Abstract: Bots are detected real-time by correlating activity between users using a lag-sensitive hashing technique that captures warping-invariant correlation. Correlated user groups in social media may be found that represent bot behavior with thousands of bot accounts detected in a couple of hours.
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SYSTEM AND METHODS FOR DETECTING BOTS REAL-TIME

CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS

This application claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 62/202,442 filed August 7, 2015, incorporated by reference.

FIELD OF THE INVENTION

The invention relates generally to the detection of bots that pretend to be humans on the Internet. More particularly, the invention relates to the detection of bots using a system and methods that differentiates between bot and human interaction based on correlated activity.

BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

A "bot" is a software application that runs automated tasks over the internet. Bots pretend to be human beings and deceive normal users in following them. Bots are used for a plethora of reasons including, for example, to harvest email addresses from contact or guestbook pages, to suck bandwidth, to grab the content of websites such as to re-use it, to buy up concert seats - particularly by ticket brokers who resell the tickets - to farm for resources, to increase traffic counts on analytics reporting, for example, to extract money from advertisers, or to deceive normal users in following them.

Typically, bots perform tasks that are both simple and structurally repetitive, at a much higher rate than would be possible for a human alone. The largest use of bots is in web spidering, in which an automated script fetches, analyses and files information from web servers at many times the speed of a human. In addition, bots may also be implemented where a response speed faster than that of humans is required (e.g., gaming bots and auction-site robots)
or less commonly in situations where the emulation of human activity is required, for example chat bots.

As a specific example, bots may be used to visit real websites run by real companies with real human visitors such that the bots inflate the monetized audience causing advertisers to lose revenue. Bots may be used to commit ad fraud by hijacking browsers to masquerade as real users and blend in with the human traffic to generate more money. Making them more difficult to detect, certain sophisticated bots may be used to move the cursor such as over ads, as well as used to generate cookies to appear more appealing to certain advertisers.

Bots are also fairly common in social media. However, current methods social media sites use to detect and prevent bots are clearly insufficient. For example, it currently takes an average of three days at best for social media sites to detect a bot measured from its day of creation. The longer a bot is active the more abuses it may initiate.

Real-time bot detection is needed because the longer bots are active, the more abuses they initiate. Bot detection methods that work within a day of registration are more desirable than methods that detect after a long time. In addition, bot detection algorithms working on archived data or at one instance of time can miss many bots. For example, bots can delete their tweets after a day or few hours once the tweets are propagated.

Surprisingly there is no work on finding these correlated bots in real-time. Most existing works including Twitter Rules focus on per-account features to classify between fraud and innocent accounts. Reactive and clever account merchants just started mimicking humans to avoid being detected and suspended by these methods. However, humans are slow in activity, while
merchants need to keep increasing followers. Therefore, they focus on throughput by creating many accounts that behave like human in the same way. In other words, instead of having one bot account which tweets 10000 times per day, they prefer to have 1000 bot accounts each tweets 10 times per day.

Therefore, real-time bot detection is necessary in order to reduce, if not eliminate, abuses created or initiated by bots. The invention satisfies this demand by tracking correlated activity to detect bots real-time.

**SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION**

Millions of people interact in social media at any time instance. Even at this large scale, users are not expected to have highly correlated activities in social media for even a small duration, let alone hours. However, there exist user accounts which show perfect correlation in activities for hours. As an example, two completely unrelated (no one follows the other) and yet perfectly correlated social media accounts may appear completely normal if they are investigated individually, but reveal a severe abnormality when their activities are correlated real-time.

Perfectly correlated activities such as those occurring in social media are bot operated as it is not humanly possible even by chance. For example, the chance of two random users posting exactly at the same pair of seconds in an hour is \(1/3600^2\). Such an event can happen by chance if there are more than 10 million active users. As an example, if ten posts are found at the same seconds of an hour from two random users, trillions of active users would be needed, an impossible number. Therefore, highly correlated active users cannot be normal users, they must be bot operated. The invention detects groups of users with
surprisingly similar activities, for example, in social media. Correlating user activities can lead to the detection of a normal user versus a bot operated user.

