May 30, 2024 0:59 WSPC/WS-IJWMIP ws-ijwmip

International Journal of Wavelets, Multiresolution and Information Processing © World Scientific Publishing Company

Comparative Study of Neighbor-based Methods for Local Outlier Detection

Zhuang Qi

School of Software, Shandong University, 1500 ShunHua Road, Jinan, Shandong, China, z qi@mail.sdu.edu.cn

Junlin Zhang

School of Mathematics and Computer, Shantou University, No. 5 Cuifeng Road, Shantou, Guangdong, China, 21jlzhang@stu.edu.cn

Xiaming Chen* (corresponding author)

School of Mathematics and Computer, Shantou University, No. 5 Cuifeng Road, Shantou, Guangdong, China, chenxm@stu.edu.cn

Xin Qi* (corresponding author)

School of Chemistry and Life Sciences, Suzhou University of Science and Technology, 99 XueFu Road, Suzhou, Jiangsu, China, qixin@usts.edu.cn

The neighbor-based method has become a powerful tool to handle the outlier detection problem, which aims to infer the abnormal degree of the sample based on the compactness of the sample and its neighbors. However, the existing methods commonly focus on designing different processes to locate outliers in the dataset, while the contributions of different types neighbors to outlier detection has not been well discussed. To this end, this paper studies the neighbor in the existing outlier detection algorithms and a taxonomy is introduced, which uses the three-level components of information, neighbor and methodology to define hybrid methods. This taxonomy can serve as a paradigm where a novel neighbor-based outlier detection method can be proposed by combining different components in this taxonomy. A large number of comparative experiments were conducted on synthetic and real-world datasets in terms of performance comparison and case study, and the results show that reverse K-nearest neighbor based methods achieve promising performance and dynamic selection method is suitable for working in highdimensional space. Notably, it is verified that rationally selecting components from this taxonomy may create an algorithms superior to existing methods.

Keywords: Neighbor-based, Local outlier, Taxonomy, Outlier detection, Reorganize components.

AMS Subject Classification: 22E46, 53C35, 57S20

1. Introduction

In recent years, with the progress of data acquisition technology, a large number of datasets have been created and applied, which have brought great benefits to sci-

entific research and social development. However, despite the large amount of data that can be used directly, some events are rare or abnormal. Previous studies have shown that the original dataset may contain about 10% of outliers [\[14,](#page-16-0)[33\]](#page-17-0). In many areas, outliers often lead to unreliable results in model decisions. In order to detect outliers, a simple but effective method is to compare the characteristics of the target sample and the samples in its neighborhood. However, the existing outlier detection methods focus on designing different indicators to measure the characteristics of each sample [\[13,](#page-16-1) [39,](#page-17-1) [41\]](#page-17-2), but ignore the significance of neighborhood.

Existing neighbor-based methods can be divided into different categories, based on their approaches to construct the neighbor and the way to select neighbor. Specifically, commonly-used neighbor construct methods include static sorting [\[13,](#page-16-1) [23\]](#page-17-3) and dynamic selection [\[42,](#page-18-0) [43\]](#page-18-1). And frequently-used neighbor select approaches can be categorized into K-nearest neighbor (KNN) based [\[12,](#page-16-2) [13,](#page-16-1) [39,](#page-17-1) [42\]](#page-18-0), nature neighbor (NaN) based [\[16,](#page-16-3) [40,](#page-17-4) [53\]](#page-18-2), reverse K-nearest neighbor (RKNN) based [\[5,](#page-16-4) [12,](#page-16-2) [36\]](#page-17-5), Hybrid-based [\[53\]](#page-18-2) and non-nature neighbor (Non-NaN) based [\[31\]](#page-17-6). Particularly worth mentioning is the existing methods generally perform well on global outlier problems, while their effectiveness on the task of detecting local outliers has not been fully validated. Although some researchers have compared the scalability, memory consumption and robustness of multiple outlier detection algorithms, the influence of neighbors on the algorithm is not the focus of discussion [\[9,](#page-16-5) [46\]](#page-18-3). To this end, it is necessary to perform a comparative study of existing neighbor-based algorithms to verify their reliability in local outlier detection scenarios.

To analyze and alleviate the aforesaid issues, the basic components of existing neighbor-based methods are decoupled and reorganized, and a taxonomy is proposed for local outlier detection. In this taxonomy, the key components of three levels are applied to define the existing methods, including Information, Methodology and Neighbor levels. The existing methods are segmented into original data and attribute reduction data on data level in detail. At the neighbor level, they are divided into three categories based on the method of neighbor selection, including KNN-based, NaN-based and Non-NaN based. And methodology level includes static sorting and dynamic searching. The taxonomy can act as a new design paradigm for local outlier detection methods and provide an idea to create novel algorithms by combining the components contained in each level of the taxonomy. A large number of experiments have been implemented on the commonly used outlier detection datasets to compare the performance of existing methods and their variants. By observing the results of comparative experiments, the effectiveness of the combination of various neighbor selection and neighbor construction methods is analyzed, and the law of the influence of various neighbors on the performance of the model is summarized. And the prospects of neighbor-based approaches for improving performance in local outlier problems. In general, the main contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

• Review the construction and selection methods of various neighbors.

- A taxonomy is presented to categorize the key components of neighborbased methods for local outliers detection and it is conducive to come up with novel algorithms.
- The effectiveness of the existing neighbor-based methods and their variants in the local outliers detection tasks is verified. In addition, the role of components at each level is also discussed, which provides guidelines for the development of neighbor based local outlier detection methods in the future.

