Xposed modules, including the WhiteLie to interact with the app. ③ The *Deceiving Module* of WhiteLie fetches the policies defined by the user from the database and ④ accordingly installs the hooks in the target app.

⑤ When the user interacts with the target app, ⑥ the app invokes the *Deceiving Hooks* methods, instead of invoking the original sensitive Resource APIs. ⑦ These methods communicate with the *Deceiving Module* via *ContentProvider* which references the stored policies to make informed decisions and sends over the policies back to the *Deceiving Hooks*. ⑧ Consequently, the target app receives the deceived data rather than the original data from the hook method. ⑨ Hence, the target app sends deceived data over to its server, which ensures user data privacy.

Additionally, the installed hooks also log the various actions performed by the hooked application with respect to user data access. ⑩ These logs are then relayed back to WhiteLie when *Deceiving Hooks* communicates with the *Deceiving Module* during hooking. ⑪ These logs are shared

with the user by the *Resource Access Log Reporter* for manual investigation by the user. Figure 5b presents a screenshot of the *Resource Access Log Reporter* logs recorded during the experiments.

6 DEFENDING AGAINST MALWARE ATTACKS

In this section, we show that WhiteLie offers a novel approach to mitigate the risk of leaking sensitive user data.

6.1 Testing WhiteLie against Real-world Malicious Apps

To analyze the defense capabilities of WhiteLie against real-world malicious apps, we selected 30 most downloaded apps that had been recently banned from Google Play Store. Due to the absence of accessible downloads for banned apps on the Google Play Store, we downloaded the latest versions available on third-party platforms. We then scrutinized the malicious behavior of these apps using the sensitive API access logs captured by the WhiteLie.

Table 4 summarizes the list of malicious behaviors we found in the 30 malicious apps. We expect users to be able to find malicious behaviors in a similar manner. In future, we plan to extend WhiteLie to notify users upon suspected malicious behaviors.

Malicious behaviors fell under 6 categories:

Upload sensitive data to the internet. Some apps were identified for transmitting substantial amounts of data over the internet while operating in the background. For example, we suspect *PhoneFinder by Clapping* was uploading user audio data as it had also been granted audio permission. We could not revoke or spoof audio permission without hurting the app's functionality. Consequently, WhiteLie limited the app's internet access to safeguard user privacy.

Accessing sensitive data unnecessarily. A typical pattern among malicious apps was to try to access irrelevant sensitive data. For example, *Amazing Video Editor* and *Keyboard Themes* apps were accessing user's contacts information. Similarly, *Instant Speech Translation* was accessing user's photos. Denying requests for these permissions led to crashes or termination of the apps. WhiteLie could successfully spoof such unnecessary sensitive data accessed by these apps without limiting app functionality.

Accessing data without user knowledge. Other apps were calling sensitive APIs at unexpected times. For example, *Free Translator Photo* app translates images uploaded by the user. However, the app was found to attempt access to user images even when user had not requested a translation. *Bus Driver Simulator* allows users to play a game using accelerometer and gyroscope sensor data. But the app was accessing the

Malicious behavior: Upload sensitive data to internet

Apps (downloads): All Good PDF Scanner (10M+), Fast PDF Scanner (5M+), PhoneFinder by Clapping (5M+), What's Me Sticker (1M+)

WhiteLie: Limit internet access to the app

Malicious behavior: Access sensitive user data like Contacts, Location, Audio, and Sensors unnecessarily

Apps (downloads): Amazing Video Editor (5M+), CapCut Pro (5M+), Instant Speech Translation (5M+), Keyboard Themes (5M+), Launcher iOS 15 (5M+)

WhiteLie: Deceived all the unnecessary user data requested without crashing the apps

Malicious behavior: Accessing data without user knowledge

Accessing sensor data in the background

Apps (downloads): Bus Driver Simulator (5M+), Bus - Metrolis 2021 (1M+), Fingerprint Changer (1M+), Fingerprint Defender (1M+), Lifeel - scan and test (5M+), Locker Tool (5M+), OFFRoaders - Survive (5M+), Racers Car Driver (5M+), Safe Lock (5M+), Slime Simulator (5M+), Smart Spot Locator (1M+), Unique Keyboard (5M+)

WhiteLie: Allowed the apps to access the sensor data in the foreground but not in the background

