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ABSTRACT
Prompt and accurate detection of system anomalies is essential to ensure the reliability of software systems. Unlike manual efforts that exploit all available run-time information, existing approaches usually leverage only a single type of monitoring data (often logs or metrics) or fail to make effective use of the joint information among multi-source data. Consequently, many false predictions occur. To better understand the manifestations of system anomalies, we conduct a comprehensive empirical study based on a large amount of heterogeneous data, i.e., logs and metrics. Our study demonstrates that system anomalies could manifest distinctly in different data types. Thus, integrating heterogeneous data can help recover the complete picture of a system’s health status. In this context, we propose HADES, the first work to effectively identify system anomalies based on heterogeneous data. Our approach employs a hierarchical architecture to learn a global representation of the system status by fusing log semantics and metric patterns. It captures discriminative features and meaningful interactions from multi-modal data via a novel cross-modal attention module, enabling accurate system anomaly detection. We evaluate HADES extensively on large-scale simulated and industrial datasets. The experimental results present the superiority of HADES in detecting system anomalies on heterogeneous data. We release the code and the annotated dataset for reproducibility and future research.

1 INTRODUCTION
Recent years have witnessed the scale and complexity of software systems expand dramatically. However, anomalies are inevitable in large-scale software systems, resulting in considerable revenue and reputation loss [36]. The core competence of service providers stems from guaranteeing the reliability of software systems, where automated anomaly detection is a primary step and has been picked up extensively within the community. In real-world scenarios, many types of monitoring data, including system/software metrics, logs, alerts, and traces, play an essential role in software reliability engineering [8, 34]. In particular, metrics and logs have been widely used for anomaly detection. Metrics (e.g., response time, number of threads, CPU usage) are real-valued time series measuring the system status. Logs are semi-structured text messages printed by logging statements to record the system’s run-time status. Logs reflect system anomalies mainly through their semantics (e.g., keywords) and sequential dependencies across events. Besides, metrics reflect different aspects of the system performance, and metrics belonging
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to different aspects tend to develop distinct behavioral patterns. For example, when a system works normally, the disk usage often moves steadily, but the CPU usage can fluctuate dramatically. Such complicated and diverse information introduces complexity in feature extraction, requiring the model to be highly competent in complicated information processing. (2) **Significant inter-modal gap.** Logs and metrics are in different forms, i.e., textual and time-series. Such a discrepancy poses a huge challenge to effectively using the joint information for downstream anomaly detection. To this end, it is critical to align the log semantics and metric patterns.

To tackle these challenges, we propose HADES, a Heterogeneous Anomaly Detector for Software systems, which is the first work to investigate anomaly detection with heterogeneous data sources. The key idea is to learn a discriminative representation of the system status based on logs and metrics. HADES first captures intra-modal dependencies using a hierarchical architecture. Then it generates a global representation of the most discriminative latent information of logs and metrics. HADES further captures intra-modal dependencies via a modal-wise attentive fusion module. More specifically, HADES involves four components: (1) For logs, we adopt the FastText algorithm [6] and the Transformer encoder [46] to model lexical semantics and sequential dependencies of logs. (2) In terms of metrics, we employ a hierarchical encoder to learn metric representations based on the causal convolution network [30]. It jointly learns aspect-oriented temporal dependencies, cross-metric relationships, and inter-aspect correlations. (3) We design a novel modal-wise attention mechanism to facilitate learning a global representation retaining meaningful intra- and inter-modal properties. (4) Finally, the framework infers the application-agnostic system status and triggers an alarm upon detecting system anomalies.

We evaluate HADES using both simulated (Dataset A) and industrial (Dataset B and C) datasets. The experimental results demonstrate the superiority of HADES, which achieves an average F1-score of 0.93, outperforming all state-of-the-art competitors, including log-based and metric-based ones. In addition, the effectiveness of our designs (including the exploitation of heterogeneous information, multi-modal learning, attentive fusion, and hierarchical feature extraction) is confirmed by extensive ablation experiments.

In summary, the main contributions of this paper are:

- We conduct a comprehensive empirical study to investigate the manifestation of system anomalies caused by practical faults. The findings greatly motivate our work.
- We propose a novel end-to-end approach, HADES, the first work to detect system anomalies accurately and efficiently based on heterogeneous monitoring data via attentive multi-modal learning. The code is publicly available [3] for reproducibility.
- Extensive experiments on simulated and industrial datasets show that HADES beats all compared approaches. Also, ablation studies further validate the effectiveness of each design in our model.
- Lastly, we release an annotated dataset on [3] containing heterogeneous run-time information with complex log semantics and diverse metric patterns.

## 2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

To begin, we introduce some essential terminologies. A *log message* is a line of the standard output of logging statements, composed of constant strings (written by the developers) and variable values (determined by the system) [19]. Parsing a log message is to remove all variables to obtain a log event, which describes system run-time events [21]. Log messages chronologically collected within a certain time period constitute a log sequence. Metrics are the numerical measurement of system performance that are sampled uniformly. Consecutive points within a certain period make up a metric segment. By collecting both the logs and metrics in a given period of length \(T\), we obtain a *chunk* with time-aligned heterogeneous data. The value of \(T\) is determined according to real-world requirements. Anomalies are system abnormal behaviors, events, or observations that do not conform to the expected patterns in the run-time information [21]. These anomalies often indicate system issues and could evolve to errors or failures. *Anomaly detection* is the process of identifying the software system anomalies.