The remaining paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce quiet a few applications of neighbor-based methods in classifiction and the main ideas of different types of outlier detection algorithms. In Section 3, the taxonomy of neighbor-based methods for local outlier detection is described from three levels: information, methodology, and neighbor. Section 4 details the evaluation metrics, experimental data, experimental results and corresponding analysis. Finally, some conclusions are summarized in Section 5.

2. Related work

2.1. Neighbor-based Methods in classification

The neighbor-based approaches have attracted a lot of attention for their simplicity and effectiveness, which are widely used in classification tasks [\[11,](#page-16-6) [37,](#page-17-7) [50,](#page-18-4) [51\]](#page-18-5). Neighbor-based methods often infer the category of the target sample from the characteristics of neighbors, so neighbor feature extraction, neighbor construction and neighbor selection are three key steps of neighbor-based methods [\[19,](#page-16-7) [28\]](#page-17-8). Euclidean distance [\[22,](#page-17-9)[27\]](#page-17-10) and Manhattan distance [\[8\]](#page-16-8) are commonly used indicators to represent features. Neighbors are usually constructed by static sorting and dynamic selection. There are many ways to select neighbors, including K nearest neighbors (KNN), K natural neighbors (NaN), and so on.

The process of static sorting method is simple and easy to implement, which sorts the distance indicators (or other indicators) between samples, and selects the nearest samples as neighbors [\[17\]](#page-16-9), as shown on the left in Figure [1](#page-3-0) (a). Dynamic selection is more complicated than static sorting, which only one neighbor is selected in each round. Applying dynamic selection method to find neighbors is based on the set of selected neighbors rather than a fixed sample. Therefore, the starting point of each round is dynamically changed, as shown on the right in Figure [1](#page-3-0) (b). The KNN set obtained by static sorting always quantifies a circular or spherical local area, which is not flexible enough because it cannot be changed according to the specific distribution of the data. In contrast, the idea of dynamic selection helps to generate the correct local neighborhood to quantify arbitrary distributions because it is dynamic rather than based on fixed objects [\[42\]](#page-18-0).

Fig. 1. Compare the neighbors obtained by (a) static sorting and (b) dynamic selection.

2.2. Outlier detection

Outlier detection approaches are generally divided into distance-based [\[3,](#page-16-10) [36,](#page-17-5) [49\]](#page-18-6), density-based [\[38,](#page-17-11) [39,](#page-17-1) [42\]](#page-18-0), cluster-based [\[5,](#page-16-4) [15\]](#page-16-11), and so on. The distance-based methods detect outliers by calculating the distance between all objects. However, they do not consider the change of local density and perform poorly in local outlier detection tasks, so they can only be applied to global outlier detection scenarios [\[16\]](#page-16-3). In density-based methods, abnormal patterns are described as the huge difference in density between an object and its neighbors, and these methods can address the problem of the uneven density of datasets. In cluster-based methods, an object that does not belong to any cluster, or belongs to a small cluster far from other clusters, is identified as an outlier. The purpose of cluster-based methods is to form clustering rather than detect outliers, so outliers can also be called a by-product of clustering.

Neighbors are a key part of the outlier detection algorithm [\[10,](#page-16-12) [48\]](#page-18-7). Due to the unreliability of traditional distance in high-dimensional space, it is necessary to find neighbors in a subspace. In [\[52\]](#page-18-8), an outlier detection algorithm based on subspace is proposed, which deletes irrelevant attributes and samples from datasets by analyzing the correlation of attributes. In [\[24\]](#page-17-12), the low-rank approximation technique is adopted, whose purpose is to project high-dimensional space into low-dimension. Outlier detection in subspace is helpful to improve the performance of the model. In addition, the choice of hyperparameter K is also crucial. In [\[29\]](#page-17-13), a parameter K search algorithm based on mutual neighbor graph (MNG) was proposed to determine parameter K by looking for the stable state of MNG.

Fig. 2. An introduction of the taxonomy for neighbor-based methods in outlier detection.

Fig. 3. Illustration of the detection process of the neighbor-based outlier detection methods.

3. Taxonomy of Neighbor-based Methods for Local Outlier Detection

The proposed taxonomy decouples and recombines components at different levels (including information, methods, and optimizations, as shown in Figure [2\)](#page-4-0) to describe existing neighbor-based approaches in local outlier detection. The following sections describe them in detail.

3.1. Information level

At the information level, the existing neighbor-based methods are divided into two categories: full space-based and subspace-based, as shown in the following.

3.1.1. Full space-based method

The full space-based methods directly use the original data without data processing. As shown in the Figure [3,](#page-4-1) we summarize the process of neighbor-based outlier detection.

The full space-based methods ignore the second step. Existing works [\[13,](#page-16-1) [23,](#page-17-3) [39\]](#page-17-1) detect outliers in the full space by designing different outlier factors, which has a good performance in low-dimensional datasets.

3.1.2. Subspace-based method

The subspace-based method maps the high-dimensional space of the original data to the low-dimensional space to ensure the reliability of the indicator (such as euclidean distance) [\[20\]](#page-16-13). The general form can be expressed as the following formula (1):

$$
X_{sub} = S(X_{ori})
$$
\n^(3.1)

where $S(\cdot)$ can be expressed as different subspace searching methods, X_{ori} is raw data and X_{sub} is the corresponding subspace data. The transformation from high dimension to low dimension is realized by feature extraction [\[30\]](#page-17-14) and feature selection [\[18,](#page-16-14) [47\]](#page-18-9).

3.2. Methodology level

Methodology level contains the existing methods of constructing neighbor. Static sorting methods select the K nearest neighbor directly, while dynamic selection methods can only select one (or multiple with the same distance) neighbor in each round until there are K neighbors.