Camera access without user consent and knowledge

Apps (downloads): Free Translator Photo (5M+), Handy Translator Pro (10M+), Heart Rate and Pulse Tracker (5M+), Heart Rhythm (1M+), My Chat Translator (5M+)

WhiteLie: Deceived camera data fed into the app

Location continuously tracked by app

Apps (downloads): Geospot: GPS Tracker (5M+), iCare - Find Location (5M+)

WhiteLie: Deceived location data according to user policy

Malicious behavior: Detected accessing Send SMS API without user knowledge

Apps (downloads): Private SMS (5M+), Mint Left Messages (1M+)

WhiteLie: Blocked access to send SMS but not from reading SMS as per user policy

Table 4: Malicious behavior of Android apps banned by Google and the actions taken by WhiteLie to protect user privacy.

sensors while it was in background. WhiteLie could effectively deceive all the sensitive data including camera, audio, contacts, location, sensors, and device information. Users can easily configure deceiving policies to deceive only while

the app is in background while allowing sensitive data while the app is in foreground.

GeoSpot: GPS tracker can let users share their current location with friends. However, it was found to track the user even when the user has not asked the app to share their location. WhiteLie could effectively deceive the location of the user. But since both regular and malicious operations happen while app is in background, user has to enable/disable deceiving manually with WhiteLie.

Sending SMS messages. Some apps like *Private SMS* call `SMSManager.sendTextMessage()` without user consent. Multiple media reports suggest that such apps commit financial fraud by subscribing users to premium services through SMS activation. WhiteLie prevented sending these messages from the device. However, doing so also limits the app's functionality. WhiteLie is therefore not effective where the app does malicious activities using the data needed for its core functionalities.

6.2 Mitigating Side-Channel Attacks

Side-channel attacks present a significant threat to the security of mobile devices. These attacks exploit unintentional channels of information leakage, such as accelerometers, gyroscopes, power consumption, or electromagnetic radiation, to infer sensitive data. With their abundance of sensors and communication interfaces, mobile devices are particularly vulnerable to side-channel attacks. These attacks can lead to the unauthorized disclosure of valuable information like passwords, cryptographic keys, or biometric data.

Recent studies [25–28] have shed light on the risks associated with so-called *Normal Permissions*, which include seemingly innocuous actions like reading sensor data that do not require explicit user approval. However, in various attacks on user privacy, these permissions are leveraged.

In response to the pressing privacy concern, our framework offers a novel approach to mitigate the risk of side-channel attacks perpetrated by malicious apps. By selectively modifying permissions granted to specific apps, WhiteLie fortifies user privacy and bolsters mobile device security. WhiteLie achieves this by deceiving user data, effectively disrupting the ability of malicious apps to gather sensitive information through side-channel channels.

We showcase the effectiveness of the WhiteLie in countering the insidious side-channel attacks, by conducting tests employing *GyroSec* [12]. *GyroSec* is an Android application that captures readings from the device's accelerometer and gyroscope without the user's knowledge or consent. This unauthorized data is then transmitted to a remote server where *GyroSec* employs machine-learning algorithms to discern and predict the precise location of touch inputs on the screen. This capability poses a significant danger, as it leads




Figure 6: Touch predictions made by Gyrosec server based on sensor readings received.

to leakage of users' sensitive information. Our experiments have uncovered that *GyroSec* can carry out such side-channel attacks without any restrictions from the Android Permission Framework.

By configuring WhiteLie to deceive *GyroSec*, we logged every instance of data access by *GyroSec*, promptly notifying users of any background resource data breaches. WhiteLie further deceived the data received by *GyroSec*. Using the *Policy Configurator* the accelerometer and gyroscope sensor readings were deceived as constant value for *GyroSec*. Figure 6 illustrates reduction in *GyroSec*'s ability to predict accurately by WhiteLie. The prediction accuracy dropped from **81.22%** to **5.36%**, proving WhiteLie to be a successful measure against Permission-based Side-Channel Attacks.

Overall, this section shows that WhiteLie could effectively stop most malicious behaviors giving better control to users over their sensitive data.

7 PRIVACY PROTECTION AGAINST REAL-WORLD APPS

In Figure 1, we showed how WhiteLie can be effectively used to protect user privacy while they are using Uber. In this section, we use three more real-world Android apps to showcase privacy advantages of WhiteLie.