We formulate the task of heterogeneous anomaly detection as follows. Given a data chunk, we need to determine the current system status as abnormal or normal, denoted as 1 and 0, respectively. Let \(X_{1:N}, Y_{1:N} = \{(X_1, y_1), (X_2, y_2), \ldots, (X_N, y_N)\}\) be the training data chunks with corresponding status labels, where \(X_i = (X_{i1}^N, X_{i}^m)\), \((i = 1, 2, \ldots, N)\) is the \(i\)-th data chunk, and \(y_i \in \{0, 1\}\) denotes the status. In the \(i\)-th chunk, \(X_{1:L}^i = [x_{i1},\ldots, x_{iL}]\) denotes the log sequence, where \(L\) is the number of log events generated during the period of length \(T\); the metric segment is denoted by \(X_{1:T}^m = [x_{11},\ldots, x_{LT}]\in \mathbb{R}^{T \times M}\), where \(M\) and \(T\) are the number and length of monitoring metrics, respectively. The goal is to model the relations behind \((X_{1:N}, Y_{1:N})\), and then for each incoming unseen instance \(X_{N+1}\), we can predict the status \(y_{N+1}\).

## 3 EMPIRICAL STUDY AND MOTIVATION

In practice, engineers usually analyze multiple sources of system run-time information for troubleshooting. However, manual inspection is tedious and fallible, especially when facing massive data. To explore the opportunity to automate this process, we conduct a detailed empirical study on simulated and real-world industrial datasets to understand how system anomalies affect the multi-source monitoring data. Moreover, most industrial datasets are access-restricted, and the publicly accessible data is often too small or single-source due to security and privacy concerns. To alleviate this problem, we have released our collected dataset on [3]. It contains large-scale logs and metrics generated from a distributed computing system, which underpins our study and will facilitate the advancement and openness of the community.

### 3.1 Data Collection

The process of data collection comprises four steps: 1) deploy the infrastructure, 2) conduct workloads to generate monitoring data, 3) inject typical faults to simulate industrial production anomalies, and 4) collect multi-source monitoring data simultaneously.

#### 3.1.1 Infrastructure and Data Generation

Apache Spark is a widely-used framework for big data processing [17]. We deploy Spark 3.0.3 on a distributed systems cluster containing a master node and five worker nodes (virtual nodes supported by Docker [39]) in our laboratory environment. Then, we employ a big data benchmark suite, HiBench [26], to conduct 22 kinds of workloads, involving basic (e.g., word counting, sorting) and sophisticated (e.g., random forest,
k-means) applications. They are diverse in terms of resource usage, including CPU (e.g., random forest performs complex computation), I/O (e.g., word counting requires transaction-intensive file inputting), and network (e.g., sorting involves frequent data transferring). Unlike existing collections (e.g., [22, 44, 47]) running only word counting, our data cover more service application scenarios.

We repeat each workload without fault injection seven times to obtain sufficient data. In this paper, we refer to the run-time data as standard data when no fault is injected during the entire workload. We mainly collect two types of run-time data, i.e., logs and metrics. Logs are aggregated by Spark automatically, and metrics are sampled (per second) and collected via an open-source monitoring tool [12]. In the following analysis, we focus on 11 monitoring metrics reflecting four critical aspects of the system status (i.e., CPU, I/O, memory, and network), for example, CPU system usage, device read speed ("rkb/s"), memory usage, and network throughput rate.

3.1.2 Fault Injection. After gathering standard data, we injected 21 common types of faults into the workloads. These faults are selected based on previous research [15, 44, 47] and our investigation on the typical service failures at Huawei. Each fault lasts for one minute, and the time from fault injection to fault clearance is called fault duration. The data collected for the rest of the time is regarded as fault-free. The injected faults fall into four categories:

- **Process suspension**: suspend a process for one minute, including the Application Worker, Master, Node Manager, Datanode, Secondary Datanode, Resource Manager, and Namenode.
- **Process killing**: kill each process once, including the Application Worker, Master, Node Manager, Datanode, and Secondary Datanode. Killing these processes does not terminate the running workload immediately.
- **Resource stress**: load the system by injecting CPU, I/O, memory, and other resource logs, supported by the stress-ng tool [27].
- **Network faults**: use Linux traffic control to inject network faults like dropping packets, high latency, and flashing disconnections. Totally, \((21 + 7) \times 22 = 616\) log files (with 1,435,139 valid messages) and 11 metric time series (with a length of 64,420) are collected. It is also worth noting that we obtain 118 log templates via Drain [20].

3.1.3 Data Annotation. We invite two Ph.D. students experienced in software reliability as annotators. They are not aware of when the faults are injected or cleaned, so the labeling is completely based on the data without off-site information. The principle to label an abnormal chunk is that the in-process data manifest discrepancies from the standard data, e.g., error logs and unusual metric jitters. Meanwhile, the abnormal manifestation should align with the expected impact of the injected fault, which is manually checked by annotators. We do not simply regard all data generated during the fault duration as abnormal because many faults can be immediately tolerated by the system’s fault-tolerant mechanisms, incurring no anomalies to the system. In this case, we treat the corresponding logs and metrics as normal. The label is accepted if the two students give the same label for one chunk independently. Otherwise, they will discuss with a post-doc until reaching a consensus. The inter-annotator agreement [11] achieves 0.864 before adjudication.

### 3.2 Empirical Study

To investigate how different types of run-time data manifest anomalies, we conduct an empirical study based on the above data. Specifically, we aim to answer the following research questions (RQs):

- **RQ1**: How do logs manifest system anomalies?
- **RQ2**: How do metrics manifest system anomalies?
- **RQ3**: How does run-time information reflect the system status?

3.2.1 RQ1: Log Manifestations of Anomalies. In general, logs are not susceptible to system faults. Only 3.62% of positively labeled chunks are anomalous from the log’s perspective. A typical example provides a closer look. If the network drops some packets, the service response becomes slow, but may not hit the timeout threshold, thereby no anomalous log event will be reported. The main reason lies in the inherent deficiency of logs. Logging [18, 21, 49, 50] is a human activity heavily relying on developers’ knowledge. While it is relatively easy to write logs describing severe failures, subtle performance issues, e.g., gray failures [23], are often hard to identify. Thus, logs capturing such anomalies could be missing.