Bots are fairly common in social media. Not all bots are bad, however, bots can achieve high number of followers quickly and later, can be used to market or spam information. Many social metrics are calculated on social media data. Significant presence of bots in social media will turn all those metrics useless. Therefore, social media sites such as Twitter strictly suspend such accounts that impersonate and abuse.

According to the invention, events are consumed at 48Hz to determine maximal user groups whose activities are correlated. Using a scale directed to rate and volume, the invention provides a result that is at least two orders of magnitude larger than existing efforts. In addition, lag-sensitive hashing for temporal data is introduced to achieve accuracy and scalability. Applying the invention to listen to a Twitter stream, bot accounts are detected with perfect precision.

The invention is directed a system and methods that finds highly correlated active users in massive event streams in real-time in which correlated user groups are not desirable such as social media (e.g. Twitter), commenting services (e.g. Disqus) and review systems (e.g. Google Play). In summary, the invention is directed to a system and methods that consumes events, for example at 48Hz, and outputs maximal user groups whose activities are correlated using a lag-sensitive hashing process for temporal data to achieve accuracy and scalability.

The invention and its attributes and advantages may be further understood and appreciated with reference to the detailed description below of
one contemplated embodiment, taken in conjunction with the accompanying drawings.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

The preferred embodiments of the invention will be described in conjunction with the appended drawings provided to illustrate and not to limit the invention, where like designations denote like elements, and in which:

FIG. 1 is a block diagram of the components of the invention.

FIG. 2 illustrates bot detection in a social media website according to the invention.

FIG. 3 is a flow chart for the collector component according to the invention.

FIG. 4 is a flow chart for the indexer component according to the invention.

FIG. 5 is a flow chart for the listener component according to the invention.

FIG. 6 is a flow chart for the validator component according to the invention.

FIG. 7 is a flow chart for the hash function according to the invention.

FIG. 8 is an illustration of three different alignments with each producing identical hash indices that are perfectly correlated according to the invention.

FIG. 9 is a dendrogram of suspicious user activities according to one embodiment of the invention.

FIG. 10 is a graph of experimental validation results directed to filter strings in order of tweets-per user.

FIG. 11 is a graph of experimental validation results directed to clusters found for different filters.
FIG. 12 is a plot of experimental validation results directed to different patterns of bots.

FIG. 13 is a graph of experimental validation results directed to support of the X²-test method and the invention.

FIG. 14 is a graph of experimental validation results directed to support of the cross-user textual method and the invention.

FIG. 15 is a graph of experimental validation results directed to human measure of the similarity between bot pairs detected in the same duster.

FIG. 18 is a graph of experimental validation results directed to the effect of base window parameters on the detection performance.

FIG. 17 is a graph of experimental validation results directed to the effect of number of bucket parameters on the detection performance.

FIG. 18 is a graph of experimental validation results directed to the effect of maximum lag parameters on the detection performance.

FIG. 19 is a graph of experimental validation results directed to cluster sizes in sorted order.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF EMBODIMENTS OF THE INVENTION

The invention is described in reference to a particular embodiment related to bots and social media applications. However, it is contemplated that the invention may be used to detect bots real-time in any application including for example, advertising fraud, email address harvesting, merchandise (i.e., ticket) purchases, etc.

According to the invention as applied detecting bots real-time in social media applications, a user performs actions in a temporal sequence. Therefore, an activity signal of a user in social media consists of all the action the user
performs in a temporal sequence. Actions include, for example, posting, sharing, liking and deleting. The sequence of time-stamps of a user typically forms a very sparse time series with mostly zero values and occasional spikes representing a number of actions on that specific second. Throughout this discussion, a one second sampling rate is assumed although the invention does not require such an assumption.

The framework 50 of the invention is shown in FIG. 1. There are four processor components, each component performing a particular process. The collector component 100 collects activity data as described in further detail in FIG. 3. The indexer component 200 identifies one or more suspicious users based on the collected activity data (see FIG. 4). The listener component 300 closely monitors the activities of the suspicious users’ data (see FIG. 5). The validator component 400 ascertains bot accounts with a high significance level while filtering out false positives as described in further detail in FIG. 8. According to the invention, bot and human interaction is differentiated based on correlated activity. Detecting bots real-time can be utilized to ultimately prevent bots from running automated tasks over the Internet, including deceiving normal users in following them.