3.2.1. Static sorting

Firstly, the distance between each sample is calculated based on the sample features. After sorting, the nearest K objects are selected as KNN set at once. Figure [1](#page-3-0) (a) describes the method of static sorting. For A, the nearest one is C, followed by B, E, F, H, D and G. Therefore, the KNN set of A is $\{C, B, E, F\}$ when $K = 4$. Changing the K value, the corresponding KNN set can also be obtained quickly. This method is widely used in existing studys owing to the simplicity [\[2,](#page-16-15) [13,](#page-16-1) [16,](#page-16-3) [39,](#page-17-1) [41\]](#page-17-2).

3.2.2. Dynamic selection

As shown in Figure [1](#page-3-0) (b), after multiple selections, KNN set is obtained, which is different from the result obtained by the static sorting method. From A to B, there are four iterations, and only consider the nearest neighbor or neighbors pointing to the subset of KNN in each iteration.

Obviously, from the perspective of the human social networks, the dynamic selection approaches consider friends of a person as well as his or her friends when constructing KNN sets [\[42\]](#page-18-0). And the KNN set of two people who are the best friend with each other is very similar.

3.3. Neighbor level

Neighbor level divides neighbors into five categories based on different selection methods of neighbors. We have shown them in Figure [2:](#page-4-0) which are (1) KNN-based, (2) RKNN-based, (3) Hybrid-based (4) NaN-based, (5) Non-NaN based. Among

Fig. 4. From left to right, the KNN set of A, B, C, and D are displayed respectively.

them, NaN set and Non-NaN set are constructed based on KNN set and RKNN set. Next, we will introduce the specific method from the details.

3.3.1. KNN-based

The way to generate KNN set can be defined as formula [\(3.2\)](#page-6-0),

$$
KNN(x) = N_k(x) \tag{3.2}
$$

where $N(\cdot)$ is neighbor selection method, static sorting or dynamic selection, and the corner mark k indicates the number of neighbors.

3.3.2. RKNN-based

The RKNN set corresponding to a sample x can be expressed as the following set:

$$
RKNN(x) = \{z \mid x \in KNN(z)\}\tag{3.3}
$$

If KNN set is regarded as a group of one's friends, then RKNN set can be regards as a team who counted the one as friend.

3.3.3. Hybrid-based

The Hybrid set extends KNN set and RKNN set by merging RKNN set on the basis of KNN set. The Hybrid set has the following form,

$$
Hybrid(x) = \{KNN(x) \cup RKNN(x)\}\tag{3.4}
$$

The hybrid approaches consider not only one's friends, but also the people who regard him or her as friends.

3.3.4. NaN-based

NaN set is obtained based on KNN set and RKNN set, i.e.,

$$
NaN_k(x) = \{ z \mid z \in KNN(x) \text{ and } z \in RKNN(x) \}
$$
\n
$$
(3.5)
$$

Similarly, in human social network, a person's real friends should be a friend who regards himself as a friend [\[16,](#page-16-3) [53\]](#page-18-2). Therefore, NaN represents a group of real friends in a social network.

3.3.5. Non-NaN based

The Non-NaN of an object can be defined as the difference set of KNN and NaN, i.e.,

$$
Non - NaN(x) = KNN(x) - NaN_k(x)
$$
\n(3.6)

Contrary to NaN, Non-NaN is a set of fake friends. Notably, applying Non-NaN based neighbors has not been investigated so far.

Next, we give an example of four neighbors. As is shown in the Figure [4,](#page-6-1) from left to right, the KNN set of A, B, C, and D are displayed respectively. Obviously, we have following result $(K=3)$, $KNN(A) = \{B, C, D\}$, $KNN(B) = \{A, D, F\}$, $KNN(C) = \{A, D, G\}, KNN(D) = \{B, F, G\}, RKNN(A) = \{B, C\}, NaN_3(A) =$ ${B, C}, \, \text{Non} - \text{NaN}_3 = \{D\}.$

4. Experimental evaluation

4.1. Metrics

Due to the sparsity of outliers, the dataset presents a class imbalance scenario. Since a high performance classifier can be obtained by identifying all samples as inliers, accuracy cannot be used to evaluate the performance of the classifier. To this end, we choose the AUC value as the main indicator, which is the area under the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. The ROC curves are drawn based on False Positive Rate (FPR) and True Positive Rate (TPR), where FPR and TPR are defined as formula $(??)$ and (4.1) ,

$$
FPR = \frac{FP}{FP + TN} \tag{4.1}
$$

$$
TPR = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \tag{4.2}
$$

True Positive(TP) denotes the number of true outliers being predicted as outliers, False Positive (FP) be the number of inliers are classified as outliers, True Negative (TN) means the number of inliers are predicted correctly, and False Negative (FN) denotes the number of outliers are classified wrongly.

In addition, to better illustrate the performance of various algorithms, the detection accuracy of outliers is also shown in the results, in which n and 2n with the highest outlier factor are regarded as outliers respectively (n is the number of outliers in the dataset), i.e.

$$
Acc_n = \frac{P_n}{R_n} \tag{4.3}
$$

$$
Acc_{2n} = \frac{P_{2n}}{R_n} \tag{4.4}
$$

where P_n and P_{2n} represent the number of outliers correctly predicted in the data points of n and 2n with the highest outlier factor, respectively.

4.2. Datasets

We evaluate the performance of the existing methods and their variants based on synthetic datasets and real-world datasets. In order to facilitate visualization, we design synthetic datasets in two-dimensional space, and we take into full consideration the diversified clustering patterns, various clustering densities and different clustering sizes when designing the datasets. The details of the synthetic datasets are illustrated in Figure [5.](#page-8-0) Similar to paper [\[13,](#page-16-1) [15\]](#page-16-11), Data1 has four clusters with different density and size as inliers, the remaining samples around the cluster are randomly generated as outliers. The total of 940 objects in Data1, and 90 objects (9.57%) are outliers. Data2 consists of two types of clusters containing 1100 samples with 105 outliers, accounting for 9.54%. Data3 involves a low density problem. It has 266 inliers and 58 outliers $(17.9\%).$

Fig. 5. Three synthetic datasets with different clusters. The red '+' is outliers and the blue '+' is inliers.