7.1 com.katana.facebook (v404.0.0.35.70)

During the experiment, while scrolling through posts in the Facebook app's *Home* activity and without engaging any other app features, WhiteLie's *Resource Access Log Reporter* recorded instances of the Facebook app accessing audio permission as shown in Figure 7(a). On further investigation, we found that the Facebook app was using *MediaRecorder* to access the device microphone. Moreover, the Android's privacy indicator [57] (green dot), which indicates active use




Figure 7: Screenshots demonstrating deceiving location and audio data using WhiteLie for the Facebook app.

of the device microphone, did not appear when WhiteLie logged the use of audio permission. We found this surprising.

We were able to repeat this behavior with a custom mobile app *i.e.*, we used MediaRecorder API to successfully record audio while Android's privacy indicator did not show up. We believe it is a bug in Android's privacy indicator implementation. We have reported this to Android and plan to open source this custom app responsibly.

Hence, WhiteLie was able to detect microphone usage that was not indicated by Android. Moreover, WhiteLie successfully spoofed audio data requested by the Facebook app.

Similar to the unexpected microphone access, WhiteLie also logged instances of calendar data access by the Facebook app while searching for nearby events. The app reads user's calendar events to display their availability when the user is viewing nearby events. Users can configure WhiteLie to manipulate calendar data in a way that allows the Facebook app to receive information about their availability without compromising sensitive details about individual events. This involves spoofing fields like event name and location. WhiteLie could spoof the app's request for calendar data by providing a list of manipulated events.

Nearby events were listed using user's location data. As shown in Figure 7(b), we could effectively spoof the fine-grained GPS location data with a nearby location ensuring that the reported nearby places and events were same without compromising user's exact location.

7.2 com.snapchat.android (v12.24.0.34)

Snapchat has a feature called *Snap Map*, which utilizes the device's GPS and other sensors to display user avatars on a map, showcasing real-time physical activities. While Snapchat does provide *Ghost Mode* as an option to refrain from sharing location and sensor data, it sacrifices *SnapMap* features



Figure 8: Screenshots demonstrating how user can share spoofed contacts using WhiteLie with Snapchat.

that rely on this information. Furthermore, *Ghost Mode* does not guarantee that the app is not accessing the data.

WhiteLie successfully spoofed device's GPS location and READ_CONTACTS by utilizing a list of contacts specified in WhiteLie's *Deceit* section as shown in Figure 8(b). Users can thus limit the information they want to share with Snapchat and still use Snap Map feature.

7.3 com.truecaller (v12.54.7)

Truecaller provides sender information about incoming text messages to highlight known spammers. With Truecaller, users can ignore spam messages. But to use this feature, users have to give permission to the app to read all their messages. We used WhiteLie to successfully spoof message content while retaining the phone number from which the message was received. This way users can retain control over the privacy of their messages while still identifying whether senders are known spammers as shown in Figure 9(b).

Overall, this section shows that WhiteLie empowers users to fully use the app features while controlling the information that they share with the apps.

8 EVALUATING OVERHEAD

In this section, we present the outcomes of our evaluation of WhiteLie, focusing on its performance overhead in a real device while running various real world apps. We first quantify per API call overhead of WhiteLie using micro-benchmarks. And then evaluate memory and battery overhead of WhiteLie was evaluated using 10 most popular apps downloaded from the Google Play Store.

All permissions requested by the apps were granted beforehand, and the apps were subjected to 10 minutes of manual usage 5 times. All experiments were conducted on a Samsung




Figure 9: Screenshots demonstrating how a user can share spoofed SMS using WhiteLie with Truecaller app.

Galaxy M21 smartphone with a 2.3 GHz octa-core processor and 4 GB of RAM running Android 12.

API call overhead. We measure the time elapsed during code execution by executing hooked API methods within the `Timing.measureNanoTime()` method. We observed an average overhead of 1.64 ms across different API calls. The increase in elapsed time is because of the operations performed by the hooks. For user data like contacts and camera, we experienced an overhead of 3.87 ms and 3.23 ms respectively. For tracking and clipboard user data, we observed an overhead of 0.83 ms and 1.07 ms respectively. The overhead depends on the operations performed by the respective permission-deceiving hooks. For contacts and camera APIs, we are performing intensive operations like reading a database and manipulating pixels of an image, whereas for tracking and clipboard APIs, we are simply returning a deceived string.

Many of these APIs were called several times during the app runs in our experiments as shown in Figure 10. The API call overhead, however, did not impact the performance of the apps we tested in any observable manner.