The invention is applied to a social media website as shown more specifically in FIG. 2. The correlation monitoring framework 75 according to the invention is designed to detect bot accounts that are not marked by social media sites in real-time. To work in a never-ending fashion, a report of suspiciously correlated user groups is produced after every $T$ hours. As shown in FIG. 2, the collector component 100A collects tweets that match with a certain set of keywords for $T$ hours. The matching process in Twitter API is quoted from the
developers guide: "The text of the Tweet and some entity fields are considered for matches. Specifically, the text attribute of the Tweet, expanded_url and display_url for links and media, text for hashtags, and screenname for user mentions are checked for matches." The indexer 200A takes the activity time series of all users as the input and hashes each of them to report suspicious users, i.e., those users that collide in some hash buckets. The set of suspicious users are then listened by the listener to form the activity time series of the suspicious users 300A. The validator component 400A validates the suspicious users. The processes of each component are discussed more specifically in reference to at least FIGs. 3-7.

As shown in FIG. 3, the collector component gathers data of users matching a set of terms for a defined time $T$ at step 302. At step 304, the collector component filters users, for example, by removing those users with data consisting of one instance of a term. The time series of each filtered user is formed into a set of time series by the collector component at step 306. The set of time series is passes to the indexer component at step 308. The collector component forms the uniformly sampled time series for all of the accounts and passes to the indexer filtering users with just one activity because correlating one activity is meaningless.

As shown in FIG. 4, the indexer component receives the filtered data at step 402 from the collector component and hashes each time series of each user into two or more hash buckets. Specifically, the hash buckets for a given set of time series $x$ are calculated by randomly selecting one of the time series as a reference time series $r$ at step 404. At step 406 the cross-correlation between each time series $x$ and $r$ is calculated. Cross-correlation between two signals
produces the correlation coefficients at all possible lags. It is noted that cross-
correlation is a good surrogate for warping-invariant measures such as Dynamic
Time Warping (DTW). DTW allows signals to translate and warp against one
another. Minimizing DTW distance effectively maximizes the warping-invariant
correlation such that it is used to compare user activities.

Finally, the index component calculates $2w$ hash buckets and determines
which hash buckets each time series should go into at step 408. Here, $w$ is a
user given parameter representing the maximum allowable lag. The hash
function is discussed more thoroughly in reference to FIG. 7. Once hashed, the
indexer finds a list of qualified suspicious users according to defined qualified
users and defined qualified buckets.

According to one embodiment, qualified users are defined as those that
have more than $\left\lceil \frac{w}{4} \right\rceil$ occurrences in a specific bucket. Similarly, qualified buckets
have more than $\left\lceil \frac{w}{4} \right\rceil$ qualified users. Once hashed, the indexer component finds a
list of qualified suspicious users at step 410 by going thru each qualified bucket
and picking qualified users to report as suspicious users.

The set of suspicious users are then listened by the listener component as
shown in FIG. 5. The listener component is different from the collector component
in that it can receive all the activities or actions of a suspicious user over a period
of time (i.e., $T$ hours) as opposed to filtered ones. At step 402, the listener
component reviews all activities of a suspicious user. Any action that involves
one of the suspicious users anywhere - e.g., text, author, mention, etc. - is
logged by the listener component at step 404. The listener component forms at
step 406 the activity time series of the suspicious users. At step 408, the
suspicious users are then filtered for those with less than a specific number of
activities, for example, users with less than ten activities. This is a very important design choice since the chance of two signals with ten or more activities being perfectly correlated over an hour is $10^{-35}$. Therefore, a highly correlated group of users is always a set of bots, possibly managed by the same program. At step 410, the filtered users are passed to the validator component.

The validator component validates the suspicious users as shown in FIG. 6. More specifically, the validator component checks the suspicious users to remove false positives in the collection process. According to one embodiment of the invention, Dynamic Time Warping (DTW) correlation is used to capture user similarity in the activity time series. In particular, the validator component calculates a pair-wise DTW distance matrix over the set of users at step 502. At step 504, users are clustered hierarchically up to a very restricted distance cutoff. Every singleton user after clustering is ignored as false positive at step 508 and tightly connected clusters are reported as bots at step 508.

