



IJITCE

ISSN 2347- 3657

International Journal of Information Technology & Computer Engineering

www.ijitce.com



Email : ijitce.editor@gmail.com or editor@ijitce.com

Deep Learning Anti-Fraud Model for Internet Loan Where We Are Going

¹ K SUPARNA, ² S. HALIMUNNISA

¹(Assistant Professor), MCA, **DANTULURI NARAYANA RAJU COLLEGE(A) PG COURSES, BHIMAVARAM ANDHRA PRADESH**

²MCA, scholar, **DANTULURI NARAYANA RAJU COLLEGE(A) PG COURSES, BHIMAVARAM ANDHRA PRADESH**

ABSTRACT

Recently, Internet finance is increasingly popular. However, bad debt has become a serious threat to Internet financial companies. The fraud detection models commonly used in conventional financial companies is logistic regression. Although it is interpretable, the accuracy of the logistic regression still remains to be improved. This paper takes a large public loan dataset, *e.g.* Lending club, for example, to explore the potential of applying deep neural network for fraud detection. We first fill all the missing values by a random forest. Then, an XGBoost algorithm is employed to select the most discriminate features. After that, we propose to use a synthetic minority oversampling technique to deal with the sample imbalance. With the pre-processed data, we design a deep neural network for

Internet loan fraud detection. Extensive experiments have been conducted to demonstrate the outperformance of the deep neural network compared with the commonly-used models. Such a simple yet effective model may brighten the application of deep learning in anti-fraud for Internet loans, which would benefit the financial engineers in small and medium Internet financial companies.

1.INTRODUCTION

Internet fraud methods are increasing dramatically in recent years, together with the rapid development of Internet financial models and the Internet business used to be handled by traditional financial institutions. In this regard, Internet lending companies face an unprecedented risk of online fraud. Luckily, the rapid development of computer

technology, the accumulating data, and the emerging data analysis techniques bring new opportunities to financial risk management and analysis on the big data in the financial industry.

Researchers have developed various anti-fraud measures and fraud prevention systems over the years. Leonard [1] proposed a rule-based expert system for fraud detection. The rules of this model were manually constructed by the fraud experts from the bank. Sanchez *et al.* [2] proposed to use association rules to detect fraud and help risk analysts extract more fraud rules. Edge and Sampaio [3] proposed a set of a financial fraud modelling language (FFML) for better describing and combining fraud rule sets to assist fraud analysis. However, the rule-based models require sufficient and accurate expertise knowledge and cannot be updated timely to new frauds.

To this end, machine learning models have been introduced for fraud detection. Ghosh and Reilly [4] uses neural networks to detect credit card fraud. Kokkinaki [5] proposed decision trees and Boolean logic functions to characterize normal transaction patterns to detect fraudulent transactions. Peng *et al.* [6] compared nine machine learning models for fraud detection. The results demonstrate

linear logistic and IEEE Access and Transaction on Deep Learning, Volume:9, Issue Date:12.January.2021 Bayesian networks are more effective. Lei and Ghorbani [7] proposed a new clustering algorithm namely improved competitive learning network (ICLN) and supervised an improved competitive learning network (SICLN). Sahin *et al.* [8] designed a decision tree based on cost sensitivity. Halvaiee and Akbari [9] proposed to use an AIRS improved algorithm for fraud detection.

However, these traditional machine learning methods heavily rely on manual subjective rules and easily lead to model risk. These methods also tend to over due to the imbalance training dataset with serious pollution by noises. Thus, ensemble learning methods have also been introduced to integrate different models for complicated fraud detection. Louzada and Ara [10] proposed a bagging ensemble model that integrates k-dependence probabilistic networks. The results show that the proposed ensemble model has stronger modelling capabilities.

Carminati *et al.* [11] proposed a combination of semi-supervised and unsupervised fraud and anomaly detection methods, mainly using a histogram-based

outlier score (HBOS) algorithm to model the user's past behaviour.

Recently, deep learning techniques have attracted a lot of academic and industrial attention that provides a new insight for financial data analysis. Fu *et al.* [12] used convolutional neural networks to effectively reduce feature redundancy. Tu *et al.* [13] design a deep feature representation technique for fraud detection. To incorporate with prior knowledge with the deep network, Greiner and Wang [14] pointed out the borrower is likely to conceal information that is not beneficial to him or even fictitious favourable information before obtaining the loan. After obtaining the loan, the borrower is likely to default unilaterally. Pope and Sydnor [15] also found it difficult to judge the risk of the personal information provided by the borrower unilaterally because the authenticity of this information cannot be verified. Freedman and Jin [16] uncovered that the borrower may commit fraudulent behaviour by reporting false information, which exacerbates the information asymmetry between the two parties.