Digging into logs, we observe that the lexical semantics are noteworthy. Specifically, the appearance of some log tokens indicates anomalies. These tokens only occur in abnormal sequences, and their semantics describe unusual system events, e.g., “uncaught” and “exception” in the event “Uncought exception in thread”. This observation is in line with the programming habits of developers, as well as previous studies [9, 25, 51]. It also validates that log semantics can reflect the current system status to some extent. Moreover, the contexts of logs are crucial for detecting anomalies since logs carry the information of program control flows [48]. For example, a normal sequence of log events is an event reporting the “final application” state followed by the log event “Shutdown hook called”. When anomalies happen, the event “Shutdown hook called” may occur before reporting the “final application” state. In this case, the application state will be regarded as undefined or failed because the master has not received the message informing the application state. Hence, the contextual semantics of logs also contain information that indicates whether the system is healthy.

**Finding 1**: Logs are relatively coarse-grained and cannot manifest all system anomalies. Moreover, both lexical and contextual semantics are important characteristics with respect to reflecting the system status.

3.2.2 RQ2: Metric Manifestations of Anomalies. Metrics are more responsive to anomalies as they continuously record fine-grained system status. However, there are still some anomalous periods ignored by many existing metric-based detectors.

Existing anomaly detectors usually try to identify novel metric patterns through a comparison with normal system behaviors, i.e., novelty detection [13]. They mainly focus on local patterns (e.g., spikes, level shifts) rather than global patterns spanning the entire workload. However, system faults are not necessarily manifested by local novel patterns. Figure 1 displays an example that the metric “rkb/s” during the fault “Datanode suspension”, as shown by the red line. The metric “rkb/s” is abnormal as a whole, but its local patterns are hard to identify as anomalies. Specifically, the red line remains zero after fault injection, which is unexpected as there
should have been I/O activities going on. The blue line depicts the normal (standard) status as a comparison. However, the blue line also remains zero after the time of 90s because the system does not exchange data near the end of the workload. So “rkb/s” in either the normal or abnormal status can stay at zero for a while. This indicates that a metric can behave very similarly when the system is in the opposite status. Such patterns (may reflect the opposite system statuses) will confuse most existing methods relying on novel pattern mining, leading to performance degradation. The inherent reason is that system metrics cannot completely reflect the software’s inner executive logic. Fortunately, such anomalies can be detected by referring to the logs, where suspicious events like “Exception in createBlockOutputStream” are reported.

Figure 1: Suspending the Datanode incurs anomalies manifested in the metric “rkb/s”, but no novel pattern exists.

On the flip side, unusual metric fluctuations may trigger alarms even when no anomaly exists currently. Among all metric segments manually labeled as positive, 8.87% of them are collected in fault-free periods, indicating that relying solely on metrics may cause false alarms due to the overreactions of metrics. For example, Figure 2 displays that even in the fault-free period, the metric “CPU iowait” still generates a rare heartbeat spike. Nevertheless, such sporadic and transient fluctuation is acceptable without affecting the service, thereby no alarm should be triggered. This case suggests that other information should be involved to mitigate the issues caused by the over-sensitivity of metrics to avoid unnecessary engineering resource waste.

Figure 2: An acceptable outlier of “CPU iowait” in a fault-free period may trigger a false alarm by most automated tools.

In addition, we find that metric patterns presented at the segment level sketch issues much better than single-point outliers. For example, the metric “memory usage” performs noticeably abnormal jitters when injecting a “virtual memory hog” (Figure 3). However, these jittering points are not outliers because their values are not extraordinarily high or low. Clearly, the outlier perspective ignores high-order data variations, such as the scope and denseness, resulting in missing alarm issues.

Figure 3: The irregular metric jitters cannot be detected by single point-based detectors.

Finding 2: Metrics are more responsive to faults but still insufficient in many cases. Also, their over-sensitivity may cause false alarms on uncommon yet acceptable fluctuations. Besides, segment-level metric patterns are more useful in anomaly detection than single-point outliers.

3.2.3 RQ3: Overall Anomalous Manifestations. To answer this RQ, we summarize representative faults and their effects on multi-source monitoring data, as listed in Table 1.

We find that multi-source data can be affected by faults simultaneously. For example, when a resource hog is posed, anomalous manifestations appear in both metrics (e.g., sudden spikes) and logs (e.g., warnings for limited resources). Also, there is an evident complementary relationship between the two data sources in some cases. For instance, when the Datanode or Secondary Namenode is killed, the related metrics’ abnormal manifestations cannot be detected (i.e. silent) since these metrics also plummet to zero if the application ends normally. Metric-based anomaly detectors cannot distinguish such abnormal drops from normal ones. In this case, logs can serve as an additional source of information to help determine the system status. On the contrary, when the connection between nodes flashed, no warnings or errors are generated in logs since the network disconnection time is too short to affect program operation. Nevertheless, network-related metrics can faithfully reflect these transient anomalies, such as the network throughput that drops rapidly during flashes. Such observations align with intuition. Basically, logs record the software’s internal execution logic, while metrics provide an external view by measuring software services’ performances, resource usage, etc. Thus, combining the two can better portray the system status due to their collaborative and complementary relationships.

Furthermore, a fault can affect different types of monitoring data to varying degrees. For example, killing the Datanode during the Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) application causes 29 abnormal metric segments while only one log sequence reports anomalies. Another example is that when suspending the Namenode in word counting, the related metrics experience a sharp drop and remain unchanged since most of the computation has been done. Yet tens of logs reporting a failed state are generated because the worker nodes keep warning while the master node cannot receive messages. Hence, simply regrating all types of data equally important is unreasonable since the more severely affected part may deserve more attention. In brief, we should combine and assign appropriate weights to metrics and logs to promote effective anomaly detection.
Table 1: Typical faults and the corresponding anomalous manifestations of multi-source monitoring data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faults</th>
<th>Anomalous manifestations in logs</th>
<th>Anomalous manifestations in metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory hog</td>
<td>Warnings (reaches the memory limit; dropping blocks)</td>
<td>Memory-related metrics rise steeply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual memory hog</td>
<td>Errors (reporter thread fails)</td>
<td>CPU and memory-related metrics jitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/O hog</td>
<td>Warnings (slow ReadProcessor)</td>
<td>I/O-related metrics rise steeply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network delay</td>
<td>Warnings (executor heartbeat timeout)</td>
<td>Network-related metrics suddenly drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection flash</td>
<td>Nothing (silent)</td>
<td>Related metrics plummet to zero (silent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datanode killed</td>
<td>Errors (excluding datanode)</td>
<td>Related metrics plummet to zero (silent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary namenode killed</td>
<td>Errors (failed to connect to &lt;IP&gt;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding 3: Metrics and logs can both respond to anomalies, but neither is sufficiently informative. They have collaborative and complementary relationships in providing clues for the system’s health. Also, the degree to which they are affected by the same anomaly can vary greatly.