Each signal $x$ is hashed into $2w$ buckets according to the hash function of the indexer component discussed more thoroughly in reference to FIG. 7. The lag-sensitive hash function according to the invention guarantees that correlated activities are hashed in multiple buckets reliably. Each signal or time series $x$ has a length $m$ and a lag $I$ as provided at step 802. A randomly picked reference object $r$ is selected as shown by step 604. At step 606, cross-correlation $p_{xr}$ is calculated between time series or signal $x$ and reference object $r$.

At step 608, the lag $I$ is defined. According to one embodiment, the following lag is used to produce the necessary $2w$ indices of buckets:

$$I \subseteq [-w, w]$$
with \( w \) representing the maximum allowable lag as given by a user. \( H \) is a mapping function that is chosen at step 810. According to one embodiment, the mapping function is \( H: [-1,1] \rightarrow \{1 \ldots B\} \). The choice \( H \) depends on the distribution of correlation of the users with respect to \( r \), which can be dynamically estimated, for example, everyday morning and used for the rest of the ay.

At step 612, applying the hash function:

\[
h_r (x, r) = H(\rho_{xr}(m + l))
\]

results in mapping the correlation coefficient to a bucket index \( h \) such that each signal \( x \) is hashed into \( 2w \) buckets. With cross-correlations \( \rho_{xr} \) assumed to be normally distributed, \( H \) divides the distribution into \( B \) equi-probable regions of the normal distribution whose variance is estimated using past windows. \( B \) is the number of buckets in the hash structure.

Once the \( T \) hours of collection are over, the hash structure contains users distributed in buckets. The users who collide many times in the same bucket are the most suspicious users. A qualified user is a user whose activity time series is hashed to the same bucket many times \( (\text{i.e.,} \lceil \frac{w}{l} \rceil) \). Similarly, a qualified bucket is one that contains more unique qualified users than a threshold \( \lceil \frac{w}{l} \rceil \). Qualified users are extracted and, as mentioned above, sent to the listener component.

Turning away from an infinite time series, if \( |w| \ll T \), a large number of collisions may be expected for perfectly correlated time series. For example, if \( x \) and \( y \) are correlated without any lag, they should collide in all \( 2w \) buckets. If they are correlated at the maximum allowable lag \( w \) then they should collide at least in \( w \) buckets. FIG. 8 illustrates the \( 2w - l \) possibilities of collision illustrating three different alignments (a), (b), (c). As shown, each can produce identical hash
indices for x and y that are perfectly correlated at lag I. This redundancy allows
lagged correlation to be caught more reliably.

According to the invention, only one reference object is used for one hash
structure. It is not a locality sensitive scheme and a lot of spurious collisions can
happen for a bad choice of reference object. It is contemplated that more
reference objects and more hash structures may be added to reliably prune off
spurious collisions.

Although the hash function is described using cross-correlation, it is
contemplated that an alternative formulation of the above hash function is
possible using cross-covariance instead of cross-correlation, which has identical
effect in finding correlated groups.

Turning back to FIG. 2, the correlation monitoring framework 75 according
to the invention is designed to defect bot accounts that are not marked by social
media sites in real-time.

The invention is applied to a social media website as shown more
specifically in FIG. 2. The correlation monitoring framework 75 according to the
invention is designed to detect bot accounts that are not marked by social media
sites in real-time. The buckets are labeled as a through h as shown by the
indexer component 200A. According to this embodiment of the invention w = 12
and each user is hashed in these buckets 24 times. The number of occurrence of
a user is denoted by the superscript. To qualify, \[ \left| \frac{w}{4} \right| = 3 \] occurrences of a user
account in the same bucket are needed, e.g., \( U_2 \) is a qualified user in bucket d.
Qualified users are circled as shown in FIG. 2. However, bucket d is not a
qualified bucket as it does not have three qualified users. Bucket a and e are
qualified buckets because they have three qualified users each. Thus from the
shown segment of the hash structure, four suspicious users are extracted as shown by the listener component 300A.

