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Abstract—In order to evaluate the prevalence of security and privacy practices on a representative sample of the Web, researchers rely on website popularity rankings such as the Alexa list. While the validity and representativeness of these rankings are rarely questioned, our findings show the contrary: the conclusions made in these studies can be affected by the inherent properties of these rankings. To that end, we show for four main rankings how the choice of a list affects which domains are included, whether these are representative of real sites and if they are malicious. Moreover, we find that it is trivial for an adversary to manipulate the composition of these lists. We are the first to empirically validate that each of the lists can be manipulated, in certain instances with as little as a single HTTP request. This allows adversaries to manipulate rankings on a large scale and insert malicious domains into whitelists or bend the outcome of research studies to their will. Finally, to overcome the limitations of such rankings, we propose improvements to reduce the fluctuations in list composition and guarantee better defenses against manipulation. To allow the research community to work with reliable and reproducible rankings, we provide TRACO, an online service where these improved rankings can be accessed.

I. INTRODUCTION

Researchers and security analysts frequently study a selection of popular sites, such as for measuring the prevalence of security issues or as an evaluation set of available and often used domain names, as these are purported to reflect real-world usage. The most well known and widely used list in research studies has been that of Alexa, with researchers’ reliance on this commercial list being accentuated by their concern when it was momentarily taken offline in November 2016 [12]. However, several companies provide alternative rankings based on Internet usage data collected through various channels: a panel of users whose visits are logged, tracking code placed on websites and raw traffic logging by intermediaries such as ISPs [56].

We found that 102 studies over the past three years based their experiments and conclusions on the data from these rankings. Their validity and by extension that of the research that relies on them, should however be questioned: the methodology behind the rankings is not fully disclosed, and commercial interests may prevail in their composition. Moreover, the providers only have access to a limited userbase that may be skewed e.g. towards certain user groups or geographic regions. Even though most providers declare that the data is processed to remove such statistical biases, the lack of exact details makes it impossible for researchers to assess the potential impact of these lists on their results and conclusions.

In this paper, we show that the four main popularity rankings (Alexa, Cisco Umbrella, Majestic and Quantcast) exhibit significant problems for usage in research, e.g. seeing large changes depending on the provider and date, or including non-representative or even dangerous sites. This means that the choice of a particular ranking can disproportionally skew measurements of vulnerabilities or secure practices.

Moreover, we are the first to empirically prove that pitfalls in these rankings leave them vulnerable to one of our newly introduced manipulation techniques. These techniques have a surprisingly low cost and can therefore be used to change thousands of domains at once. The incentives of adversaries to alter the composition of these lists, both on the level of single domains due to the practice of whitelisting popular domains, and on a larger scale to affect research and its impact outside academia, make this manipulation particularly valuable.

In concurrent work, Scheitl et al. [65] analyzed the structure and stability of these rankings, studied their usage in (Internet measurement) research and the potential impact on results, and drafted guidelines for using these rankings. In our work, we extend their analysis with additional properties, focus on the impact for security research and are the first to demonstrate the possibility of malicious large-scale manipulation.

Finally, there is still a need for researchers to study popular domains, so they would therefore benefit from a list that prevents biases due to its inherent properties or manipulation, and that is easily retrieved for future reference. To this extent, we propose improvements to current rankings in terms of stability over time, representativeness and resilience to manipulation. We create TRACO1, an online service where such rankings are created and archived. The community can therefore continue to study the security of popular domains while ensuring valid, verifiable and reproducible research.

In summary, we make the following contributions:

• We describe how the main rankings can negatively affect security (research): e.g. half of the Alexa list changes every day, the Umbrella list has only 49% real sites, and the Majestic list contains 2,162 malicious domains despite being used as a whitelist.

1https://tranco-list.eu
We classify how 102 recent security studies rely on these rankings, in particular Alexa, and show how adversaries could exploit the rankings to bias these studies.

We show that there exists at least one technique to manipulate each list on a large scale, as e.g. only one HTTP request suffices to enter the widely used Alexa top million. We empirically validate that reaching a rank as good as 28798 is easily achieved.

Motivated by the discovered limitations of the widely-used lists, we propose TRANCO, an alternative list that is more appropriate for research, as it varies only by 0.6% daily and requires at least the quadrupled manipulation effort to achieve the same rank as in existing lists.

II. METHODOLOGY OF TOP WEBSITES RANKINGS

Multiple commercial providers publish rankings of popular domains that they compose using a variety of methodologies. For Alexa, Cisco Umbrella, Majestic and Quantcast, the four lists that are available for free in an easily parsed format and that are regularly updated, we discuss what is known on how they obtain their data, what metric they use to rank domains and which potential biases or shortcomings are present. We base our discussion mainly on the documentation available from these providers; many components of their rankings are proprietary and could therefore not be included.

