

MalNet: A Large-Scale Image Database of Malicious Software

Scott Freitas*
 safreita1@gmail.com
 Georgia Institute of Technology
 Atlanta, GA, USA

Rahul Duggal
 rahulduggal@gatech.edu
 Georgia Institute of Technology
 Atlanta, Georgia, USA

Duen Horng Chau
 polo@gatech.edu
 Georgia Institute of Technology
 Atlanta, Georgia, USA

ABSTRACT

Computer vision is playing an increasingly important role in automated malware detection with the rise of the image-based binary representation. These binary images are fast to generate, require no feature engineering, and are resilient to popular obfuscation methods. Significant research has been conducted in this area, however, it has been restricted to small-scale or private datasets that only a few industry labs and research teams have access to. This lack of availability hinders examination of existing work, development of new research, and dissemination of ideas. We release MALNET-IMAGE, the largest public cybersecurity image database, offering 24× more images and 70× more classes than existing databases (available at <https://mal-net.org>). MALNET-IMAGE contains over 1.2 million malware images—across 47 types and 696 families—democratizing image-based malware capabilities by enabling researchers and practitioners to evaluate techniques that were previously reported in propriety settings. We report the first million-scale malware detection results on binary images. MALNET-IMAGE unlocks new and unique opportunities to advance the frontiers of machine learning, enabling new research directions into vision-based cyber defenses, multi-class imbalanced classification, and interpretable security.

CCS CONCEPTS

- Security and privacy → Malware and its mitigation;
- Computing methodologies → Neural networks; Supervised learning by classification.

KEYWORDS

Dataset, deep learning, supervised learning, computer vision, imbalanced classification, cybersecurity, malware detection, binary image

1 INTRODUCTION

Attack campaigns from criminal organizations and nation state actors are one of the most powerful forms of disruption, costing the U.S. economy as much as \$109 billion a year [40]. These cyber attacks are highly sophisticated, targeting governments and large-scale

* Now at Microsoft, work completed when at Georgia Tech.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

CIKM '22, October 17–21, 2022, Atlanta, GA, USA

© 2022 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM. ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-9236-5/22/10...\$15.00
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3511808.3557533>

	Dataset	Images	Classes
Public	MALNET-IMAGE	1,262,024	696
	Virus-MNIST [39]	51,880	10
	Malimg [38]	9,458	25
Private	Stamina [7]	782,224	2
	McAfee [20]	367,183	2
	Kancherla [28]	27,000	2
	Choi [8]	12,000	2
	Fu [19]	7,087	15
	Han [21]	1,000	50
	IoT DDoS [48]	365	3

Table 1: MALNET-IMAGE: a state-of-the-art cybersecurity image database containing over 1.2 million binary images across a hierarchy of 47 types and 696 families.

enterprises to interrupt critical services and steal intellectual property [18]. Defending against these attacks requires the development of strong antivirus tools to identify new variants of malicious software before they can infect a network. Unfortunately, as a majority of newly identified malware is *polymorphic* in nature, where a few subtle source code changes result in significantly different compiled code (e.g., instruction reordering, branch inversion, register allocation) [15, 53], the predominant signature-based form of malware detection is rendered inert [46].

To combat these issues, the cybersecurity industry [7] has turned to image-based malware representations as they are quick to generate, require no feature engineering, and are resilient to common obfuscation techniques (e.g., section encryption [37], file packing [38]). For all of these reasons, image-based malware detection and classification research has surged in popularity. Unfortunately, a majority of this research uses small-scale or private data repositories, making it increasingly difficult to characterize and differentiate existing work, develop new research methodologies, and disseminate new ideas [7, 9, 16, 19–21, 32, 33, 37, 38, 42]. To address these issues, we constructed MALNET-IMAGE, the first large-scale ontology of malicious software images.

1.1 Contributions

1. Largest Cybersecurity Image Database. MALNET-IMAGE contains over 1.2 million software images across a hierarchy of 47 types and 696 families, enabling researchers and practitioners to conduct experiments on an industry scale dataset, and evaluate techniques

that were previously reported in propriety settings. Compared to the next large public database [39], MALNET-IMAGE offers 24× more images and nearly 70× more classes (see Table 1). We report the first public large-scale malware detection and classification results on binary images, where we are able to detect malicious files with an AUC of 0.94 and classify them across 47 types and 696 families with a macro-F1 score of 0.49 and 0.45, respectively.