These findings support our motivation to propose an automated approach for detecting anomalies based on heterogeneous monitoring data, i.e., logs and metrics. The approach should enable comprehensive information extraction and inference for effectively detecting anomalies in software systems. This results in HADES, our solution to attack the above-mentioned challenges.

4 METHODOLOGY

Figure 4 presents the overview of HADES, which is a Heterogeneous Anomaly DEtector for Software systems via attentive multi-modal learning. It consists of four components: Log Modeling, Metric Modeling, Heterogeneous Representation Fusion, and Detection. The core idea is to infer the system status from current heterogeneous monitoring data based on historical extracted patterns. We incorporate domain knowledge and the insights obtained from our previous empirical study to design a more practical model architecture. Specifically, for logs, HADES captures lexical and contextual log semantics and maps each raw log sequence into a low-dimensional representation. For metrics, HADES preserves aspect-aware information at the segment level along the timeline and learns cross-aspect correlations. Our framework also employs an attention-based fusion module with multi-modal learning to acquire a global representation, which is fed into a successive detection component. Consequently, it will trigger an alarm to operations engineers when a noteworthy anomaly occurs.

4.1 Log Modeling

Log modeling contains three steps, including log parsing, log vectorization, and log representation learning, aiming at learning log representations with respect to lexical and contextual semantics, whose importance has been demonstrated in § 3.2.1.

4.1.1 Log Parsing. In this step, we transform unstructured log messages into structured log events. As aforementioned, raw log messages are unstructured and contain variables that can hinder log analysis [19]. Therefore, we first employ a widely-used parser Drain [20] to extract log events since it has shown effectiveness and efficiency in the previous evaluation study [53]. Next, we conduct a stable sorting based on the log timestamps. As a result, all valid log messages are transferred into chronologically arranged log events.

4.1.2 Log Vectorization. This phase turns textual log events into numerical vectors while preserving lexical log semantics. We utilize FastText [6] to capture the intrinsic relationships of log vocabulary since the importance of log semantics has been demonstrated in our empirical study (§ 3.2.1). FastText is a popular, lightweight, and efficient technique for producing word embeddings that can represent semantic similarities between words. After training, FastText maps every token into a D-dimension vector, so a log event \( \mathbf{x}_t \) is transformed into a token embedding list \( \mathbf{v}_t = [v_1, v_2, ..., v_{\omega}] \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times \omega} \), where \( \omega \) is the token number of an event. Subsequently, we average all elements inside \( V \) to acquire a sentence embedding \( \bar{V} = \frac{1}{\omega} \sum_{v_i \in \mathbf{v}_t} v_i \). Consequently, a log sequence \( X_t \) can be denoted by a sentence embedding list \( \bar{V} = [\bar{V}_1, \bar{V}_2, ..., \bar{V}_L] \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times D} \).

4.1.3 Log Representation Learning. This step models the log contextual semantics and generates log representations with learned information. In particular, the sentence embeddings of a sequence obtained from the previous phase are fed into a sequence encoder, which is composed of two Transformer encoder layers [46]. This encoder captures contextual dependencies across the events. Afterward, a fully-connected (FC) layer maps the output into a D-dimensional feature space. Hence, we obtain the log representation of a chunk, denoted by \( R_t \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times D} \). Note that if the log sequence is too long, we partition it into fixed-size sub-sequences and conduct the above steps. For a too-short sequence, we pad it with zeros.

4.2 Metric Modeling

We model metrics in a hierarchical manner with respect to segment-level patterns based on the finding in § 3.2.2. The module comprises an intra-aspect encoder and an inter-aspect encoder (Figure 4).

The rationale behind the design is summarized in three points: (1) Metrics sketching the same aspect of the system should be modeled together. Monitoring metrics can reflect various aspects of system performance, e.g., CPU utilization, memory utilization, etc. Generally, metric patterns of the same aspect share certain similarities (e.g., CPU user usage and CPU system usage both characterize CPU usage). Such metrics should be grouped and regarded as multivariate time series (MTS) to be analyzed together. (2) Metrics depicting different aspects should be modeled separately. If two metrics belong to different aspects, their patterns can be very different. For example, the disk usage tends to be stable while the I/O throughput may fluctuate violently even under the normal status. So metrics of different aspects should be fed into separate models to capture fine-grained information. (3) While metrics of different aspects tend to develop distinct patterns, they still exhibit some inter-aspect correlations when anomalies occur. For instance, if a worker node...
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Figure 4: Overview of HADES.

model complex patterns by capturing multi-level information. We
take \( \mathbf{H}^m \) outputted by the intra-aspect encoder as an MTS and
feed it into the inter-aspect encoder to model the correlations be-
tween metric aspects. In this way, the metrics \( \mathbf{X}^m \) inside a chunk
are embedded into a \( D \)-dimensional representation, denoted by
\( \mathbf{R}^m \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times D} \). Note that data of all modalities should be embedded
into the same feature space for alignment.