We do not consider any lists that require payment, such as SimilarWeb\(^2\), as their cost (especially for longitudinal studies) and potential usage restrictions make them less likely to be used in a research context. We also disregard lists that would require scraping, such as Netcraft\(^3\), as these do not carry the same consent of their provider implied by making the list available in a machine-readable format.

A. Alexa

Alexa, a subsidiary of Amazon, publishes a daily updated list\(^4\) consisting of one million websites since December 2008 [6]. Usually only pay-level domains\(^5\) are ranked, except for subdomains of certain sites that provide ‘personal home pages or blogs’ [9] (e.g. tmall.com, wordpress.com). In November 2016, Alexa briefly took down the free CSV file with the list [12]. The file has since been available again [11] and is still updated daily; however, it is no longer linked to from Alexa’s main website, instead referring users to the paid ‘Alexa Top Sites’ service on Amazon Web Services [13].

The ranks calculated by Alexa are based on traffic data from a “global data panel”, with domains being ranked on a proprietary measure of unique visitors and page views, where one visitor can have at most one page view count towards the page views of a URL [76]. Alexa states that it applies “data normalization” to account for biases in their user panel [9].

The panel is claimed to consist of millions of users, who have installed one of “many different” browser extensions that include Alexa’s measurement code [10]. However, through a crawl of all available extensions for Google Chrome and Firefox, we found only Alexa’s own extension (“Alexa Traffic Rank”) to report traffic data. Moreover, this extension is only available for the desktop version of these two browsers. Chrome’s extension is reported to have around 550,000 users [1]; no user statistics are known for Firefox, but extrapolation based on browser usage suggests at most one million users for two extensions, far less than what Alexa claims.

In addition, sites can install an ‘Alexa Certify’ tracking script that collects traffic data for all visitors; the rank can then be based on these actual traffic counts instead of on estimates from the extension [9]. This service is estimated to be used by 1.12% of the top one million and 3% of the top 10,000 [21].

The rank shown on Alexa’s website is based on data over three months, while in 2016 they stated that the downloadable list was based on data over one month [7]. This statement was removed after the brief takedown of this list [8], but the same period was seemingly retained. However, as we derive in Section III-B, since January 30, 2018 the list is based on data for one day; this was confirmed to us by Alexa.

Alexa’s data collection methodology leads to a focus on sites that are visited in the top-level browsing context of a web browser (i.e. HTTP traffic). They also indicate that ranks worse than 100,000 are not statistically meaningful, and that for these sites small changes in measured traffic may cause large rank changes [9], negatively affecting the stability of the list.

B. Cisco Umbrella

Cisco Umbrella publishes a daily updated list\(^6\) consisting of one million entries since December 2016 [39]. Any domain name may be included, with it being ranked on the aggregated traffic counts of itself and all its subdomains.

The ranks calculated by Cisco Umbrella are based on DNS traffic to its two DNS resolvers (marketed as OpenDNS), claimed to consist of over 100 billion daily requests from 65 million users [39]. Domains are ranked on the number of unique IPs issuing DNS queries for them [39]. Not all traffic is said to be used: instead the DNS data is sampled and ‘data normalization methodologies’ are applied to reduce biases [23], taking the distribution of client IPs into account [49]. Umbrella’s data collection methodology means that non-browser-based traffic is also accounted for. A side-effect is that invalid domains are also included (e.g. internal domains such as *.ec2.internal for Amazon EC2 instances, or typos such as google.com).

C. Majestic

Majestic publishes the daily updated ‘Majestic Million’ list\(^7\) consisting of one million websites since October 2012 [40]. The list comprises mostly pay-level domains, but includes

\(^2\)https://www.similarweb.com/top-websites

\(^3\)https://toolbar.netcraft.com/stats/topsites

\(^4\)https://s3.amazonaws.com/alexas-static/top-1m.csv.zip

\(^5\)A pay-level domain (PLD) refers to a domain name that a consumer or business can directly register, and consists of a subdomain of a public suffix or effective top-level domain (e.g. .com but also .co.uk).

\(^6\)https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/umbrella-static/top-1m.csv.zip

\(^7\)http://downloads.majestic.com/majestic_million.csv
subdomains for certain very popular sites (e.g. plus.google.com, en.wikipedia.org).

The ranks calculated by Majestic are based on backlinks to websites, obtained by a crawl of around 450 billion URLs over 120 days, changed from 90 days on April 12, 2018 [50], [51]. Sites are ranked on the number of class C (IPv4 /24) subnets that refer to the site at least once [40]. Majestic’s data collection methodology means only domains linked to from other websites are considered, implying a bias towards browser-based traffic, however without counting actual page visits. Similarly to search engines, the completeness of their data is affected by how their crawler discovers websites.

D. Quantcast

Quantcast publishes a list\(^8\) of the websites visited the most in the United States since mid 2007 [63]. The size of the list varies daily, but usually is around 520,000 mostly pay-level domains; subdomains reflect sites that publish user content (e.g. blogspot.com, github.io). The list includes around 5000 ‘hidden profiles’, where sites are ranked but the domain is hidden.