2. Permissive Licensing & Open Source Code. We release MALNET-IMAGE with a CC-BY license, allowing researchers and practitioners to share and adapt the database to their needs. We open-source the code to create the images and run the experiments on Github.

3. Visual Exploration Without Downloading. We develop MALNET-IMAGE EXPLORER, an image exploration and visualization tool that enables researchers and practitioners to easily study the data without installation or download. MALNET-IMAGE EXPLORER is available online at: <https://mal-net.org>.

4. Community Impact. MALNET-IMAGE offers new and unique opportunities to advance the frontiers of cybersecurity research. In particular, MALNET-IMAGE offers researchers a chance to study imbalanced classification on a large-scale cybersecurity database with a natural imbalance ratio of 16,901× (see Figure 1); and explore explainability research in a high impact domain, where it is critical that security analysts can interpret and trust the model.

2 ADVANCING THE STATE-OF-THE-ART

Aside from MALNET-IMAGE, there are only two publicly available binary-image based cybersecurity datasets—Malimg [38] and Virus-MNIST [39]—containing 9,458 images across 25 classes, and 51,880 images across 10 classes, respectively. In surveying the malware detection and classification literature [3–8, 16, 19–21, 26, 28, 29, 33–35, 38, 43, 48, 54], we observed that almost all experiments were conducted on small-scale or private data. As the field advances, large-scale public databases are necessary to develop the next generation of algorithms. In Table 1, we compare MALNET-IMAGE with other public and private cybersecurity image datasets. We find that that MALNET-IMAGE offers 24× more images and 70× the classes, compared to the largest alternative public binary image database (Virus-MNIST [39]); and 479,800 more images and 694 more classes than the largest private database (Stamina [7]). We do not compare against repositories of malicious binaries such as AndroZoo [30], AMD [50], Microsoft-BIG [45], Malicia [36], VirusShare, and VirusTotal in this discussion, as none of them have images available to use.

Security Implications. With the release of MALNET-IMAGE, researchers will now have access to a critical resource to develop advanced, image-based malware detection and classification algorithms. Like most open data resources, there is a potential for misuse by malicious actors who aim to craft new variants to evade detection. We believe MALNET-IMAGE’s contribution to the research community significantly outweighs such risk.

2.1 Constructing MalNet-Image

MALNET-IMAGE is an ambitious project to collect and process over 1.2 million binary images, and is a major extension to the graph




Figure 1: Class imbalance distribution for type and family.

representation learning database MALNET [17], offering significant new malware detection capabilities. Below, we describe the provenance and construction of MALNET-IMAGE.

Collecting Candidate Images. We construct MALNET-IMAGE using the Android ecosystem due to its large market share [41], easy accessibility [30] and diversity of malicious software [1]. With the generous permission of AndroZoo [2, 30], we collected 1,262,024 Android APK files, specifically selecting APKs containing both a *family* and *type* label obtained from Euphony [25], a state-of-the-art malware labeling system that aggregates and learns from the labelling results of up to 70 antivirus vendors from VirusTotal [49].

Processing the Images. The first step in constructing the image representation was to extract the DEX file (bytecode) from each Android APK. The extracted DEX file was then converted into a 1D array of 8 bit unsigned integers. Each entry in the array is in the range [0, 255] where 0 corresponds to a black pixel and 255 a white pixel. We then convert each 1D byte array into a 2D array using standard linear plotting where the width of the image is fixed




Figure 2: Left: Android DEX file structure, composed of three major components—(1) header, (2) ids, and (3) data. Right: binary image representation of the DEX file.

and the height is allowed to vary based on the file size. We use the same image width proposed in the seminal work [37] (and follow up work [11, 27, 44, 51]), and scale each image to 256×256 using a standard Lanczos filter from the Pillow library. Finally, we color each byte according to its use, adding a layer of semantic information on top of the raw bytecode. While a variety of techniques can be used to encode semantic information into the image, there is currently no accepted standard. We follow [20] and assign each byte to a particular RGB channel depending on its position in the DEX file structure—(i) *header*, (ii) *identifiers* and *class definitions*, and (iii) *data* (see Figure 2). Distributed across Google Cloud’s General-purpose (N2) machine with 16 cores running 24 hours a day, this process took approximately a week. We release the source code used to process the APKs on Github.