In addition, 9 real-world datasets are used in the study. The number of samples ranged from 148 to 9868 and feature numbers ranged from 5 to 258. Table [1](#page-9-0) gives an overview of datasets information. All of these datasets are publicly available on UCI [\[1\]](#page-16-16).

4.3. Implementation Details

In the experiment, the method of calculating density and outlier factor refers to [\[4\]](#page-16-17). The K value ranged from 5 to 50. Since RKNN set, NaN set, and Non-NaN set may be empty sets, the following rules are applied. First, if RKNN set or NaN set of an object is empty, then the object is seen as outlier. Second, if Non-NaN set of an object is empty, then the object is categorized as inlier. In the following experiments, FP-KNN-SS indicates that KNN set is constructed by Static Sorting method in the Full space, SP-RKNN-DS indicates that in the Subspace, the Dynamic Selection method is used to construct the RKNN set, and so on.

Table 1. The information of 11 datasets.

4.4. Performance Comparison

4.4.1. Accuracy analysis

In this section, we analyze the results of comparative experiments. Firstly, we experiment the whole space method based on different neighborhood and different neighborhood construction methods on synthetic data sets. We set the control parameter k of neighbor size between 5-50. We use different neighborhoods and their construction methods to realize lof [\[23\]](#page-17-3). All results are shown in Table [2,](#page-10-0) Figure [6.](#page-10-1) We can summarize the followings:

- In scenarios without low-density patterns, such as Data1 and Data2, RKNN-based methods, better performance than other was achieved. For AUC values, RKNN-based methods get the highest scores. And the outliers in Data2 are identified correctly by FP-RkNN-SS method. It may be caused by the RKNN set contains a lot of data with large density difference from the target sample.
- For Data1 and Data2, RKNN-based methods achieve the best Accuracy on top-n and top-2n. This verifies that RKNN can well represent the relationship between samples without low-density patterns.
- The RKNN-based has a poor performance on Data3. As shown in Figure [5,](#page-8-0) Data3 has three different density clusters. At this moment, Non-NaN based methods achieve the best AUC and Accuracy. This is mainly because some instances in KNN set are pseudo nearest neighbors, they may have a negative impact on the inference of the model.
- In Figure [6](#page-10-1) (right), the blue line decreases with the increase of K value, while the red line fluctuates in the low-level region. This verifies that hyperparameter K is a key factor to determine the performance of the model.
- Compared with other methods, KNN-based methods is always neither the

ີ										
Methods		Data1			Data2		Data3			
	A_n	A_{2n}	$_{\mathrm{AUC}}$	A_n	A_{2n}	$\rm AUC$	A_n	A_{2n}	AUC	
FP-KNN-SS	0.6822	0.8066	0.9299	0.8609	0.9009	0.9610	0.6758	0.8027	0.8564	
FP-RKNN-SS	0.9466	1.0000	0.9980	0.8438	0.9276	0.9908	0.4586	0.4517	0.7504	
FP-Hy-SS	0.7122	0.8433	0.9891	0.8223	0.8980	0.9807	0.6603	0.7982	0.8545	
FP-NaN-SS	0.2335	0.3122	0.6336	0.3895	0.4161	0.6154	0.1517	0.5948	0.7343	
FP-Non-SS	0.7377	0.8466	0.9401	0.7857	0.8485	0.9443	0.7749	0.8334	0.8707	
FP-KNN-DS	0.7200	0.7900	0.9118	0.8095	0.8514	0.9172	0.2068	0.4620	0.5719	
FP-RKNN-DS	0.8889	0.9211	0.9784	0.8623	0.9228	0.9582	0.0534	0.1586	0.5421	
FP-Hy-DS	0.7655	0.8644	0.9756	0.8590	0.9076	0.9489	0.1810	0.3810	0.5562	
FP-NaN-DS	0.1288	0.2335	0.4841	0.1742	0.1838	0.4824	0.0293	0.0482	0.5374	
FP-Non-DS	0.7233	0.7944	0.9172	0.7257	0.7914	0.8342	0.4491	0.5206	0.6733	

Comparative Study of Neighbor-based Methods for Local Outlier Detection 11

Table 2. Average AUC values of baseline and its variants for $5 \leq K \leq 50$ on real-world datasets.

Fig. 6. AUC curves of the SS-based algorithms on the synthetic datasets for $5 \leq K \leq 50$.

best nor the worst. Although FP-KNN-SS method do not perform as well as RKNN-based on Data1 and Data2, most outliers are correctly identified in Data3.

- From the overall perspective, the method based on static sorting is better than the dynamic selection on synthetic datasets. In two-dimension data, applying static sorting for constructing KNN set can achieve better detections.
- In addition, the performance of all algorithms has different tendency due to the change of K value. Among them, FP-Hy-SS has been consistent throughout the experiment.