4.3 Heterogeneous Representation Fusion
We design a fusion module with a novel cross-attention mechanism
to bridge the time-semantics gap between the representations of
logs and metrics. We fuse heterogeneous information to mitigate the
negative effects brought by the lack of information of single-source
data (§ 3.2.3) and the over-sensitivity of metrics (§ 3.2.2).
In the previous phases, logs and metrics are both embedded into a
\( D \)-dimensional feature space. These representations are fed together
into this fusion module, defined by two attention layers [46]. The
first one (Attn-\( \alpha \)) takes the log representation \( \mathbf{R}^l \) as the Query while
the metric representation \( \mathbf{R}^m \) as the Key and Value. It matches the
log events explaining the metric changes. Symmetrically, in the
second attention layer (Attn-\( \beta \)), \( \mathbf{R}^m \) plays the role of the Query, and
\( \mathbf{R}^l \) serves as the Key and Value. It helps to find the performance
variations aligned with log contents to enhance log expressiveness.
Mathematically, given the Query, Key, and Value, we calculate:
\[
\text{Fuse}(Q, K, V) = \tanh \left( \text{softmax}(Q W_e K^T V; Q \mid W_a) \right)
\]
(1)
where \( W_a \) and \( W_e \) are learnable parameters; \( [\cdot ; \cdot] \) denotes concatenation.
Afterward, outputs from Attn-\( \alpha \) and Attn-\( \beta \) are concatenated
inside the \( D \)-dimensional space to constitute a global representation
\( \mathbf{R}^g \in \mathbb{R}^{(T+L) \times D} \) for each data chunk, defined as Equation 2.
\[ R^9 = [\text{Fuse}(R^1, R^m, R^m), \text{Fuse}(R^m, R^1, R^1)] \]  

(2)

Above all, switching the roles of the two modalities allows devoting more attention to the features of different modalities that convey similar information, which is more likely to be responsive to changes in the system status. Also, it can retain meaningful intra-modal patterns explicitly by directly concatenating the Query with the attended Value. In this way, the global representation preserves not only the shared information and cross-modal interactions but also the salient intra-modal dependencies and the inferred features due to the complementary relationship between logs and metrics.

4.4 Detection

Finally, we feed the representation \( R^9 \) of the in-process chunk into stacked FC layers followed by a softmax layer. The output \( \hat{y} \in \{0, 1\} \) represents the status being normal or abnormal, computed by:

\[
\hat{y} = \arg\max \{U\sigma(V \cdot R^9 + b) + c) \}
\]

(3)

where \( U \) and \( V \) are learnable weight matrices; \( b \) and \( c \) are bias terms; \( \sigma(\cdot) \) is the ReLU activation function [1]. This module will generate an alarm if it detects an anomaly. Engineers can then conveniently locate the logs and metrics of the suspicious chunk via a visual interface for further analysis. We display a demo in Figure 5.

![Figure 5: A demo for reviewing the detected chunk.](image)

5 EVALUATION

We evaluate HADES by answering the following research questions:

- **RQ4**: How effective is HADES in anomaly detection?
- **RQ5**: How much does each design of HADES contribute to its overall performance?
- **RQ6**: How sensitive is HADES to the length of a chunk?

5.1 Experiment Setup

5.1.1 Datasets. Besides the in-lab dataset (Dataset \( A \) in §3.1), we also evaluate HADES on two industrial datasets (Dataset \( B \) and \( C \)) containing heterogeneous monitoring data from the production cloud system of Huawei. Table 2 shows the statistics of our datasets. All datasets are randomly split into three subsets (training, validation, and testing) in a 7:1:2 ratio. To generate the industrial data, we use an internal tool to inject faults into two different cloud services. We invoke three experienced reliability engineers to select the typical faults in the production systems. Eight types of faults are injected, including CPU stress, memory stress, high disk I/O latency, disk partition full, network flashing, long network latency, high packet loss rate, and zombie process. As suggested by the engineers, we set each fault duration to two hours and repeat the injection twice. The data generation process covers 5.5 days for \( B \) and eleven days for \( C \). Metrics are sampled once per minute. Particularly, we obtain 72 templates from \( B \) and 104 templates from \( C \) via Drain [20]. Lastly, we invite the aforementioned engineers to annotate the data following a similar procedure described in §3.1.3.

![Table 2: Dataset statistics](image)

5.1.2 Implementations. For logs, the hidden size of the encoder is 1024. We use Gensim [42] to train 32-dimensional word embeddings for 50 epochs. For metrics, the intra-aspect encoder comprises two causal convolution layers, with a kernel size of two and a stride of one. The inter-aspect encoder has three layers with a dropout rate of 0.1. The decoder consists of four FC layers with a hidden size of 128. We employ the binary cross-entropy loss as the loss function. Also, we train the model using the Adam optimizer with an initial learning rate of 0.001, a batch size of 64, and an epoch number of 50. It turns out that HADES is not sensitive to the above model hyperparameters. In addition, the data-setting hyper-parameter (e.g., the length of a chunk) may affect the framework’s performance by affecting the dataset distribution. We will discuss the sensitivity of HADES to the chunk length in RQ6. All approaches are trained on an NVIDIA GeForce GTX 1080 GPU. Our codes for reproducing the experiments are publicly available at [3].

5.1.3 Evaluation Measurements. As we tackle anomaly detection in a binary classification manner, we adopt the widely-used measurements to gauge models’ performances: \( \text{recall} = \frac{TP}{TP+FN}, \text{precision} = \frac{TP}{TP+FP}, \text{F1-score} = \frac{2 \cdot \text{precision} \cdot \text{recall}}{\text{precision} + \text{recall}}, \text{accuracy} = \frac{TP+TN}{TP+TN+FP+FN} \), where \( TP \) is the number of successfully detected abnormal chunks; \( TN \) is the number of correctly predicted normal chunks; \( FP \) is the number of normal chunks incorrectly triggering alarms; \( FN \) is the number of abnormal chunks that failed to be discovered.