MalNet-Image Tiny. We construct MALNET-IMAGE TINY, containing 61,201 training, 8,743 validation and 17,486 test images, for *type level classification* experiments by removing the 4 largest types in MALNET-IMAGE. The goal of MALNET-IMAGE-TINY is to enable users to rapidly prototype new ideas, since it requires only a fraction of the time needed to train a new model. MALNET-IMAGE TINY is released alongside the full dataset at <https://mal-net.org>.

3 MALNET-IMAGE APPLICATIONS

MALNET-IMAGE offers new and unique opportunities to advance the frontiers of cybersecurity research. As examples, we show three exciting new applications made possible by the MALNET-IMAGE database—(1) as a state-of-the-art cybersecurity image benchmark in Section 3.1; (2) as the first large-scale public analysis of malicious software detection using binary images in Section 3.2; and (3) how to categorize high-risk malware threats (e.g., is this Ransomware or Spyware?) in Section 3.3. Then, in Section 3.4 we highlight new research directions enabled by MALNET-IMAGE.

Application Setup. We divide MALNET-IMAGE into three stratified sets of data, with a training-validation-test split of 70-10-20 respectively; repeated for both type and family labels (suggested splits available at <https://mal-net.org>). In addition, we conduct malware detection experiments by grouping all 46 malicious software images into one type while the benign type maintains its original label. We evaluate 3 common architectures—ResNet [22], DenseNet [24] and MobileNet [23], based on its macro-F1 score, as is typical for highly imbalanced datasets [12–14, 17]. Each model is trained for 100 epochs using cross entropy loss (unless specified otherwise) and an Adam optimizer on an Nvidia DGX-1 containing 8 V100 GPUs and 512GB of RAM using Keras with a Tensorflow backend.

3.1 Application 1: Benchmarking Techniques

Leveraging the unprecedented scale and diversity of MALNET-IMAGE, we evaluate numerous malware detection and classification techniques that have previously been studied using only private or small-scale databases. Specifically, we evaluate recent techniques including: (a) semantic information encoding via colored channels, (b) model architecture, (c) imbalanced classification techniques, and (d) the performance of MALNET-IMAGE TINY, a small-scale version of MALNET-IMAGE. We detail the setup, results, and analysis of each experiment below.

Model	Param	GFlop	Binary			Type			Family		
			F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R
RN18	12M	1.8	.86	.89	.84	.47	.56	.42	.45	.54	.42
RN50	26M	3.9	.85	.91	.81	.48	.57	.44	.47	.54	.44
RN101	45M	7.6	.86	.88	.84	.48	.59	.44	.47	.54	.44
DN121	7.9M	2.9	.86	.90	.83	.47	.56	.43	.46	.53	.44
DN169	14M	3.4	.86	.89	.84	.48	.57	.43	.46	.55	.43
MN2(x ₅)	1.9M	0.1	.86	.89	.83	.46	.55	.42	.45	.53	.42
MN2(x ₁₁)	3.5M	0.3	.85	.89	.83	.45	.53	.42	.44	.53	.41

Table 2: We evaluate the performance of 3 architectures—ResNet, DenseNet and MobileNetV2—on its macro-F1, macro-precision, and macro-recall. We conduct the remaining experiments using the ResNet18 model as it provides a strong balance between performance and efficiency.

Semantic Information Encoding. We evaluate the effect of information encoding in the classification process by training two ResNet18 models—one on the RGB images, where each byte is assigned to a particular color channel depending on its position in the DEX file structure as proposed in [20], and another on grayscale converted images. We find no improvement in the macro-F1 score using semantically encoded RGB images compared to grayscale ones. As there are alternative encoding techniques [20], we believe comparing the effects of different encodings could be an interesting future research direction. Going forward, all models are trained using grayscale images.