Memory Used. The memory utilization of the benchmarking app was measured using ADB's `dumpsys` tool, using the *Proportional Set Size (PSS)* metric. This metric captures the shared memory proportionally used by each process.

Figure 11 shows that the memory overhead while using WhiteLie on various real-world apps is negligible. On average, WhiteLie only incurs 5.2 MB of memory overhead.

Battery Discharged. To accurately measure the device's battery usage during our experiments, we utilized the ADB's `batterystats` tool [58]. Before each experiment, we ensured a clean slate by resetting the tool. To mitigate any potential




Figure 10: Heatmap illustrating number of API calls made by various popular apps while evaluating performance overhead.




Figure 11: Memory used by various Android apps with and without WhiteLie.

inconsistencies in battery usage statistics, we remotely connected the device via *Wifi ADB*, as physically connecting it to a PC can inadvertently charge the device and yield inaccurate results. By leveraging `batterystats`'s *discharge* metric, we could quantify the amount of battery discharged since the last charge, accounting for the impact by both the target app and the system.

Figure 12 shows the battery drained during the app runs with and without WhiteLie. It shows that WhiteLie's impact on battery drain is negligible. An average additional discharge of approximately 1.76 mAh (2.52%) was observed across the 5 minute runs of various apps experimented when they were run with WhiteLie.

Overall, our experiments show that WhiteLie's usage has a minimal impact on app's performance, app's memory consumption, and the device's battery drain. This shows that WhiteLie is a versatile and efficient approach to protecting user privacy.

We further experimented with actively reducing battery drain using WhiteLie. In particular, by returning null from




Figure 12: Battery discharged by various Android apps with and without WhiteLie.




Figure 13: Battery discharged by benchmarking app while fetching user data for various Permissions with and without WhiteLie.

the `beforeHookedMethod()`, the method calls to the original method can be blocked which can save battery consumed by sensors and other components. To examine this, we added a battery saver mode to WhiteLie that selectively blocks Android API calls according to user policies. To quantitatively measure the battery drainage, we developed a benchmarking app that performed a consecutive series of 1000 API calls to retrieve user data. We observed this approach can save an average of 4.08 μAh (60.83%) per API call.

9 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this paper introduces WhiteLie, a robust user data spoofing system designed to enhance user privacy without compromising app functionality on non-rooted Android devices with minimal overhead. Through extensive evaluations on popular apps WhiteLie demonstrated its ability to effectively spoof 78.32% of requested permissions without detection or app crashes. Beyond its primary purpose, WhiteLie revealed its potential to bypass continuous authentication mechanisms based on sensor data, highlighting vulnerabilities in existing security measures. The findings of this research emphasize the importance of improving ongoing

authentication methods and enhancing privacy safeguards and security measures within the Android ecosystem. The system also proved effective in detecting unexpected permission accesses by benign apps and mitigating side-channel attacks launched by malicious apps. Real-world examples, such as Facebook's unauthorized microphone access and protection against recently banned apps like Private SMS, showcase the diverse applications of WhiteLie.