Next, we ran experiments on real-world datasets. Compared with synthetic data, the real-world datasets may contain more samples, the samples have more features, and the data distribution is more complex. In order to solve the problem of unreliable distance in high-dimensional space, PCA method is used to construct subspace and the dimension is reduced to half of the original. The results are reported in Figure [7,](#page-13-0) [8](#page-14-0) and Table [3,](#page-11-0) [4,](#page-11-1) [5.](#page-12-0) We have the following points:

• In Table [3,](#page-11-0) we noticed that RKNN-based method achieved the best performance 22 times in all the comparative experiments. The second is Hybridbased methods, which got the best 11 times. And compared with other

Methods	Arrhythmia	PenDigits	Annthyroid	Pima	Glass	WDBC	Wilt	Cardiot	Shuttle	Waveform	Lympho
FP-KNN-SS	0.976	0.897	0.648	0.634	0.756	0.977	0.741	0.534	0.909	0.731	0.971
FP-RKNN-SS	0.986	0.986	0.576	0.820	0.819	0.999	0.691	0.651	0.911	0.775	0.995
FP-Hy-SS	0.977	0.966	0.649	0.688	0.794	0.998	0.735	0.557	0.944	0.738	0.981
FP-NaN-SS	0.728	0.537	0.569	0.601	0.207	0.806	0.632	0.532	0.473	0.543	0.634
FP-Non-SS	0.977	0.916	0.638	0.655	0.794	0.978	0.733	0.858	0.891	0.762	0.976
FP-KNN-DS	0.968	0.929	0.633	0.796	0.825	0.966	0.698	0.529	0.842	0.702	0.988
FP-RKNN-DS	0.960	0.936	0.597	0.845	0.844	0.999	0.694	0.659	0.921	0.613	0.986
FP-Hy-DS	0.971	0.968	0.634	0.813	0.875	0.998	0.713	0.552	0.868	0.705	0.991
FP-NaN-DS	0.737	0.597	0.436	0.482	0.653	0.809	0.426	0.586	0.625	0.438	0.091
FP-Non-DS	0.964	0.933	0.618	0.784	0.825	0.973	0.684	0.726	0.815	0.693	0.989
SP-KNN-SS	0.981	0.864	0.782	0.632	0.749	0.982	0.474	0.558	0.953	0.735	0.978
SP-RKNN-SS	0.978	0.988	0.793	0.833	0.825	0.999	0.248	0.679	0.929	0.785	0.985
SP-Hy-SS	0.982	0.944	0.840	0.707	0.791	0.998	0.444	0.581	0.951	0.742	0.977
SP-NaN-SS	0.792	0.631	0.659	0.601	0.231	0.825	0.484	0.552	0.481	0.565	0.938
SP-Non-SS	0.986	0.875	0.771	0.657	0.787	0.981	0.499	0.571	0.959	0.757	0.974
SP-KNN-DS	0.986	0.916	0.776	0.776	0.821	0.955	0.468	0.545	0.779	0.682	0.852
SP-RKNN-DS	0.998	0.989	0.775	0.856	0.856	0.999	0.286	0.561	0.796	0.639	0.953
SP-Hy-DS	0.996	0.976	0.789	0.813	0.880	0.998	0.442	0.552	0.786	0.684	0.872
SP-NaN-DS	0.842	0.606	0.389	0.474	0.617	0.876	0.481	0.543	0.809	0.463	0.508
SP-Non-DS	0.992	0.921	0.747	0.774	0.832	0.962	0.498	0.566	0.827	0.673	0.815

Table 3. Average AUC values of baseline and its variants for $5 \leq K \leq 50$ on real-world datasets.

Table 4. Average top-n Accuracy of baseline and its variants for $5 \leq K \leq 50$ on real-world datasets.

Methods	Arrhythmia	PenDigits	Annthyroid	Pima	Glass	WDBC	Wilt	Cardiot	Shuttle	Waveform	Lympho
FP-KNN-SS	0.425	0.015	0.113	0.335	0.189	0.790	0.084	0.279	0.131	0.173	0.667
FP-RKNN-SS	0.528	0.010	0.069	0.552	0.111	0.904	0.005	0.322	0.177	0.276	0.750
FP-Hy-SS	0.425	0.030	0.109	0.366	0.199	0.870	0.049	0.295	0.131	0.177	0.683
FP-NaN-SS	0.132	0.020	0.149	0.259	0.022	0.200	0.095	0.276	0.100	0.042	0.283
FP-Non-SS	0.451	0.040	0.111	0.396	0.156	0.800	0.074	0.144	0.131	0.228	0.733
FP-KNN-DS	0.675	0.005	0.127	0.495	0.089	0.800	0.016	0.245	0.069	0.127	0.617
FP-RKNN-DS	0.551	0.170	0.104	0.548	0.089	0.900	0.007	0.362	0.054	0.083	0.533
FP-Hy-DS	0.650	0.010	0.146	0.517	0.078	0.890	0.008	0.268	0.081	0.129	0.617
FP-NaN-DS	0.212	0.011	0.055	0.219	0.111	0.720	0.061	0.278	0.054	0.023	0.324
FP-Non-DS	0.695	0.023	0.092	0.468	0.156	0.830	0.029	0.258	0.023	0.122	0.633
SP-KNN-SS	0.421	0.025	0.227	0.336	0.156	0.780	0.021	0.288	0.377	0.214	0.517
SP-RKNN-SS	0.125	0.005	0.302	0.562	0.111	0.903	0.005	0.437	0.285	0.334	0.55
SP-Hy-SS	0.375	0.035	0.250	0.395	0.156	0.860	0.016	0.297	0.385	0.219	0.500
SP-NaN-SS	0.124	0.011	0.186	0.274	0.022	0.313	0.034	0.272	0.138	0.036	0.467
SP-Non-SS	0.400	0.021	0.204	0.394	0.194	0.820	0.015	0.311	0.438	0.289	0.534
SP-KNN-DS	0.800	0.005	0.165	0.457	0.100	0.860	0.023	0.269	0.200	0.142	0.517
SP-RKNN-DS	0.950	0.145	0.262	0.575	0.100	1.000	0.001	0.307	0.169	0.112	0.750
SP-Hy-DS	0.875	0.005	0.188	0.516	0.089	0.930	0.019	0.281	0.185	0.148	0.533
SP-NaN-DS	0.128	0.023	0.054	0.197	0.133	0.700	0.064	0.294	0.446	0.009	0.342
SP-Non-DS	0.801	0.013	0.166	0.424	0.211	0.880	0.072	0.318	0.192	0.133	0.544

methods, NaN-based methods is always maintains a low level. This result is similar to the above. This is mainly because NaN contains the most similar neighbors, making it impossible to distinguish outliers from inliers.