Evaluating Model Architectures. We evaluate malware detection and classification performance on 3 popular deep learning architectures (ResNet, DenseNet and MobileNetV2) across a variety of model sizes, using grayscale encoded images, and cross entropy loss. In Table 2, we report the macro-F1, macro-precision, and macro-recall of each model. We find that all models obtain similar macro-F1 scores, indicating that a small model has enough capacity to learn the features present in the binary images. Going forward, all experiments use a ResNet18 model due to its strong performance and fast training time.

Accounting for Class Imbalance. We evaluate 3 imbalanced classification techniques—(1) class reweighting with cross entropy loss, (2) focal loss, and (3) class reweighting with focal loss; and compare this to a model trained using cross entropy loss without class weighting. For class reweighting, each example of a class c is weighted according to its effective number $\frac{1-\beta}{1-\beta^{n_c}}$, where n_c is the number of images in class c and $\beta = 0.999$ is selected through a line search across standard values [10] of $\{0.9, 0.99, 0.999, 0.9999\}$. For focal loss [31], a regularization technique that tackles imbalance by establishing margins based on the class size, we set the hyperparameter $\gamma = 2$ as suggested in [31].

Analyzing the results, we find that cross entropy loss with class reweighting improves the *type* macro-F1 score by 0.021, but lowers the binary and family classification scores by 0.002 and 0.006, respectively. In particular, we notice that MALNET-IMAGE’s smallest

types benefit the most from class reweighting, where the ‘Click’ type (113 examples), sees its F1 score rise from 0 to 0.91. On the other hand, focal loss shows no improvement over the baseline model, likely due to its design for use in dense object detectors like R-CNN. Going forward, all experiments use cross entropy loss with class reweighting due to the strong improvement in smaller malware types.

MALNET-IMAGE TINY Performance. We train a ResNet18 model on grayscale images using cross entropy loss and class reweighting, and achieve a macro-F1 score of 0.65. Compared to full dataset, the macro-F1 score is significantly higher 0.65 vs 0.49; which is unsurprising since the largest 4 types contained a significant proportion of the image diversity (based on the number of families), resulting in an easier classification task.

Limitations. Methods that work well on other datasets may not work well on MALNET-IMAGE due to structural differences in the images; vice-versa, methods that work on MALNET-IMAGE may not transfer well to other datasets. We hope this work inspires new research in the binary image domain, enabling the development of methods that generalize across key domains such as cybersecurity.

3.2 Application 2: Malware Detection

Researchers and practitioners can now conduct malware detection experiments on an industry scale dataset, evaluating things that were previously reported in propriety settings. Using the model selected in Section 3.1—a ResNet18 model trained on grayscale images using cross entropy loss and class reweighting—we perform an in-depth analysis of this highly imbalanced detection problem containing 1,182,905 malicious and 79,119 benign images. We find that the model is able to obtain a strong macro-F1 score of 0.86, macro-precision of 0.89 and a macro-recall of 0.84. We further study the model’s detection capabilities by analyzing its ROC curve, where the model achieves an AUC score of 0.94, and is able to identify 84% of all malicious files with a false positive rate of 10% (a common threshold used in security [7]). This first of its kind analysis allows researchers insight into malware detection that is usually restricted to handful of industry labs.

MALNET-IMAGE also opens new opportunities in the nascent and promising research direction of analyzing attention maps to interpret malware detection results. Yakura et al. [51, 52] showed that specific byte sequences found in the attention map closely correlate with malicious code payloads. We evaluate the potential of attention maps on MALNET-IMAGE using the popular Grad-Cam [47] technique to highlight regions of interest across 3 types of malware and benignware in Figure 3. In the malware images (left three), we see the attention map is focused on thin regions of bytecode in the data section (where malicious payloads are often stored), while in the benign images (right side) the attention map is dispersed across the larger data region. This type of visual analysis can significantly reduce the amount of time and effort required to manually investigate a file by guiding security analysts to suspicious regions of the bytecode.