The listener component 300A listens to all the activities of these suspicious users and forms new activity time series for the next $T$ hours. Pair-wise constrained DTW distances are calculated for all of these users and a hierarchical clustering is performed on the pair-wise warping distances using a "single" linkage technique. A sample dendrogram of the suspicious user activities is shown in FIG. 9 with clusters and numerous false positives extracted from the hash structure. As seen in FIG. 9, only a few users fall below the restricted cutoff with the rest of the users cleared as false positives. It should be noted that the windows size for constrained DTW is the same as the lag parameter $w$.

A very strict cutoff threshold is used to extract highly dense clusters and all the remaining singleton users are ignored. According to one embodiment, the cutoff used is a DTW distance of 0.1 which is equivalent to a warping-invariant correlation of 1.0. The extracted dusters contain bot accounts by definition. Each cluster also contains semantically similar user accounts.

As more periods of $T$ hours pass, clusters can be merged to form bigger clusters. This is an important step because bots form correlated groups and may disband them dynamically. Therefore, an already detected bot can reveal a new set of bots in the next $T$ hour period. Two clusters may be merged if they share one user in common - such a simple method can retain high precision because of overwhelming number of existing bots.

Large clusters are generated by the merging process. Typically, large clusters contain highly regular behaviors. For example, a big duster is found of 2427 user accounts that tweet one tweet every one or two seconds. All these
accounts are bots for their too accurate periodicity, however, some of them may not be as harmful as others such as those with a fixed periodicity. Smaller clusters show more human-like behavior from impersonating accounts.

Detailed experimental validation is provided below. In particular, the experiments were performed on commodity computers running Ubuntu 12.04 with Intel Core i7 processor and 32 GB of memory using the streaming data that Twitter publicly provides, although it is contemplated that the invention is applicable to any streaming Application program interface (API). Three inter-dependent parameters are given as follows: number of buckets (#=5000), base window (7-2 hours) and maximum lag (s*=20 seconds). Unless otherwise specified, the default parameters are used with all the numbers averaged over five runs at different times of the day. The impact on filter strength, bot detection, cluster quality, parameter sensitivity, and scalability is provided from the experimental validation.

Turning to the impact of filter strings on the number of activities and the number of user accounts collected, FIG. 10 shows the results for eight different filter strings in the order of number of tweets-per-user providing a general idea about the strengths of these strings. An "or" filter of internet keywords ("www—http—https—@") is found to be more general (i.e. matches more activities) than the "vowel" filter ("a - e - i - o - u") which emphasizes the prominence of tweets containing urls and email addresses. The same order of the strings in the x-axis is used to represent the general-to-specific trend.

As can be seen, tweets-per-user increases for more specific filter strings essentially describing the tradeoff between number of users and tweets-per-user for correlation purposes. If more users with to be correlated, the time series will
be more sparse degrading the quality. Selecting the filter strings based on the exploration for bots in Twitter, third party sharing services (video, image, location, etc.) are shown to be commonly used to create automated tweets.

For example, the swarm application provides services to post check-ins for attractions, restaurants, etc. Benign strings such as "a", "the" and domain such as "net" are also covered. The invention is ran for $T = 2$ hours on each of these filters to calculate the number of clusters and number of bot accounts detected. As shown in FIG. 11, the general-to-specific trend does not hold in terms of clusters and bot accounts and it is found that "instagram" and "net" detect the largest number of dusters and bots. It is found that "youtube" and its superset detect a few bots. Thus, the invention can find thousands of correlated users every couple of hours using a good filter string noticing that the number of clusters and the number of bots are very correlated to each other irrespective of the general-to-specific trend.

The invention produces a set of clusters of highly correlated users based on just the temporal similarity. As mentioned above, correlated users who have more than ten activities in 7 hours are found. Any highly correlated group (> 0.99 correlation) cannot appear at random and certainly disclose a bot-family. To assess the accuracy of the invention, context of other methods is considered such as comparing the invention with a per-user method on temporal data and a cross-user method on text and authors of the tweets.

First, the invention is compared to an existing per-user method which uses the dependence between minute-of-an-hour and second-of-a-minute as an indicator for bot accounts. For example, FIG. 12 shows a set of bots and their second-of-minute vs. minute-of-hour plots. Testing the independence of these
two quantities using the $X^2$-test, a bot is declared if there is any dependence. While the $X^2$-test method fails for a particular user because of independence among the quantities, the invention can detect the same user as a bot.