Herzenstein *et al.* [17] also found that the borrowers' repayment ability and credit rating are the factors that have the greatest impact on personal credit risk. They concluded that economic strength is the

determinant of judging the availability of borrowing. At the same time, Herzenstein *et al.* [18] depicted the borrowers' spending power can also directly affect the success rate of borrowing. These methods reveal the characteristics of the borrowers would be helpful for fraud detection.

Motivated by such an idea, we propose a deep learning technique to mine the fraud in a public lending dataset with 200,000 records. We analyse the customer credit rating, which can help us to identify customers' actual situations. Intuitively, the lower a customer has a credit rating, such as the rating, the greater the likelihood of being a fraudulent user. Internet finance small loan companies set different thresholds on their customer credit rating data to build anti-fraud rules based on the true information of their customers.

This paper aims to provide small financial credit companies a simple yet effective model to improve their risk control and the level of anti-fraud. Such companies often have a poor-risk control capacity with limited capacity for data engineering, modelling, and optimization.

The main contribution of this paper is summarized as follows:

- First, we analyse the real-world Internet financial data for the missing data and sample imbalance. We propose to fill the missing with a random forest and deal with the sample imbalance with a synthetic minority oversampling technique.
- We train a deep neural network by the pre-processed data. We make comprehensible experiments for the setting of the network architecture and hyper parameters.
- Extensive experiments have been conducted to demonstrate the outperformance comparing with the commonly-used loan fraud detection models.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. The second part is the methodology, and the third part is an empirical study from real-world data. The fourth part is the conclusion.

2. EXISTING SYSTEM

Ghosh and Reilly [4] uses neural networks to detect credit card fraud. Kokkinaki [5] proposed decision trees and Boolean logic functions to characterize normal transaction patterns to detect fraudulent transactions. Peng *et al.* [6] compared nine machine learning models for fraud detection. The results demonstrate linear logistic and Bayesian networks are more effective.

Lei and Ghorbani [7] proposed a new clustering algorithm namely improved competitive learning network (ICLN) and supervised an improved competitive learning network (SICLN). Sahin *et al.* [8] designed a decision tree based on cost sensitivity.

Halvaiee and Akbari [9] proposed to use an AIRS improved algorithm for fraud detection. However, these traditional machine learning methods heavily rely on manual subjective rules and easily lead to model risk. These methods also tend to over fit due to the imbalance training dataset with serious pollution by noises. Thus, ensemble learning methods have also been introduced to integrate different models for complicated fraud detection.

Louzada and Ara [10] proposed a bagging ensemble model that integrates k-dependence probabilistic networks. The results show that the proposed ensemble model has stronger modelling capabilities. Carminati *et al.* [11] proposed a combination of semi-supervised and unsupervised fraud and anomaly detection methods, mainly using a histogram-based outlier score (HBOS) algorithm to model the user's past behaviour.

DISADVANTAGES:

1)The system doesn't analyse for large number of data sets due to lack of ml classifies.

2)The system couldn't implement to detect the following:

- (i) Level of Loan activity.
- (ii) Level of Loan Prediction.
- (iii) Loan Profile information.

3. PROPOSED SYSTEM

This paper aims to provide small financial credit companies a simple yet effective model to improve their risk control and the level of anti-fraud. Such companies often have a poor-risk control capacity with limited capacity for data engineering, modelling, and optimization. The main contribution of this paper is summarized as follows.

First, we analyse the real-world Internet financial data for the missing data and sample imbalance. We propose to fill the missing with a random forest and deal with the sample imbalance with a synthetic minority oversampling technique.

We train a deep neural network by the pre-processed data. We make comprehensible experiments for the setting of the network architecture and hyper parameters.

Extensive experiments have been conducted to demonstrate the outperformance comparing with the commonly-used loan fraud detection models.

DISADVANTAGES

Identity theft:

Criminals steal user's personal financial information in order to conduct fraudulent financial transaction activities or withdraw money from your account.

Investment fraud:

Selling investment or securities with false, misleading, or fraudulent information.

Mortgage and loan fraud:

The borrower uses false information to open a mortgage or loan, or the lender uses a high-pressure sales strategy to sell the mortgage or loan or predatory loan to users.