5.2 RQ4: Overall Performance of HADES

We compare HADES with a multi-modal baseline and five single-modal baselines. In particular, SCWarn [52] is the only multi-modal approach for binary classification in the software engineering literature, as far as we know, despite not being designed for anomaly detection. LogRobust [51], LogAnomaly [38], and Deepleog [14] are log-based, whereas Telemamon [24] and Adsketch [10] are metric-based. For baseline implementation, we employ the codes released by their papers for [10, 24, 52], and a toolkit [9] for [14, 38, 51] that do not provide codes. All baselines use the same classifier and hyper-parameter searching space as HADES for a fair comparison. We adopt the parameters achieving the highest validation \( F1 \)-score. Note that for log-based methods, we drop the chunks without log messages and adopt the sliding window mode as the original papers.
Table 3: Performance comparison between HADES and the baselines.

| Data source | Approaches | Dataset A | | | Dataset B | | | Dataset C | | |
|-------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Multi-source| HADES      | 0.8503    | 0.8251    | 0.8772    | 0.9340    | 0.9790    | 0.9722    | 0.9859    | 0.9899    |
|             | SCWarn     | 0.7926    | 0.7822    | 0.8034    | 0.9070    | 0.9041    | 0.9167    | 0.8919    | 0.9532    |
|             | LogRobust  | 0.4569    | 0.4737    | 0.4412    | 0.8199    | 0.5854    | 0.6316    | 0.5455    | 0.8759    |
|             | LogAnomaly | 0.4454    | 0.5579    | 0.3706    | 0.7778    | 0.4681    | 0.5789    | 0.3929    | 0.8175    |
|             | Deeplog    | 0.4396    | 0.4211    | 0.4598    | 0.8283    | 0.4651    | 0.5263    | 0.4167    | 0.8321    |
|             | Telemanon  | 0.6063    | 0.5457    | 0.6850    | 0.8306    | 0.5366    | 0.6197    | 0.4731    | 0.7424    |
| Metrics     | Adsketch   | 0.6535    | 0.5747    | 0.7573    | 0.6560    | 0.6667    | 0.5634    | 0.8163    | 0.8644    |

Table 3 presents the overall performance comparison. HADES outperforms all baselines by a significant margin, achieving the best result on every evaluation measurement. Specifically, its F1-scores are 0.8503, 0.9790, and 0.9612, 7.65%–106.55% higher than competitors on average. The high recall, precision and accuracy scores of HADES illustrate that there are very few missed anomalies or false alarms. Thus, HADES is considerably effective to detect system anomalies, redounding to economizing engineering resources.

Compared with the multi-modal baseline, SCWarn, the success of HADES can be attributed to its powerful capability in heterogeneous representation learning, summarized as three points. (1) HADES utilizes multi-level log semantics to generate more informative representations, as log semantics are important in reflecting anomalies (§ 3.2.1). (2) HADES represents log events via succinct and low-dimensional embeddings, facilitating effective representation learning. In comparison, SCWarn transforms logs into event occurrence sequences, generating an over-large sparse feature matrix for log events. Such a design poses barriers to extracting meaningful features and wastes computation and space resources, especially when hundreds of events exist. (3) HADES devises an attentive fusion to capture significant cross-modal interactions and bridge temporal and textual representations. By contrast, SCWarn simply concatenates the heterogeneous representations. It ignores the vast gap between metrics and logs, i.e., the information form and the input size discrepancies, thereby degrading the model’s performance.

The superiority of HADES over single-modal baselines stems from the effective use of logs and metrics. Compared with the best single-modal model (Adsketch), the F1-score, recall, precision, and accuracy of HADES is increased by 42.29%, 64.39%, 19.40%, 22.49% respectively. Such improvement is exciting and reasonable. Our empirical study reveals that metrics and logs can both reflect anomalies, and neither of them is sufficient (§ 3.2.3). However, these baselines only review one data source and omit much important information hidden in the other source. So they cannot infer the system status precisely and deliver satisfying performances.

In brief, HADES effectively detects system anomalies on all datasets. It significantly improves the detection performance compared to all baselines concerning every evaluation measurement, especially compared to the single-modal competitors.

5.3 RQ5: Individual Contribution of Modules

5.3.1 Derived Models. We conduct an extensive ablation study on HADES. Particularly, we derive seven models based on the original HADES to investigate the contribution of the introduction of heterogeneous information, multi-modal learning, cross-modal attentive fusion, and single-modal feature extraction.

- **Heterogeneous information**: log-HADES and metric-HADES. log-HADES is log-based, containing a log modeling module (duplicated from § 4.1) and a decoder. Similarly, metric-HADES is metric-based, containing a metric modeling module (duplicated from § 4.2) and a decoder. The decoders adopt the detection module’s structure of HADES (§ 4.4). Representations of logs and metrics are directly fed into the respective decoder separately.

- **Multi-modal learning**: or-HADES. or-HADES performs a Boolean OR operation on the results from log-HADES and metric-HADES. It is built on the motivation that it’s natural to process each type of data individually and then aggregate results instead of multi-modal learning when involving various sources of data.

- **Attentive fusion**: concat-HADES and sep-HADES. These two models share the same log and metric representation learning modules with HADES but change the way of fusing representations (§ 4.3). concat-HADES simply concatenates the representations of metrics and logs as the global representation; sep-HADES operates conventional self-attention on the two representations separately and then concatenates them.

- **Single-modal feature extraction**: agn-HADES and onehot-HADES. agn-HADES is designed for validating the contribution of the specially-designed aspect-aware metric modeling module (§ 4.2). It models metrics in an aspect-agnostic manner based on causal convolutions to deal with all metrics simultaneously. onehot-HADES replaces the word embedding with one-hot encoding to present the usefulness of log semantics (§ 4.1.2). Other modules of agn-HADES and onehot-HADES all keep unchanged from HADES for comparison.

5.3.2 Experimental Results. We adopt the same measurements as RQ4 to assess the contribution of the above-mentioned components. The results are shown in table 4, underpinning four key conclusions.