Calculating the percentage of the bots that the invention detects and that can also be detected by the $X^2$-test for every filter string, it is found that the higher the percentage, the less promising the invention as shown by the results in FIG. 13. As can be seen in FIG. 13, the best result is for the "instagram" filter detecting three times more bots. The worst result is for the "youtube" filter noting only a small number of clusters detected.

Using cross-user text and author matching, the relative accuracy is evaluated using contextual information such as tweet-text and tweet-authors. The quality measure "botness" of a cluster is defined as the average of the "botness" of all the pairs of accounts in the cluster. For a given pair, "botness" is the percentage of identical tweets over a window. The higher the "botness", the more support the invention gets from the context. As shown in FIG. 14, up to 80% support is achieved from the context when text and/or authors of the tweets are matched. There is a very little difference between "and" and "or" configuration suggesting that most of the time tweets and authors match together. However, less support from the context does not necessarily mean the invention is detecting false positives as many users are seen that correlate in time but do not have identical tweets. For example, two twitter users posting a sequence of different tweets at identical time-stamps.

To determine relative accuracy within cluster consistency, Amazon Mechanical Turk is used to evaluate fifty random pairs of accounts from different clusters to determine if they are similar. The ways two accounts can be similar
may be based, for example, on text, url, timestamp and language similarities. The results are shown in FIG. 15 with 100% accuracy for "instagram" and "net" filters. As before the "youtube" filter is shown to be the worst performer.

Now turning to the analysis of three inter-dependent parameters iterations over each parameter are performed while the remaining parameters are fixed. According to this experimental validation, the following keywords "swarmapp - youtube - instagram") are used as the filter string.

First, the size of the base window 7 is changed to observe the change in detection performance. A consistent growth in number of clusters and bot accounts can be seen with a larger base window ensuring more correlated users show up to be hashed. The end effect is higher quality dusters at the expense of a longer wait as can be seen in FIG. 16.

Second, the number of buckets \( B \) in the hash structure is changed. Too few buckets induce unnecessary collisions while too many buckets spread users sparsely. FIG. 17 shows the maximum number of clusters and bot accounts that can be achieved by using 2000 to 4000 buckets.

Lastly, maximum lag \( \omega \) is reviewed, specifically, the impact of maximum lag over detection performance. FIG. 18 is a graph of experimental validation results directed to the effect of maximum lag parameters on the detection performance.

FIG. 19 is a graph of experimental validation results directed to cluster sizes in sorted order. User activities require lag and a warping sensitive correlation measure. For zero lag (essentially Euclidean distance), significantly less clusters and bot accounts are obtained. For the lag of 30 seconds, the number of dusters is again low because the hash structure is crowded with copies of each user, resulting in lots of spurious collisions.
Although scalability for real-time methods is hard to quantify because of having more than one degree of freedom, two quantities are always involved - data rate and window size. Fortunately, Twitter streaming API has a hard-limit on the data rate receiving tweets at 48 tweets-per-second rate at the most. Therefore, scalability depends on the amount and analysis of stored history, which is considered parameter $T$ in the problem definition. One million user accounts are used since this is a massive number of time series to calculate warping-invariant correlation for all-pairs. Calculating pair-wise DTW for a million users is equivalent to a trillion distance calculation without overlapping substructure. However, the sparsity of the signals is exploited, which enables the hashing algorithm of the invention to calculate clusters.

According to one example, it takes $T = 9.5$ hours to collect 1 million users. The indexer then takes 40 minutes to hash all the users of which 24,000 users are qualified for the listener and the validator detects 93 clusters of 1485 accounts. The invention can listen to a million users using one machine for half a day and find bots in the remaining time of a day. Thus, the invention can be deployed to produce a daily report on bot accounts analyzing the activities in the previous day.

The invention can detect account registered by account merchants, such as those that may be sold to miscreants and thus, the invention can detect bots soon-after-registration to prevent future abuse. Detecting bots by correlating users can identify bot accounts that may potentially become spammers.