- Experiments on most datasets using subspace methods generally outperform full-space methods. In particular, the performance of methods based on dynamic selection and subspace is better than the corresponding full space methods on the Waveform dataset. However, subspace methods sometimes perform poorly, such as they do not perform as well as full space methods on Annthyroid dataset. This shows that constructing a reliable subspace is essential for improving the performance.
- As shown in Table [4,](#page-11-1) [5,](#page-12-0) for top-n and top-2n Accuracy, many methods

Comparative Study of Neighbor-based Methods for Local Outlier Detection 13

Table 5. Average top-2n Accuracy of baseline and its variants for $5 \leq K \leq 50$ on real-world datasets[.]

achieve poor performance on PenDigits and Wilt datasets. They can barely identify outliers. However, this leads a high AUC values. We find an interesting fact that when the proportion of outliers in dataset is small, low accuracy can also lead to a high AUC. With the increase of the proportion of outliers, high AUC corresponds to high accuracy.

- From Figure [7](#page-13-0) and [8,](#page-14-0) we can learn that the performance of the same algorithm may change greatly under different K values. Among them, the performance of the SP-KNN-SS method on the Glass dataset change the most, where a small K value $(K=5)$ corresponds to an AUC value less than 0.5, while the AUC increases to about 0.9 as the k value increases to 20.
- Experimental results in some high dimensional datasets show that the method based on dynamic selection is superior to the method based on static sorting. This indicates that methods based on dynamic selection is suitable for high-dimensional data rather than low-dimensional.
- The performance of Non-NaN based methods in subspace is stable. Even if performance degrades, it is negligible compared to other methods. For example, on Annthyroid dataset, the AUC value of SP-KNN-SS method decreased by about 0.07 compared with the corresponding full-space method,, but SP-Non-SS decreased by about 0.01.
- As shown in Figure [7](#page-13-0) and [8,](#page-14-0) on both datasets, all methods achieve best performance at or around $K = 30$. This can serve as a knowledge guide for us to select the K parameter.

Fig. 7. AUC curves of the SS-based algorithms on the real-world datasets for $5 \leq K \leq 50$.

4.5. Case Study

In this section, we will further analyze the performance of all methods. The detection results of both methods on the synthetic datasets are visualized. The following observations can be drawn:

- In Figure [9](#page-19-0) and [10,](#page-20-0) the RKNN-based methods can hardly identify local outliers. It is noteworthy that Non-NaN based methods has the best result on Data3. This shows that the Non-NaN based methods may alleviate the problem of low density.
- Whether the neighbors are obtained by static sorting or dynamic selection, the NaN-based methods always maintains a low level. In Figure [10,](#page-20-0) NaN-

Fig. 8. AUC curves of the DS-based algorithms on the real-world datasets for $5 \leq K \leq 50$.

based method identifies the points on the edge of cluster as outliers. This can be caused by the fact that the similarity of the data within the set is too high to distinguish between outliers and inliers.

• RKNN-based methods can detection all outliers successfully on Data1 and Data2. Other methods often treat points on the boundary of clusters as outliers, this may leads a poor performance.

4.6. Discussion

As we can observe from the result of comparison experiments in Section [4.4,](#page-9-1) the performance of the algorithm can be further improved by reorganizing the three levels of components in the taxonomy. As shown in Table [2](#page-10-0) and [3,](#page-11-0) different neighbors favor different scenarios. For instance, RKNN-based methods lead to a significant increase in performance of KNN-based methods on Data1. However, they hardly works in data with low-density patterns. Furthermore, DS-based methods seem to be more suitable for working in the environment of high-dimensional data. They perform poorly on the subspace of the Wilt dataset besides synthetic datasets.

In Figure [9](#page-19-0) and [10,](#page-20-0) most algorithms will recognize the samples in low-density areas as outliers and the Non-NaN based approaches is the most efficient in this scenario. We also investigated the effect of parameter K by visualization. In Figure [7](#page-13-0) and [8,](#page-14-0) different K value may lead to a substantial change in model decision. NaNbased method can be called the most unreliable method. Since all the objects in the NaN set are the most similar, it cannot bring benefits to distinguish outliers. In addition, the method based on static sorting has great advantages in time indicators. Therefore, they are suitable for real scenes.

5. Conclusions

This paper introduces a taxonomy of neighbor-based methods for local outlier detection, which classifies existing algorithms from information, neighbor and methodology levels. Existing methods usually focus on designing different outlier factors, while ignoring the importance of neighbors. We discussed the advantages and disadvantages of various neighbors based on the proposed taxonomy. Experimental results verify that other neighbors can be used to replace KNN to further improve the algorithm. And the improvement can be achieved by a rational combination of components in the information, neighbor, and methodology levels.

Although satisfactory results have been achieved, there are still several problems to be further solved. On the one hand, the performance benefits brought by different subspaces need to be analyzed. On the other hand, it is crucial to design a method to find the best K value adaptively based on data. Comparative studies have shown that effective subspaces will bring benefits. We can find subspace by attribute reduction based on the complexity of each attribute of data. Furthermore, the method of selecting K value can be developed based on the stability of neighbor. Moreover, some challenging tasks is valuable to explore, such as federated learning [\[26,](#page-17-15) [32,](#page-17-16) [34,](#page-17-17) [35\]](#page-17-18) and visual classification [\[6,](#page-16-18) [7,](#page-16-19) [21,](#page-16-20) [25,](#page-17-19) [44,](#page-18-10) [45\]](#page-18-11).