3.3 Application 3: Malware Classification

MALNET-IMAGE opens up new research into binary images as a tool for multi-class malware classification (e.g., is this file Ransomware or Spyware?). Using the model selected in Section 3.1, we perform

Visualizing Model Attention Regions




Figure 3: Model attention patterns across 4 malware types (each with 2 images). Ransom++Trojan: focus on thin region of data section. Benign: wide range of attention across data section. Adware: attention on circular bytecode “hotspots”. Monitor: focus on “empty” black region of data section.

an in-depth analysis of its multi-class classification capability across 47 types and 696 families of malware. We find the model is able to classify the malware *type* and malware *family* with a macro-F1 score of 0.49 and 0.45, respectively.

In Figure 4, we conduct an in-depth analysis into *type* level classification performance through a confusion matrix heatmap. A dark diagonal indicates strong classifier performance, where a dark off-diagonal entry indicates poor performance. Each square in the diagonal indicates the percent of examples correctly classified for a particular malware type, and each off-diagonal row entry indicates the percent of incorrectly classified examples for a particular malware type. We find that four types of malware comprise the majority of misclassifications: Adware, Benign, Riskware, and Trojan. Unsurprisingly, these are the 4 largest types of malware (based on the number of images in each class), indicating the strong effect that data imbalance has in the malware classification process. In addition, the heatmap can be used to identify potential naming disagreements between vendor labels (e.g., “adware” and “adsware”), serving as the basis for merging certain types of malware. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first public large-scale analysis of malware classification, providing a new state-of-the-art benchmark to compare against.

3.4 Enabling New Research Directions

The scale and diversity of MALNET-IMAGE opens up new exciting research opportunities to the ML and security communities. Below, we present 3 promising directions (R1-R3).

R1. Advancing Vision Based Cybersecurity Research. Research into developing image-based malware detection and classification algorithms has recently surged across industry (e.g., Intel-Microsoft collaboration on Stamina [7], security companies [20, 39]) and academia [3–6, 8, 16, 19, 21, 26, 28, 29, 33–35, 43, 48, 54]. However, existing public datasets contain only a handful of classes and thousands of images, and as the field advances, larger and more challenging datasets are needed for

Classification Performance: Image Type




Figure 4: Malware classification results using confusion matrix heatmap (classes in descending order of number of samples). We analyze type level classification performance, where a dark diagonal indicates strong performance, and a dark off-diagonal indicates poor performance. Each square in the diagonal indicates the percent of examples correctly classified for a particular malware type, and each off-diagonal entry indicates the percent of incorrectly classified examples for a particular type.

the next generation of models. With the release of MALNET-IMAGE, researchers have access to a critical resource to develop and benchmark advanced image-based malware detection and classification algorithms, previously restricted to a few industry labs and research teams.

R2. Extending Imbalanced Classification to a New Domain. Only preliminary work has studied binary-image malware classification under data imbalance [54] due to the limited number of classes and images available in public datasets. As a result, it is unknown whether many techniques may generalize to the binary-image domain, and how they will perform in highly imbalanced classification scenarios. We take a first step in this direction in Section 3.1, where we show that classes containing only a few examples typically underperform relative to their more populous counterparts—highlighting the significant challenge of imbalanced classification in the cybersecurity domain. By releasing MALNET-IMAGE, one of the largest naturally imbalanced databases to date, we hope to foster new interest in this important research area, enabling the machine learning community to impact and generalize across domains.

R3. Interpretable Cybersecurity Research. Preliminary research has demonstrated the importance of attention mechanisms in binary-image malware classification, where extracted regions can provide strong indicators to human analysts, helping guide them to suspicious parts of the bytecode for additional analysis [51, 52]. This includes recent research in salience based methods that automatically discover concepts, helping to identify correlated regions of bytecode [55]. Prior to MALNET-IMAGE, researchers were limited to a small number of malicious families and types, hindering their ability to conduct large-scale explainability studies. With MALNET-IMAGE’s nearly 700 classes, researchers can explore a wide variety of malicious software, enabling new breakthroughs and discoveries. For example, researchers might discover that new types of visualization and sense-making techniques are needed to accurately summarize large volumes of binary-image data to enhance security analysts decision making capabilities.