REFERENCES

- [1] Zainab R Alkindi, Sultan Qaboos Univiresity, Oman Muscat, Mohamed Sarrah, and Nasser Alzidi. Android application permission model. In *4th FREE & OPEN SOURCE SOFTWARE CONFERENCE (FOSSC'2019-OMAN)*, 2019.
- [2] Elizabeth Ha and David Wagner. Do android users write about electric sheep? examining consumer reviews in google play. In *2013 IEEE 10th Consumer Communications and Networking Conference (CCNC)*, pages 149–157. IEEE, 2013.
- [3] Nisarg Raval, Animesh Srivastava, Ali Razeen, Kiron Lebeck, Ashwin Machanavajjhala, and Lanodn P Cox. What you mark is what apps see. In *Proceedings of the 14th Annual International Conference on Mobile Systems, Applications, and Services*, pages 249–261, 2016.
- [4] Stephen Smalley and Robert Craig. Security enhanced (se) android: bringing flexible mac to android. In *NDSS*, volume 310, pages 20–38, 2013.
- [5] David Wu and Sergey Bratus. A context-aware kernel ipc firewall for android. *Proceedings of ShmooCon*, 17, 2017.
- [6] Michael Backes, Sven Bugiel, Christian Hammer, Oliver Schranz, and Philipp von Styp-Rekowsky. Boxify: Full-fledged app sandboxing for stock android. In *24th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security)*, pages 691–706, 2015.
- [7] Jinseong Jeon, Kristopher K Micinski, Jeffrey A Vaughan, Ari Fogel, Nikhilesh Reddy, Jeffrey S Foster, and Todd Millstein. Dr. android and mr. hide: fine-grained permissions in android applications. In *Proceedings of the second ACM workshop on Security and privacy in smartphones and mobile devices*, pages 3–14, 2012.
- [8] Hang Zhang, Dongdong She, and Zhiyun Qian. Android root and its providers: A double-edged sword. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1093–1104, 2015.
- [9] Android play integrity api. <https://developer.android.com/google/play/integrity>, Apr 2023. [Online; accessed 28-May-2023].
- [10] Feng Hong, Shujuan You, Meiyu Wei, Yongtuo Zhang, and Zhongwen Guo. Mgra: Motion gesture recognition via accelerometer. *Sensors*, 16(4):530, 2016.
- [11] Linghan Zhang, Sheng Tan, Jie Yang, and Yingying Chen. Voicelive: A phoneme localization based liveness detection for voice authentication on smartphones. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1080–1091, 2016.
- [12] Jessy Lin and Jason Seibel. Motion-based side-channel attack on mobile keystrokes, 2019.
- [13] Samia Masood Awan, Urooj Waheed, Yusra Khalid, Muhammad Ahsan Khan, Yusra Mansoor, and Syed Abdur Rehman. Violation of user's privacy rights by facebook. In *2020 International Conference on Information Science and Communication Technology (ICISCT)*, pages 1–4. IEEE, 2020.
- [14] Mervyn Cornelius Chapman. *Exploring the Privacy Behavior of Facebook Users*. PhD thesis, National University, 2023.
- [15] Kevin Zhijie Chen, Noah M Johnson, Vijay D'Silva, Shuaifu Dai, Kyle MacNamara, Thomas R Magrino, Edward XueJun Wu, Martin C Rinard,