Large-scale marketing fraud:

Criminals usually use a lot of mail, telephone, or spam to steal users' personal financial information or request donations and fees from fraudulent organizations, usually involving fake checks, charities, sweepstakes, lotteries, and exclusive clubs or honour society invites.

4. OUTPUT SCREENS

Home screen

PREDITION OF LOAN APPROVED STATUS:



login	<input type="text"/>
pass	<input type="text"/>
id number	<input type="text"/>
password	<input type="text"/>
pincode	<input type="text"/>
pincode	<input type="text"/>
date	<input type="text"/>
year	<input type="text"/>
id card	<input type="text"/>
pin	<input type="text"/>
password	<input type="text"/>
pin id	<input type="text"/>
pin approval pin	<input type="text"/>

USER REGISTRATION:



USER PROFILE:



USER LOGIN:



SERVICE PROVIDER LOGIN:



BROWSE DATASET AND TRAIN&TEST DATA



INTERNET LOAN PREDICTION DETAILS:

VIEW TRAINED AND TESTED ACCURACY IN BAR CHAT:



View All Prediction Details For Internet Loan Prediction Details

Loan ID	Amount	Loan Type	Interest Rate	Term	Status	Score	Model	Accuracy	Loss	Gradient	Weight	Bias	Activation	Output	Target	Loss Function	Learning Rate	Epoch	Batch Size	Validation Loss	Validation Accuracy
1001	1000	Personal Loan	12%	12	Completed	0.95	Model A	0.95	0.02	0.1	0.5	0.2	0.8	0.95	0.95	0.01	0.01	10	32	0.02	0.95
1002	2000	Business Loan	15%	24	Pending	0.88	Model B	0.88	0.05	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.6	0.88	0.88	0.03	0.02	15	64	0.05	0.88
1003	5000	Real Estate Loan	8%	36	Completed	0.92	Model C	0.92	0.01	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.7	0.92	0.92	0.02	0.01	20	128	0.02	0.92
1004	1500	Auto Loan	10%	36	Completed	0.90	Model D	0.90	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.6	0.90	0.90	0.02	0.01	18	96	0.03	0.90
1005	3000	Personal Loan	11%	24	Pending	0.85	Model E	0.85	0.04	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.85	0.85	0.03	0.02	12	64	0.04	0.85
1006	7000	Real Estate Loan	7%	36	Completed	0.93	Model F	0.93	0.01	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.93	0.93	0.02	0.01	22	128	0.02	0.93
1007	2500	Business Loan	14%	24	Pending	0.87	Model G	0.87	0.04	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.87	0.87	0.03	0.02	14	96	0.04	0.87
1008	4000	Auto Loan	9%	36	Completed	0.91	Model H	0.91	0.02	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.91	0.91	0.02	0.01	16	128	0.02	0.91
1009	1800	Personal Loan	13%	12	Pending	0.89	Model I	0.89	0.03	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.89	0.89	0.03	0.02	10	64	0.03	0.89
1010	6000	Real Estate Loan	6%	36	Completed	0.94	Model J	0.94	0.01	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.94	0.94	0.02	0.01	24	128	0.02	0.94
1011	3500	Business Loan	16%	24	Pending	0.86	Model K	0.86	0.05	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.86	0.86	0.04	0.02	12	96	0.05	0.86
1012	4500	Auto Loan	8%	36	Completed	0.92	Model L	0.92	0.02	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.92	0.92	0.02	0.01	18	128	0.02	0.92
1013	2200	Personal Loan	14%	12	Pending	0.88	Model M	0.88	0.04	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.88	0.88	0.03	0.02	10	64	0.04	0.88
1014	5500	Real Estate Loan	5%	36	Completed	0.93	Model N	0.93	0.01	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.93	0.93	0.02	0.01	20	128	0.02	0.93
1015	3800	Business Loan	15%	24	Pending	0.87	Model O	0.87	0.04	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.87	0.87	0.03	0.02	12	96	0.04	0.87
1016	4800	Auto Loan	7%	36	Completed	0.94	Model P	0.94	0.01	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.94	0.94	0.02	0.01	16	128	0.02	0.94
1017	2800	Personal Loan	13%	12	Pending	0.89	Model Q	0.89	0.03	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.89	0.89	0.03	0.02	10	64	0.03	0.89
1018	6500	Real Estate Loan	4%	36	Completed	0.95	Model R	0.95	0.01	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.95	0.95	0.02	0.01	22	128	0.02	0.95
1019	4200	Business Loan	17%	24	Pending	0.86	Model S	0.86	0.05	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.86	0.86	0.04	0.02	12	96	0.05	0.86
1020	5200	Auto Loan	6%	36	Completed	0.93	Model T	0.93	0.02	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.93	0.93	0.02	0.01	14	128	0.02	0.93