4 CONCLUSION

Computer vision research into binary-image malware detection and classification is a crucial tool in protecting enterprise networks and governments from cyber attacks seeking to interrupt critical services and steal intellectual property. Leveraging MALNET-IMAGE’s scale and diversity—containing 1,262,024 binary images across a hierarchy of 47 types and 696 families—researchers and practitioners can now conduct experiments that were previously restricted to a few industry labs and research teams. We hope MALNET-IMAGE becomes a central resource for a broad range of research into vision-based cyber defenses, multi-class imbalanced classification, and interpretable security.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Kevin Allix and AndroZoo colleagues for generously allowing us to use their data in this research; this work was in part

supported by NSF grant IIS-1563816, CNS-1704701, GRFP (DGE-1650044), a Raytheon research fellowship, and an IBM fellowship.

REFERENCES

- [1] 2018. Nokia Threat Intelligence Report. *Network Security* (2018). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1353-4858\(18\)30122-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1353-4858(18)30122-3)
- [2] Kevin Allix, Tegawendé F Bissyandé, Jacques Klein, and Yves Le Traon. 2016. Androzoo: Collecting millions of android apps for the research community. In *2016 IEEE/ACM 13th Working Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*. IEEE, 468–471.
- [3] Ahmad Azab and Mahmoud Khasawneh. 2020. MSIC: Malware Spectrogram Image Classification. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 102007–102021.
- [4] Roland Burks, Kazi Aminul Islam, Yan Lu, and Jiang Li. 2019. Data Augmentation with Generative Models for Improved Malware Detection: A Comparative Study. In *UEMCON*. IEEE, 0660–0665.
- [5] Ferhat Ozgur Catak, Javed Ahmed, Kevser Sahinbas, and Zahid Hussain Khand. 2020. Data Augmentation Based Malware Detection using Convolutional Neural Networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.01862* (2020).
- [6] Li Chen. 2018. Deep transfer learning for static malware classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.07606* (2018).
- [7] Li Chen, Ravi Sahita, Jugal Parikh, and Marc Marino. [n.d.]. Stamina: scalable deep learning approach for malware classification. *Intel White Paper* ([n.d.]).
- [8] Sunoh Choi, Sungwook Jang, Youngsoo Kim, and Jonghyun Kim. 2017. Malware detection using malware image and deep learning. In *ICTC*. IEEE, 1193–1195.
- [9] Gregory Conti, Sergey Bratus, Anna Shubina, Andrew Lichtenberg, Roy Ragsdale, Robert Perez-Alemany, Benjamin Sangster, and Matthew Supan. 2010. A visual study of primitive binary fragment types. *Black Hat USA* (2010).
- [10] Yin Cui, Menglin Jia, Tsung-Yi Lin, Yang Song, and Serge Belongie. 2019. Class-balanced loss based on effective number of samples. In *CVPR*. 9268–9277.
- [11] Zhihua Cui, Fei Xue, Xingjuan Cai, Yang Cao, Gai-ge Wang, and Jinjun Chen. 2018. Detection of malicious code variants based on deep learning. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics* 14, 7 (2018), 3187–3196.
- [12] Rahul Duggal, Scott Freitas, Sunny Dhammani, Duen Horng Chau, and Jimeng Sun. 2021. HAR: Hardness Aware Reweighting for Imbalanced Datasets. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. IEEE, 735–745.
- [13] Rahul Duggal, Scott Freitas, Sunny Dhammani, Duen Horng, Jimeng Sun, et al. 2020. ELF: An Early-Exiting Framework for Long-Tailed Classification. *arXiv:2006.11979* (2020).
- [14] Rahul Duggal, Scott Freitas, Cao Xiao, Duen Horng Chau, and Jimeng Sun. 2020. REST: Robust and Efficient Neural Networks for Sleep Monitoring in the Wild. In *Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020*. 1704–1714.
- [15] Thomas Dullien and Rolf Rolles. 2005. Graph-based comparison of executable objects. *SSTIC* (2005).
- [16] Yong Fang, Yangchen Gao, Fan Jing, and Lei Zhang. 2020. Android Malware Familial Classification Based on DEX File Section Features. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 10614–10627.
- [17] Scott Freitas, Yuxiao Dong, Joshua Neil, and Duen Horng Chau. 2020. A Large-Scale Database for Graph Representation Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.07682* (2020).
- [18] Scott Freitas, Andrew Wicker, Duen Horng Chau, and Joshua Neil. 2020. D2M: Dynamic Defense and Modeling of Adversarial Movement in Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2020 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*. SIAM.
- [19] Jianwen Fu, Jingfeng Xue, Yong Wang, Zhenyan Liu, and Chun Shan. 2018. Malware visualization for fine-grained classification. *IEEE Access* 6 (2018), 14510–14523.
- [20] Jordy Gennissen, Lorenzo Cavallaro, Veelasha Moonsamy, and Lejla Batina. 2017. Gamut: Sifting through Images to Detect Android Malware.
- [21] Kyoung Soo Han, Jae Hyun Lim, Boojoong Kang, and Eul Gyu Im. 2015. Malware analysis using visualized images and entropy graphs. *International Journal of Information Security* 14, 1 (2015), 1–14.
- [22] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 770–778.
- [23] Andrew G Howard, Menglong Zhu, Bo Chen, Dmitry Kalenichenko, Weijun Wang, Tobias Weyand, Marco Andreetto, and Hartwig Adam. 2017. Mobilenets: Efficient convolutional neural networks for mobile vision applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.04861* (2017).
- [24] Gao Huang, Zhuang Liu, Laurens Van Der Maaten, and Kilian Q Weinberger. 2017. Densely connected convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 4700–4708.
- [25] Médéric Hurier, Guillermo Suarez-Tangil, Santanu Kumar Dash, Tegawendé F Bissyandé, Yves Le Traon, Jacques Klein, and Lorenzo Cavallaro. 2017. Euphony: Harmonious unification of cacophonous anti-virus vendor labels for Android malware. In *2017 IEEE/ACM 14th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*. IEEE.