- and Dawn Xiaodong Song. Contextual policy enforcement in android applications with permission event graphs. In *NDSS*, volume 234, 2013.
- [16] Xin Chen, Heqing Huang, Sencun Zhu, Qing Li, and Quanlong Guan. Sweetdroid: Toward a context-sensitive privacy policy enforcement framework for android os. In *Proceedings of the 2017 on Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society (WPES)*, pages 75–86, 2017.
- [17] M Bokhorst. Xprivacy-the ultimate, yet easy to use, privacy manager, 2017.
- [18] Paul Ratazzi, Ashok Bommisetti, Nian Ji, and Wenliang Du. Pinpoint: Efficient and effective resource isolation for mobile security and privacy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.07732*, 2019.
- [19] Peter Hornyack, Seungyeop Han, Jaeyeon Jung, Stuart Schechter, and David Wetherall. These aren't the droids you're looking for: retrofitting android to protect data from imperious applications. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM conference on Computer and communications security*, pages 639–652, 2011.
- [20] Prakash Shrestha, Manar Mohamed, and Nitesh Saxena. Slogger: Smashing motion-based touchstroke logging with transparent system noise. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM Conference on Security & Privacy in Wireless and Mobile Networks*, pages 67–77, 2016.
- [21] Marcel Bokhorst. Xprivacylua, 2021.
- [22] Nisarg Raval, Ali Razeen, Ashwin Machanavajjhala, Landon P Cox, and Andrew Warfield. Permissions plugins as android apps. In *Proceedings of the 17th Annual International Conference on Mobile Systems, Applications, and Services*, pages 180–192, 2019.
- [23] Saksham Chitkara, Nishad Gothoskar, Suhas Harish, Jason I Hong, and Yuvraj Agarwal. Does this app really need my location? context-aware privacy management for smartphones. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies (IMWUT)*, 1(3):1–22, 2017.
- [24] Lynn Tsai, Primal Wijesekera, Joel Reardon, Irwin Reyes, Serge Egelman, David Wagner, Nathan Good, and Jung-Wei Chen. Turtle guard: Helping android users apply contextual privacy preferences. In *Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS)*, volume 2017, 2017.
- [25] Ragib Hasan, Nitesh Saxena, Tzipora Halevitz, Shams Zawoad, and Dustin Rinehart. Sensing-enabled channels for hard-to-detect command and control of mobile devices. In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM SIGSAC symposium on Information, computer and communications security*, pages 469–480, 2013.
- [26] Laurent Simon and Ross Anderson. Pin skimmer: inferring pins through the camera and microphone. In *Proceedings of the Third ACM workshop on Security and Privacy in Smartphones & Mobile devices (SPSM)*, pages 67–78, 2013.
- [27] Zhongjie Ba, Tianhang Zheng, Xinyu Zhang, Zhan Qin, Baochun Li, Xue Liu, and Kui Ren. Learning-based practical smartphone eavesdropping with built-in accelerometer. In *NDSS*, pages 23–26, 2020.
- [28] Chao Shen, Shichao Pei, Zhenyu Yang, and Xiaohong Guan. Input extraction via motion-sensor behavior analysis on smartphones. *Computers & Security*, 53:143–155, 2015.
- [29] Primal Wijesekera, Arjun Baokar, Lynn Tsai, Joel Reardon, Serge Egelman, David Wagner, and Konstantin Beznosov. The feasibility of dynamically granted permissions: Aligning mobile privacy with user preferences. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1077–1093. IEEE, 2017.
- [30] Nikolaos Kolokas, Stelios Krinidis, Anastasios Drosou, Dimosthenis Ioannidis, and Dimitrios Tzovaras. Gait matching by mapping wearable to camera privacy-preserving recordings: Experimental comparison of multiple settings. In *2019 6th International Conference on Control, Decision and Information Technologies (CoDIT)*, pages 338–343. IEEE, 2019.
- [31] Yingnan Sun and Benny Lo. An artificial neural network framework for gait-based biometrics. *IEEE journal of biomedical and health informatics*, 23(3):987–998, 2018.
- [32] Hoang Minh Thang, Vo Quang Viet, Nguyen Dinh Thuc, and Deokjai Choi. Gait identification using accelerometer on mobile phone. In *2012 International Conference on Control, Automation and Information Sciences (ICCAIS)*, pages 344–348. IEEE, 2012.
- [33] Thang Hoang, Thuc Nguyen, Chuyen Luong, Son Do, and Deokjai Choi. Adaptive cross-device gait recognition using a mobile accelerometer. *Journal of Information Processing Systems*, 9(2):333–348, 2013.
- [34] Dong-Her Shih, Chia-Ming Lu, and Ming-Hung Shih. A flick biometric authentication mechanism on mobile devices. In *2015 international conference on informative and cybernetics for computational social systems (ICCSS)*, pages 31–33. IEEE, 2015.
- [35] Takumi Nohara and Ryuya Uda. Personal identification by flick input using self-organizing maps with acceleration sensor and gyroscope. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Ubiquitous Information Management and Communication (IMCOM)*, pages 1–6, 2016.
- [36] Li Lu and Yongshuai Liu. Safeguard: User reauthentication on smartphones via behavioral biometrics. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems*, 2(3):53–64, 2015.
- [37] Ankita Jain and Vivek Kanhangad. Exploring orientation and accelerometer sensor data for personal authentication in smartphones using touchscreen gestures. *Pattern recognition letters*, 68:351–360, 2015.
- [38] Kent W Nixon, Xiang Chen, Zhi-Hong Mao, and Yiran Chen. Slowmo-enhancing mobile gesture-based authentication schemes via sampling rate optimization. In *2016 21st Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference (ASP-DAC)*, pages 462–467. IEEE, 2016.
- [39] Tao Feng, Jun Yang, Zhixian Yan, Emmanuel Munguia Tapia, and Weidong Shi. Tips: Context-aware implicit user identification using touch screen in uncontrolled environments. In *Proceedings of the 15th workshop on mobile computing systems and applications*, pages 1–6, 2014.
- [40] Mohammed Abuhamad, Tamer Abuhmed, David Mohaisen, and Dae-Hun Nyang. AUtoSen: Deep-learning-based implicit continuous authentication using smartphone sensors. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 7(6):5008–5020, 2020.
- [41] Sara Amini, Vahid Noroozi, Amit Pande, Satyajit Gupte, Philip S Yu, and Chris Kanich. Deepauth: A framework for continuous user re-authentication in mobile apps. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM)*, pages 2027–2035, 2018.
- [42] Yantao Li, Hailong Hu, and Gang Zhou. Using data augmentation in continuous authentication on smartphones. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 6(1):628–640, 2018.
- [43] Jinpei Yan, Yong Qi, Qifan Rao, and Saiyu Qi. Towards a user-friendly and secure hand shaking authentication for smartphones. In *2018 17th IEEE International Conference On Trust, Security And Privacy In Computing And Communications/12th IEEE International Conference On Big Data Science And Engineering (TrustCom/BigDataSE)*, pages 1170–1179. IEEE, 2018.
- [44] Chen Song, Aosen Wang, Kui Ren, and Wen Yao Xu. Eyeveri: A secure and usable approach for smartphone user authentication. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2016-The 35th Annual IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications*, pages 1–9. IEEE, 2016.
- [45] Qingxin Xia, Feng Hong, Yuan Feng, and Zhongwen Guo. Motion-hacker: Motion sensor based eavesdropping on handwriting via smart-watch. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2018-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications Workshops (INFOCOM WKSHPS)*, pages 468–473. IEEE, 2018.
- [46] Feng Hong, Meiyu Wei, Shujuan You, Yuan Feng, and Zhongwen Guo. Waving authentication: your smartphone authenticate you on motion gesture. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference Extended*

- Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 263–266, 2015.
- [47] Oscar Miguel-Hurtado, Ramon Blanco-Gonzalo, Richard Guest, and Chiara Lunerti. Interaction evaluation of a mobile voice authentication system. In *2016 IEEE International Carnahan Conference on Security Technology (ICCST)*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2016.
 - [48] Qian Wang, Xiu Lin, Man Zhou, Yanjiao Chen, Cong Wang, Qi Li, and Xiangyang Luo. Voicepop: A pop noise based anti-spoofing system for voice authentication on smartphones. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2019-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, pages 2062–2070. IEEE, 2019.
 - [49] RC Johnson, Walter J Scheirer, and Terrance E Boulton. Secure voice-based authentication for mobile devices: vaulted voice verification. In *Biometric and Surveillance Technology for Human and Activity Identification X*, volume 8712, pages 164–176. SPIE, 2013.
 - [50] Mohamed Khamis, Florian Alt, Mariam Hassib, Emanuel von Zezschwitz, Regina Hasholzner, and Andreas Bulling. Gazetouchpass: Multimodal authentication using gaze and touch on mobile devices. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 2156–2164, 2016.
 - [51] Jiang Zhu, Pang Wu, Xiao Wang, and Joy Zhang. Sensec: Mobile security through passive sensing. In *2013 International Conference on Computing, Networking and Communications (ICNC)*, pages 1128–1133. IEEE, 2013.
 - [52] Zdeňka Sitová, Jaroslav Šeděnka, Qing Yang, Ge Peng, Gang Zhou, Paolo Gasti, and Kiran S Balagani. Hmog: New behavioral biometric features for continuous authentication of smartphone users. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 11(5):877–892, 2015.
 - [53] Xiaojian Pang, Li Yang, Maozhen Liu, and Jianfeng Ma. Mineauth: Mining behavioural habits for continuous authentication on a smartphone. In *Information Security and Privacy: 24th Australasian Conference, ACISP 2019, Christchurch, New Zealand, July 3–5, 2019, Proceedings 24*, pages 533–551. Springer, 2019.
 - [54] Alejandro Acien, Aythami Morales, Ruben Vera-Rodriguez, Julian Fierrez, and Ruben Tolosana. Multilock: Mobile active authentication based on multiple biometric and behavioral patterns. In *1st International Workshop on Multimodal Understanding and Learning for Embodied Applications (MULEA)*, pages 53–59, 2019.
 - [55] Tiantian Zhu, Zhengyang Qu, Haitao Xu, Jingsi Zhang, Zhengyue Shao, Yan Chen, Sandeep Prabhakar, and Jianfeng Yang. Riskcog: Unobtrusive real-time user authentication on mobile devices in the wild. *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, 19(2):466–483, 2019.
 - [56] Wei-Han Lee and Ruby B Lee. Implicit smartphone user authentication with sensors and contextual machine learning. In *2017 47th Annual IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks (DSN)*, pages 297–308. IEEE, 2017.
 - [57] Android privacy indicators. <https://source.android.com/docs/core/permissions/privacy-indicators>, Oct 2022. [Online; accessed 28-May-2023].
 - [58] Profile battery usage with batterystats and battery historian. <https://developer.android.com/topic/performance/power/setup-battery-historian>, May 2023. [Online; accessed 28-May-2023].