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 32270705)

References

- 1. K. Bache and M. Lichman, Uci machine learning repository (2013).
- 2. G. Bhattacharya, K. Ghosh and A. S. Chowdhury, Outlier detection using neighborhood rank difference, *Pattern Recognit. Lett.* **60** (2015) 24–31.
- 3. L. Boukela, G. Zhang, M. Yacoub, S. Bouzefrane and S. B. Baba Ahmadi, An approach for unsupervised contextual anomaly detection and characterization, Intelligent Data Analysis $26(5)$ (2022) 1185-1209.
- 4. M. M. Breunig, H.-P. Kriegel, R. T. Ng and J. Sander, Lof: identifying density-based local outliers, ACM sigmod record $29(2)$ (2000) 93-104.
- 5. A. Bryant and K. Cios, Rnn-dbscan: A density-based clustering algorithm using reverse nearest neighbor density estimates, IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data. Eng. 30(6) (2017) 1109–1121.
- 6. Z. Chen, Z. Qi, X. Cao, X. Li, X. Meng and L. Meng, Class-level structural relation modeling and smoothing for visual representation learning, 10(3) (2023) 2964–2972.
- 7. Z. Chen, Z. Qi, X. Li, Y. Wang, L. Meng and X. Meng, Class-aware convolution and attentive aggregation for image classification, Proceedings of the 5th ACM International Conference on Multimedia in Asia, $10(3)$, (ACM, 2023), pp. 1–7.
- 8. C. Dewi and Y. K. Arbawa, Performance evaluation of distance function in knn and wknn for classification of soil organic matter, 2019 International Conference on Sustainable Information Engineering and Technology (SIET), $33(3)$, (IEEE, 2019), pp. 196–199.
- 9. R. Domingues, M. Filippone, P. Michiardi and J. Zouaoui, A comparative evaluation of outlier detection algorithms: Experiments and analyses, Pattern Recognit. 74 (2018) 406–421.
- 10. M. B. Duggimpudi, S. Abbady, J. Chen and V. V. Raghavan, Spatio-temporal outlier detection algorithms based on computing behavioral outlierness factor, Data Knowl Eng 122 (2019) 1–24.
- 11. A. J. Gallego, J. R. Rico-Juan and J. J. Valero-Mas, Efficient k-nearest neighbor search based on clustering and adaptive k values, Pattern Recognit. 122 (2022) p. 108356.
- 12. J. Gao, W. Ji, L. Zhang, A. Li, Y. Wang and Z. Zhang, Cube-based incremental outlier detection for streaming computing, *Inf. Sci.* 517 (2020) 361–376.
- 13. J. Ha, S. Seok and J.-S. Lee, Robust outlier detection using the instability factor, Knowl. -Based Syst. 63 (2014) 15–23.
- 14. F. R. Hampel, E. M. Ronchetti, P. J. Rousseeuw and W. A. Stahel, Robust statistics: the approach based on influence functions (John Wiley & Sons, 2011).
- 15. J. Huang, Q. Zhu, L. Yang, D. Cheng and Q. Wu, A novel outlier cluster detection algorithm without top-n parameter, $Knowl.$ -Based Syst. **121** (2017) 32–40.
- 16. J. Huang, Q. Zhu, L. Yang and J. Feng, A non-parameter outlier detection algorithm based on natural neighbor, Knowl. -Based Syst. 92 (2016) 71–77.
- 17. W. Kim, C. Shim, W. Heo, S. Yi and Y. D. Chung, Moving view field nearest neighbor queries, Data Knowl Eng 119 (2019) 58–70.
- 18. H.-P. Kriegel, P. Kröger, E. Schubert and A. Zimek, Outlier detection in axis-parallel subspaces of high dimensional data, Pacific-asia conference on knowledge discovery and data mining, 10(3), (Springer, 2009), pp. 831–838.
- 19. A. Latifi-Pakdehi and N. Daneshpour, Dbhc: A dbscan-based hierarchical clustering algorithm, Data Knowl Eng 135 (2021) p. 101922.
- 20. J. Leng and Z. Huang, Outliers detection with correlated subspaces for high dimensional datasets, International Journal of Wavelets, Multiresolution and Information Processing 9(02) (2011) 227–236.
- 21. J. Li, H. Ma, X. Li, Z. Qi, L. Meng and X. Meng, Unsupervised contrastive masking

for visual haze classification, Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Multimedia Retrieval, 10(3), (ACM, 2022), pp. 426–434.