[26] Ashutosh Jain, Hugo Gonzalez, and Natalia Stakhanova. 2015. Enriching reverse engineering through visual exploration of Android binaries. In *Proceedings of the 5th Program Protection and Reverse Engineering Workshop*. 1–9.

[27] Mahmoud Kalash, Mrigank Rochan, Noman Mohammed, Neil DB Bruce, Yang Wang, and Farkhund Iqbal. 2018. Malware classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In *NTMS*. IEEE, 1–5.

[28] Kesav Kancherla and Srinivas Mukkamala. 2013. Image visualization based malware detection. In *2013 IEEE Symposium on Computational Intelligence in Cyber Security (CICS)*. IEEE, 40–44.

[29] Ajit Kumar, K Pramod Sagar, KS Kuppusamy, and G Aghila. 2016. Machine learning based malware classification for Android applications using multimodal image representations. In *ISCO*. IEEE, 1–6.

[30] Li Li, Jun Gao, Médéric Hurier, Pingfan Kong, Tegawendé F Bissyandé, Alexandre Bartel, Jacques Klein, and Yves Le Traon. 2017. Androzoo++: Collecting millions of android apps and their metadata for the research community. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.05281* (2017).

[31] Tsung-Yi Lin, Priya Goyal, Ross Girshick, Kaiming He, and Piotr Dollár. 2017. Focal loss for dense object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 2980–2988.

[32] Shuqiang Lu, Lingyun Ying, Wenjie Lin, Yu Wang, Meining Nie, Kaiwen Shen, Lu Liu, and Haixin Duan. 2019. New Era of Deeplearning-Based Malware Intrusion Detection: The Malware Detection and Prediction Based On Deep Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.08356* (2019).

[33] Jhu-Sin Luo and Dan Chia-Tien Lo. 2017. Binary malware image classification using machine learning with local binary pattern. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. IEEE, 4664–4667.

[34] Niall McLaughlin, Jesus Martinez del Rincon, Boojoong Kang, Suleiman Yerima, Paul Miller, Sakir Sezer, Yeganeh Safaei, Erik Trickel, Ziming Zhao, Adam Doupé, et al. 2017. Deep android malware detection. In *CODASPY*. ACM, 301–308.

[35] Francesco Mercaldo and Antonella Santone. 2020. Deep learning for image-based mobile malware detection. *Journal of Computer Virology and Hacking Techniques* (2020).