(1) Introducing heterogeneous information contributes incredibly to enhancing anomaly detection in view of two observations. First, HADES outperforms log-HADES and metric-HADES considerably, mainly in recall. Such results indicate that HADES can discover suspicious situations while reducing false alarms because it leverages the relationships between logs and metrics. Also, all derived models based on multi-source data deliver better performances than single-source-based variants (log-HADES and metric-HADES), validating that heterogeneous data goes far towards characterizing the system health more fully.
We herein evaluate the sensitivity of HADES to the pre-determined imbalance, mainly reflected by the increase in missing anomalies. By adjusting the value of $T$, we observe the robustness of HADES. It makes HADES easy to deploy and come into play in practice. Yet, when the value of $T$ deviates from the default configuration, the scores of recall and precision render imbalance, mainly reflected by the increase in missing anomalies.

### Table 4: Performance comparison between HADES and the derived models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Dataset $A$</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Dataset $B$</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Dataset $C$</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HADES</td>
<td>0.8503</td>
<td>0.8251</td>
<td>0.8772</td>
<td>0.9340</td>
<td>0.9790</td>
<td>0.9722</td>
<td>0.9859</td>
<td>0.9899</td>
<td>0.9612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log-HADES</td>
<td>0.4646</td>
<td>0.4842</td>
<td>0.4666</td>
<td>0.8215</td>
<td>0.6061</td>
<td>0.5263</td>
<td>0.7143</td>
<td>0.9051</td>
<td>0.5567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metric-HADES</td>
<td>0.7564</td>
<td>0.7327</td>
<td>0.7817</td>
<td>0.8928</td>
<td>0.8281</td>
<td>0.7465</td>
<td>0.9298</td>
<td>0.9254</td>
<td>0.8179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or-HADES</td>
<td>0.8245</td>
<td>0.7822</td>
<td>0.8715</td>
<td>0.9245</td>
<td>0.9296</td>
<td>0.9167</td>
<td>0.9429</td>
<td>0.9665</td>
<td>0.9173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concat-HADES</td>
<td>0.8307</td>
<td>0.7855</td>
<td>0.8815</td>
<td>0.9273</td>
<td>0.9517</td>
<td>0.9583</td>
<td>0.9452</td>
<td>0.9764</td>
<td>0.9574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sep-HADES</td>
<td>0.8331</td>
<td>0.8152</td>
<td>0.8517</td>
<td>0.9258</td>
<td>0.9577</td>
<td>0.9444</td>
<td>0.9714</td>
<td>0.9798</td>
<td>0.9419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agn-HADES</td>
<td>0.8401</td>
<td>0.8152</td>
<td>0.8667</td>
<td>0.9295</td>
<td>0.9722</td>
<td>0.9722</td>
<td>0.9865</td>
<td>0.9865</td>
<td>0.9567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onehot-HADES</td>
<td>0.8299</td>
<td>0.7888</td>
<td>0.8755</td>
<td>0.9265</td>
<td>0.9379</td>
<td>0.9444</td>
<td>0.9315</td>
<td>0.9697</td>
<td>0.9209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Two shreds of evidence highlight the benefits of multi-modal learning: 1) HADES performs better than or-HADES (4.28% higher in F1-score on average); 2) the variants using multi-modal learning (concat-HADES and sep-HADES) outperform or-HADES. It is not surprising since or-HADES cannot fully mine cross-modal interactions. For example, the over-sensitivity of metrics (stated in § 3.2.2) may cause false alarms, and or-HADES fails to overcome such inaccuracy, while HADES alleviates this issue by utilizing logs as supplementary information to make more reasonable inferences.

(3) Our attentive fusion module shows the extraordinary value since HADES achieves better results than concat-HADES and seq-HADES. Compared with the variants, HADES can filter more informative features and exploit higher-order cross-modal interactions. It allows heterogeneous data to complement each other to probe a stronger ability to characterize the system’s health.

(4) The devised encoders make contributions via fuller- and finer-grained feature extraction. Specifically, agn-HADES generate more false predictions (0.77% lower in F1-score than HADES on average) since mixing patterns of diverse aspects degrades the model’s detecting ability. Besides, onehot-HADES has a relatively poor performance because lexical semantics are crucial for analyzing logs.

To sum up, the results conform to the findings of our previous empirical study in § 3, and they further reveal that heterogeneous data is significantly valuable for anomaly detection, and our designs for intra- and inter-modal representation learning are competent.

### 5.4 RQ6: Sensitivity to Chunk Length

We herein evaluate the sensitivity of HADES to the pre-determined chunk length $T$ (§ 2) as it influences our end-to-end framework by affecting the data distribution.

We change the value of $T$ while keeping all other hyper-parameters unchanged and conduct experiments as in RQ4. In detail, for Dataset $A$, the default value of $T$ is 10 (sec), ranging from 5 to 25; for Dataset $B$ and $C$, $T$ is 5 (min) by default and ranges from 3 to 11, since the sampling frequencies of the simulated dataset and industrial datasets are different.

Figure 6 presents the experimental results. Overall, HADES is fairly stable under different settings of $T$, further confirming the robustness of HADES. It makes HADES easy to deploy and come into play in practice. Yet, when the value of $T$ deviates from the default configuration, the scores of recall and precision render imbalance, mainly reflected by the increase in missing anomalies.

Since our fault duration periods are one minute and one hour, respectively, the default granularity of chunks may felicitously fit the anomalous patterns. In practice, $T$ can be selected according to the validation result or the engineering expertise and requirements.

### 6 CASE STUDY

We share two representative cases of industrial anomalies that HADES successfully detected. In order to display the core patterns of metrics more clearly, we eliminate the jitters inside the curves.

#### 6.1 Case I

We inject a CPU hog into a cloud cache service of Huawei (Dataset $B$), then the metric “CPU usage” is abnormally high, indicating a performance degradation (Figure 7-top). However, no suspicious event is reported in logs since the execution logic of the service remains correct. This case demonstrates that some performance anomalies cannot be reflected by logs in practice, making log-based detectors less responsive. By fusing heterogeneous information, HADES successfully detects such anomalies.