- 22. C.-M. Liu, Z. Niu and K.-T. Liao, Mechanisms to improve clustering uncertain data with ukmeans, Data Knowl Eng 116 (2018) 61-79.
- 23. F. Liu, Y. Yu, P. Song, Y. Fan and X. Tong, Scalable kde-based top-n local outlier detection over large-scale data streams, Knowl. -Based Syst. 204 (2020) p. 106186.
- 24. H. Liu, X. Li, J. Li and S. Zhang, Efficient outlier detection for high-dimensional data, IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern. -Syst. 48(12) (2017) 2451–2461.
- 25. J. Liu, J. Xiao, H. Ma, X. Li, Z. Qi, X. Meng and L. Meng, Prompt learning with cross-modal feature alignment for visual domain adaptation, CAAI International Conference on Artificial Intelligence, $10(3)$, (Springer, 2022), pp. 416–428.
- 26. T. Liu, Z. Qi, Z. Chen, X. Meng and L. Meng, Cross-training with prototypical distillation for improving the generalization of federated learning, 2023 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME), $10(3)$, (IEEE, 2023), pp. 648–653.
- 27. M. A. Masud, J. Z. Huang, M. Zhong and X. Fu, Generate pairwise constraints from unlabeled data for semi-supervised clustering, Data Knowl Eng 123 (2019) p. 101715.
- 28. P. Moutafis, G. Mavrommatis, M. Vassilakopoulos and S. Sioutas, Efficient processing of all-k-nearest-neighbor queries in the mapreduce programming framework, Data Knowl Eng 121 (2019) 42–70.
- 29. J. Ning, L. Chen, C. Zhou and Y. Wen, Parameter k search strategy in outlier detection, Pattern Recognit. Lett. 112 (2018) 56–62.
- 30. C. Pascoal, M. R. De Oliveira, R. Valadas, P. Filzmoser, P. Salvador and A. Pacheco, Robust feature selection and robust pca for internet traffic anomaly detection, 2012 Proceedings Ieee Infocom, 11(1), (IEEE, 2012), pp. 1755–1763.
- 31. Z. Qi and X. Chen, A novel density-based outlier detection method using key attributes, *Intelligent Data Analysis* $26(6)$ (2022) 1431–1449.
- 32. Z. Qi, W. He, X. Meng and L. Meng, Attentive modeling and distillation for out-ofdistribution generalization of federated learning, $10(3)$ (2023) 1–7.
- 33. Z. Qi, D. Jiang and X. Chen, Iterative gradient descent for outlier detection, International Journal of Wavelets, Multiresolution and Information Processing 19(04) (2021) p. 2150004.
- 34. Z. Qi, L. Meng, Z. Chen, H. Hu, H. Lin and X. Meng, Cross-silo prototypical calibration for federated learning with non-iid data, Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia, $10(3)$, (ACM, 2023), pp. 3099-3107.
- 35. Z. Qi, Y. Wang, Z. Chen, R. Wang, X. Meng and L. Meng, Clustering-based curriculum construction for sample-balanced federated learning, CAAI International Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 10(3), (Springer, 2022), pp. 155–166.
- 36. M. Radovanović, A. Nanopoulos and M. Ivanović, Reverse nearest neighbors in unsupervised distance-based outlier detection, IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data. Eng. 27(5) (2014) 1369–1382.
- 37. N. Rastin, M. Z. Jahromi and M. Taheri, A generalized weighted distance k-nearest neighbor for multi-label problems, Pattern Recognit 114 (2021) p. 107526.
- 38. M. Riahi-Madvar, A. A. Azirani, B. Nasersharif and B. Raahemi, A new densitybased subspace selection method using mutual information for high dimensional outlier detection, Knowl. -Based Syst. 216 (2021) p. 106733.
- 39. B. Tang and H. He, A local density-based approach for outlier detection, Neurocomputing 241 (2017) 171–180.
- 40. A. Wahid and C. S. R. Annavarapu, Nanod: A natural neighbour-based outlier detection algorithm, *Neural. Comput. Appl.* $33(6)$ (2021) 2107–2123.
- 41. B. Wang and Z. Mao, A dynamic ensemble outlier detection model based on an adap-

tive k-nearest neighbor rule, Inf. Fusion 63 (2020) 30–40.

- 42. R. Wang, Q. Zhu, J. Luo and F. Zhu, Local dynamic neighborhood based outlier detection approach and its framework for large-scale datasets, Egypt. Inf. J. 22(2) (2021) 125–132.
- 43. X. Wang, X. L. Wang, Y. Ma and D. M. Wilkes, A fast mst-inspired knn-based outlier detection method, Inf. Syst. 48 (2015) 89–112.
- 44. Y. Wang, X. Li, Z. Qi, J. Li, X. Li, X. Meng and L. Meng, Meta-causal feature learning for out-of-distribution generalization, European Conference on Computer Vision, 10(3), (Springer, 2022), pp. 530–545.
- 45. Y. Wang, Z. Qi, X. Li, J. Liu, X. Meng and L. Meng, Multi-channel attentive weighting of visual frames for multimodal video classification, 2023 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN), $10(3)$, (IEEE, 2023), pp. 1–8.
- 46. X. Xu, H. Liu, L. Li and M. Yao, A comparison of outlier detection techniques for high-dimensional data, Int. J. Comput. Intell. Syst. $11(1)$ (2018) 652–662.
- 47. P. Yang and Q. Zhu, Finding key attribute subset in dataset for outlier detection, Knowl. -Based Syst. 24(2) (2011) 269–274.
- 48. V. Yepmo, G. Smits and O. Pivert, Anomaly explanation: A review, Data Knowl Eng 137 (2022) p. 101946.
- 49. K. Zhang, M. Hutter and H. Jin, A new local distance-based outlier detection approach for scattered real-world data, Pacific-Asia Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, 30(6), (Springer, 2009), pp. 813–822.
- 50. S. Zhang, Cost-sensitive knn classification, Neurocomputing 391 (2020) 234–242.
- 51. Y. Zhang, G. Cao, B. Wang and X. Li, A novel ensemble method for k-nearest neighbor, Pattern Recognit. 85 (2019) 13–25.
- 52. X. Zhao, J. Zhang and X. Qin, Loma: A local outlier mining algorithm based on attribute relevance analysis, Expert. Syst. Appl. 84 (2017) 272–280.
- 53. Q. Zhu, J. Feng and J. Huang, Natural neighbor: A self-adaptive neighborhood method without parameter k, Pattern Recognit. Lett. 80 (2016) 30-36.

Fig. 9. Outlier detection results of the SS-based methods at $K = 20$.

Fig. 10. Outlier detection results of the DS-based methods at $K = 20$.