While the disclosure is susceptible to various modifications and alternative forms, specific exemplary embodiments of the invention have been shown by way of example in the drawings and have been described in detail. It should be
understood, however, that there is no intent to limit the disclosure to the particular embodiments disclosed, but on the contrary, the intention is to cover all modifications, equivalents, and alternatives falling within the scope of the disclosure as defined by the appended claims.
CLAIMS
1. A system for defecting bot accounts comprising:
   a collector component to collect activity data;
   an indexer component to identify one or more suspicious users based on
   the collected activity data;
   a listener component that closely monitors the activities of the suspicious
   users data; and
   a validator component to ascertain bot accounts with high significance
   level and thus, filter out false positives.

2. The system for detecting bot accounts according to claim 1, wherein the
   collector component collects activity data based on a predefined keyword
   appearing within a stream of social activities in real-time.

3. The system for detecting bot accounts according to claim 1, wherein the
   indexer component takes an activity time series of each user and hashes using a
   lag-sensitive hash function the series into multiple hash buckets with the one or
   more identified suspicious users defined as qualified users colliding in a qualified
   hash bucket.

4. The system for detecting bot accounts according to claim 1, wherein the
   listener component forms an activity time series of each of the one or more
   identified suspicious users and the one or more identified suspicious users are
   filtered for those with less than a specific number of activities.

5. The system for detecting bot accounts according to claim 1, wherein the
   validator component identifies the one or more suspicious users as true or false
   based upon a pair-wise Dynamic Time Warping (DTW) distance matrix and a
   hierarchical clustering algorithm over the one or more users.

6. The system for detecting bot accounts according to claim 3, wherein the
   qualified users are those that have more than \( \frac{w}{4} \) occurrences.
7. The system for detecting bot accounts according to claim 3, wherein the qualified hash buckets are those that have more than \( \left\lceil \frac{w}{4} \right\rceil \) qualified users.

8. The system for detecting bot accounts according to claim 4, wherein the specific number of activities is more than 10 activities.

9. The system for detecting bot accounts according to claim 3, wherein the hash function is:

\[
h_i(x, r) = H(p_{x|r}(m + l))
\]

with \( h \) representing a bucket index, \( x \) representing the time series of each signal with a length \( m \), \( r \) representing a randomly picked reference of the same length, \( p_{x|r} \) representing cross-correlation between \( x \) and \( r \) at lag \( l \), \( H \) is a function converting the cross-correlation into an index to a bucket in the hash table with \( B \) representing the number of buckets in the hash structure.

10. A process for detecting bot accounts comprising the steps of:
    - collecting by a collector component activity data;
    - identifying by an indexer component one or more suspicious users based on the collected activity data;
    - monitoring by a listener component the collected activity data of the one or more suspicious users; and
    - ascertaining by a validator component one or more bot accounts with a high significance level to filter out false positives.

11. The process for detecting bot accounts according to claim 10, wherein the collecting step further comprises the steps of:
    - gathering data of one or more users matching a set of terms for a defined time period;
    - filtering users by removing those users with data consisting of one instance of a term;
    - forming filtered data as a set of time series of all remaining users;
passing filtered data to the indexer component.

12. The process for detecting bot accounts according to claim 10, wherein the identifying step further comprises the steps of:

- receiving by the indexer component the filtered data of the set of time series;
- selecting a reference time series randomly from the set;
- calculating a cross-correlation between each time series of the set and the reference time series;
- determining one or more hash buckets for each time series; and
- finding qualified suspicious users within each hash bucket.

13. The process for detecting bot accounts according to claim 12, wherein the suspicious users have more than \( \left\lfloor \frac{w}{4} \right\rfloor \) occurrences in a hash bucket, with \( w \) representing a user given parameter of the maximum allowable lag.

14. The process for detecting bot accounts according to claim 10, wherein the monitoring step further comprises the steps of:

- receiving all activities or actions of suspicious users over a period of time;
- reviewing all activities of the suspicious users;
- logging one or more actions of the suspicious users;
- forming an activity time series of the suspicious users; and
- filtering the suspicious users for those with less than a specific number of activities.

15. The process for detecting bot accounts according to claim 10, wherein the ascertaining step further comprises the steps of:

- checking the suspicious users to remove false positives;
- calculating a pair-wise DTW distance matrix over a set of users;
- clustering hierarchically the set of user up to a very restricted distance cutoff;
- ignoring each singleton user as a false positive; and
- identifying connected dusters as bots.
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