#### 6.2 Case II

Another case in Dataset $C$ is that after removing the fault “high network latency”, the related metric “Ping latency” catches back up with its long-run trend immediately, as shown in Figure 7-bottom. However, in practice, the service is still unable to function properly for a short period after the fault removal because it takes some time to process the previously blocked requests in the request queue. Since we expect that issues affecting the quality of service can all be identified, an alarm should be triggered during such a period.
Relying solely on metrics cannot achieve this goal. Fortunately, logs can provide clues for troubleshooting by reporting events "Get user info failed". Thus, HADES can keenly capture such anomalies.

![Figure 7: Case I: CPU Usage is abnormally high (top); Case II: Ping latency immediately returns to normal, while the service is still latent (bottom).](image)

7 DISCUSSION

7.1 Lessons Learned

7.1.1 Beware of the semantic gap between natural language and logs. Recent studies [29, 38, 51] have gradually adopted models pre-trained in natural language corpus to encode log texts. However, the semantics of natural language and logs are not exactly identical. Notably, the semantic gap of keywords may have a more severe impact. For example, the word "successfully" usually expresses positive emotions in natural languages, yet it indicates an anomaly when occurring in the special event "Successfully connected to /<IP>:<NUM> for BP-<NUM>-<IP><NUM>:blk_<NUM>_<NUM>". The following condition triggers this event: after killing the Datanode process, the Application Worker process loses the connection and tries to reconnect with the Data node process. If the re-connection is successful, then this event is triggered. However, such a condition does not exist in normal, so the re-connection should not happen. To mitigate this problem, HADES uses self-trained word embeddings and considers not only word-level semantics but also event-level semantics and cross-event sequential dependencies. Integrating multi-level semantics of logs can help draw a more fundamental picture of system events.

7.1.2 Generalize the approach. We find that in some large companies, metrics and logs are collected separately by different departments, and the sampling/logging frequency of different data sources varies dramatically. Sometimes a certain data source is even absent for a while. Thus, we add an extra mode to allow alternate use of single-source and multi-source anomaly detection in a streaming manner, thus extending the applicability of our approach.

7.2 Threats to Validity

7.2.1 Internal Validity. A potential threat lies in the acquisition of log event embeddings. We use the average token embeddings as an event embedding, ignoring the sequential information inside an event. Still, it is too time-consuming to extract the sequential dependencies event by event, so we choose to balance the information granularity and efficiency. Fortunately, it is almost impossible for two log events to have identical tokens with different orders representing the opposite system statuses. Thus, omitting intra-event sequentiality will not cause an apparent adverse effect.

7.2.2 External Validity. The external threat mainly comes from the representativeness and quality of datasets. Though we validated the effectiveness of HADES on simulated and industrial data, it is yet unknown how it generalizes to different datasets. Also, the industrial data is relatively limited and simple. We have run various workloads and injected diverse typical faults to improve the representativeness of our datasets. The services we selected in Huawei are also representative. We may evaluate our approach on a variety of datasets in the future. Another concern is that there may be annotation noise. Our datasets are manually labeled, so labeling noise may be introduced when human mistakes happen. To alleviate this issue, we invite experienced Ph.D. students (Dataset A) and professional engineers (Dataset B and C) to annotate our datasets, who are all experts in troubleshooting. Besides, since the faults are typical in the real world, they are familiar with the corresponding abnormal patterns, making errors less likely to occur.

8 RELATED WORK

Many efforts have been devoted to automated anomaly detection for large-scale system reliability insurance [2, 5, 10, 28, 29, 31, 33, 37, 43, 45]. Logs, metrics, and other monitoring data are pivotal for troubleshooting since they maintain the run-time information of systems. Many advanced log-based anomaly detectors adopt deep learning techniques. For example, Du et al. [14] proposed DeepLog to learn normal log sequential patterns via LSTM, based on which Meng et al. [38] considered log semantics behind synonyms and antonyms. LogRobust [51] tackled log instability by introducing the attention mechanism, as well as employing word embedding and TF-IDF. Also, many outstanding metric-based methods employ machine learning. They attempt to capture the temporal dependencies [28, 43], mine representative patterns [10], and learn inter-series relationships [2, 24, 33, 45]. For instance, Hundman et al. [24] modeled multi-variate metrics via LSTM networks with non-parametric dynamic thresholding. Recently, Adsketch [10] achieved superior performances by discovering anomalous metric patterns that sketch particular performance issues. These methods only leverage single-source data, ignoring rich information from diverse sources and their interactions. Our approach overcomes this problem by capturing meaningful features from heterogeneous data.

Some approaches employ more than one source of data, though they are not for anomaly detection [16, 32, 35, 52]. Gandalf [32] identified bad software rollouts by consuming multi-source data, whereas it used each source separately rather than analyzing all sources generically. [16, 35] explored the correlations between logs and metrics to identify rolling upgrade operations that incur failures. They regard logs as operation records and metric variations as the consequences of operations. Zhao et al. [52] transformed logs into event occurrence sequences, which are modeled together with metrics to alarm bad software changes. However, these methods convert heterogeneous data into a homogeneous form and ignore the gap and high-order interactions among different data types, resulting in performance degradation. Our approach outperforms...
by learning cross-modal representations while narrowing the gap, delivering more reasonable inference thereby.

9 CONCLUSION

To profoundly comprehend the system’s health, we conduct a comprehensive empirical study on large-scale heterogeneous monitoring data to investigate how typical faults affect system behaviors. The findings reveal that anomalies can be manifested in multi-source data, and neither source is sufficient. Motivated by the empirical study, we propose a novel end-to-end approach, HADES, which is the first work to detect anomalies effectively by synthesizing heterogeneous information. HADES has a powerful ability of heterogeneous representation learning. It leverages not only multi-level log semantics and aspect-aware dependencies of metrics but also learns meaningful inter-modal interactions via attentive fusion. Extensive experiments on both simulated and industrial data validate the effectiveness of HADES, which vastly outperforms all compared approaches by achieving an average F1-score of 0.93. Our ablation study further displays the contribution of each design of our approach to the overall performance. Lastly, we also release our code and dataset to facilitate future research.
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