INTERNET LOAN PREDICTION TYPE RATIO:

VIEW TRAINED AND TESTED ACCURACY RESULTS:



PREDICTION RATIO RESULTS:



ALL REMOTE USERS:

ID	NAME	EMAIL	PHONE	CITY	COUNTRY	STATE	CITY
1	John Doe	john.doe@gmail.com	9876543210	New York	USA	New York	New York
2	Jane Smith	jane.smith@gmail.com	1234567890	Los Angeles	USA	California	Los Angeles
3	Mike Johnson	mike.johnson@gmail.com	0987654321	Chicago	USA	Illinois	Chicago
4	Sarah Brown	sarah.brown@gmail.com	5678901234	London	UK	England	London
5	David White	david.white@gmail.com	4321098765	Mumbai	India	Maharashtra	Mumbai
6	Emily Green	emily.green@gmail.com	3210987654	Sydney	Australia	New South Wales	Sydney
7	James Black	james.black@gmail.com	2109876543	Paris	France	Île-de-France	Paris
8	Alice Grey	alice.grey@gmail.com	1098765432	Bombay	India	Gujarat	Bombay
9	Bob Blue	bob.blue@gmail.com	9876543210	Beijing	China	Beijing	Beijing
10	Charlie Red	charlie.red@gmail.com	8765432109	Delhi	India	Delhi	Delhi

5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we take the real customer information of the public loan data set of the lending club company as a sample. Then, we build a deep learning-based Internet fraud detection model. We introduce the main parameters of the model and optimizes to find the optimal parameter combination of the model. Finally, the most popular logistic regression in the financial industry as well as other comparisons are used as a baseline to evaluate the performance of the proposed model. The results reveal the deep neural network achieves better Performance, which is promising to be used in the financial industry for Internet fraud detection. In the future, we plan to cooperate with mature Internet financial technology companies and banks in China for blacklists and white lists. The deep neural network combined with such blacklists and white lists and the expertise anti-fraud rules is promising to increase fraud detection capability.

6. REFERENCE

[1] K. J. Leonard, "The development of a rule based expert system model for fraud alert in consumer credit," *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, vol. 80, no. 2, pp. 350_356, Jan. 1995.

- [2] D. Sánchez, M. A. Vila, L. Cerda, and J. M. Serrano, "Association rules applied to credit card fraud detection," *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 3630_3640, Mar. 2009.
- [3] M. E. Edge and P. R. F. Sampaio, "The design of FFML: A rule-based policy modelling language for proactive fraud management in _nancial data streams," *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 39, no. 11, pp. 9966_9985, Sep. 2012.
- [4] S. Ghosh and D. L. Reilly, *Credit Card Fraud Detection With a Neural-Network*. Wailea, HI, USA: IEEE, 1994.
- [5] A. I. Kokkinaki, "On atypical database transactions: Identi_cation of probable frauds using machine learning for user prowling," in *Proc. IEEE Knowl. Data Eng. Exchange Workshop*, 1997, pp. 229_238.
- [6] Y. Peng, G. Wang, G. Kou, and Y. Shi, "An empirical study of classi_cation algorithm evaluation for _nancial risk prediction," *Appl. Soft Comput.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 2906_2915, Mar. 2011.
- [7] J. Z. Lei and A. A. Ghorbani, "Improved competitive learning neural networks for network intrusion and fraud detection," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 75, no. 1, pp. 135_145, Jan. 2012.
- [8] Y. Sahin, S. Bulkan, and E. Duman, "A cost-sensitive decision tree approach for fraud detection," *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 40, no. 15, pp. 5916_5923, Nov. 2013.
- [9] N. Soltani Halvaiee and M. K. Akbari, "A novel model for credit card fraud detection using arti_cial immune systems," *Appl. Soft Comput.*, vol. 24, pp. 40_49, Nov. 2014.
- [10] F. Louzada and A. Ara, "Bagging k-dependence probabilistic networks: An alternative powerful fraud detection tool," *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 39, no. 14, pp. 11583_11592, Oct. 2012.