[36] Antonio Nappa, M Zubair Rafique, and Juan Caballero. 2013. Driving in the cloud: An analysis of drive-by download operations and abuse reporting. In *DIMVA*.

[37] Lakshmanan Nataraj, Sreejith Karthikeyan, Gregoire Jacob, and Bangalore S Manjunath. 2011. Malware images: visualization and automatic classification. In *international symposium on visualization for cyber security*.

[38] Lakshmanan Nataraj, Vinod Yegneswaran, Phillip Porras, and Jian Zhang. 2011. A comparative assessment of malware classification using binary texture analysis and dynamic analysis. In *Proceedings of the 4th ACM Workshop on Security and Artificial Intelligence*. 21–30.

[39] David Noever and Samantha E Miller Noever. 2021. Virus-MNIST: A Benchmark Malware Dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.00602* (2021).

[40] The Council of Economic Advisers. 2018. The Cost of Malicious Cyber Activity to the U.S. Economy. (2018).

[41] Ben Popper. 2017. Google announces over 2 billion monthly active devices on Android. <https://www.theverge.com/2017/5/17/15654454/android-reaches-2-billion-monthly-active-users>

[42] Edward Raff, Jon Barker, Jared Sylvester, Robert Brandon, Bryan Catanzaro, and Charles K Nicholas. 2018. Malware detection by eating a whole exe. In *Workshops at the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.

[43] Zhongqi Ren, Haomin Wu, Qian Ning, Iftikhar Hussain, and Bingcui Chen. 2020. End-to-end malware detection for android IoT devices using deep learning. *Ad Hoc Networks* (2020).

[44] Edmar Rezende, Guilherme Ruppert, Tiago Carvalho, Antonio Theophilo, Fabio Ramos, and Paulo de Geus. 2018. Malicious software classification using VGG16 deep neural network's bottleneck features. In *Information Technology-New Generations*. Springer, 51–59.

[45] Royi Ronen, Marian Radu, Corina Feuerstein, Elad Yom-Tov, and Mansour Ahmadi. 2018. Microsoft malware classification challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.10135* (2018).

[46] V Sai Sathyanarayanan, Pankaj Kohli, and Bezwada Bruhadheeshwar. 2008. Signature generation and detection of malware families. In *ACISP*. Springer, 336–349.

[47] Ramprasaath R Selvaraju, Michael Cogswell, Abhishek Das, Ramakrishna Vedantam, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra. 2017. Grad-cam: Visual explanations from deep networks via gradient-based localization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 618–626.

[48] Jiawei Su, Vargas Danilo Vasconcellos, Sanjiva Prasad, Sgandurra Daniele, Yaokai Feng, and Kouichi Sakurai. 2018. Lightweight classification of IoT malware based on image recognition. In *COMPSAC*. Vol. 2. IEEE, 664–669.

[49] Virus Total. 2012. Virustotal-free online virus, malware and url scanner. *Online*: <https://www.virustotal.com/en> (2012).

[50] Fengguo Wei, Yuping Li, Sankardas Roy, Xinming Ou, and Wu Zhou. 2017. Deep ground truth analysis of current android malware. In *DIMVA*.

[51] Hiromu Yatura, Shinnosuke Shinozaki, Reon Nishimura, Yoshihiro Oyama, and Jun Sakuma. 2018. Malware analysis of imaged binary samples by convolutional neural network with attention mechanism. In *CODASPY*. 127–134.

[52] Hiromu Yatura, Shinnosuke Shinozaki, Reon Nishimura, Yoshihiro Oyama, and Jun Sakuma. 2019. Neural malware analysis with attention mechanism. *Computers & Security* (2019).

[53] Ilsun You and Kangbin Yim. 2010. Malware obfuscation techniques: A brief survey. In *BWCCA*. IEEE, 297–300.

[54] Songqing Yue. 2017. Imbalanced malware images classification: a CNN based approach. *arXiv:1708.08042* (2017).

[55] Rui Zhao, Wanli Ouyang, Hongsheng Li, and Xiaogang Wang. 2015. Saliency detection by multi-context deep learning. In *CVPR*. 1265–1274.