The ranks calculated by Quantcast are based on the number of people visiting a site within the previous month, and comprises ‘quantified’ sites where Quantcast directly measures traffic through a tracking script as well as sites where Quantcast estimates traffic based on data from ‘ISPs and toolbar providers’ [67]. These estimates are only calculated for traffic in the United States, for other countries only directly quantified sites are ranked; the list of top sites also only considers US traffic. Moreover, while quantified sites see their visit count updated daily, estimated counts are only updated monthly [68], which may inflate the stability of the list. Quantified sites make up around 10% of the full (US) list.

III. QUANTITATIVE COMPARISON

Ideally, the domain rankings would perfectly reflect the popularity of websites, free from any biases. However, the providers of domain rankings do not have access to complete Internet usage data and use a variety of largely undisclosed data collection and processing methodologies to determine the metric based upon which they rank websites. This may lead to differences between the lists and potential ‘hidden’ factors influencing the rankings: the choice of list can then critically affect e.g. studies that measure the prevalence of security practices or vulnerabilities. We compare the four main lists over time in order to assess the breadth and impact of these differences.

Certain properties may reflect how accurately Internet usage is measured and may be (more or less) desired when using the lists for security research. We consider five properties in our comparison: 1) similarity or the agreement on the set of popular domains, 2) stability or the rank changes over time, 3) representativeness or the reflection of popularity across the web, 4) responsiveness or the availability of the listed websites, and 5) benignness or the lack of malicious domains.

\(^8\)https://ak.quantcast.com/quantcast-top-sites.zip
Fig. 2. The intersection percentage between each provider’s lists for two consecutive days.

Fig. 3. The cumulative distribution function of TLD usage across the lists.

C. Representativeness

Sites are mainly distributed over a few top-level domains, with Figure 3 showing that 10 TLDs capture more than 80% of every list. The .com TLD is by far the most popular, at almost half of Alexa’s and Majestic’s list and 71% of Quantcast’s list; .net and .org are used most often by other sites. One notable outlier is the .jobs TLD: while for the other lists it does not figure in the top 10, it is the fourth most popular TLD for Quantcast. Most of these sites can be traced to DirectEmployers, with thousands of lowly ranked domains. This serves as an example of one entity controlling a large part of a ranking, potentially giving them a large influence in research results.

We use the autonomous system to determine the entities that host the ranked domains. Google hosts the most websites within the top 10 and 100 sites, at between 15% and 40% except for Quantcast at 4%; for Alexa these are the localized versions, for the other lists these are subdomains. For the full lists, large content delivery networks dominate, with Cloudflare being the top network hosting up to 10% of sites across all lists. The outcomes of security studies can be significantly affected if one organization controlling a large share of popular domains implements e.g. new HTTP security headers [20], as this can improperly suggest widespread uptake.

D. Responsiveness

Figure 4 shows the HTTP status code reported for the root pages of the domains in the four lists. 5% of Alexa’s and Quantcast’s list and 11% of Majestic’s list could not be reached. For Umbrella, this jumps to 28%; moreover only 49% responded with status code 200, and 30% reported a server error. Most errors were due to name resolution failure, as invalid or unconfigured (sub)domains are not filtered out.

Of the reachable sites, 3% for Alexa and Quantcast, 8.7% for Majestic and 26% for Umbrella serve a page smaller than 512 bytes on their root page, based on its download size as reported by the browser instance. This indicates that they may not contain any useful content, even though they are claimed to be regularly visited by real users. Unavailable sites and those without content do not represent real sites and may therefore skew e.g. averages of third-party script inclusion counts [58], as these sites will be counted as having zero inclusions.

E. Benignness

Malicious campaigns may target popular domains to extend the reach of their attack, or use a common domain as a point of contact, leading to it being picked up as ‘popular’. However, popular sites are often assumed to be trustworthy, as evidenced by the practice of whitelisting them [31] or, as we show in Section IV-A, their usage in security research as the benign test set for classifiers.

Table I lists the number of domains flagged on May 31, 2018 by Google Safe Browsing, used among others by Chrome and Firefox to automatically warn users when they visit dangerous sites [35]. At 0.22% of its list, Majestic has the most sites that are flagged as potentially harmful (in particular as malware sites), but all lists rank at least some malicious domains. In Alexa’s top 10,000, 4 sites are flagged as performing social engineering (e.g. phishing), while 1 site in Majestic’s top 10,000 serves unwanted software. The presence of these sites in Alexa’s and Quantcast’s list is particularly striking, as users would have to actively ignore the browser warning in order to trigger data reporting for Alexa’s extension or the tracking scripts.

Given the presence of malicious domains on these lists, the practice of whitelisting popular domains is particularly dangerous. Some security analysis tools whitelist sites on Alexa’s list [38], [52]. Moreover, Quad9’s DNS-based blocking service whitelists all domains on Majestic’s list [31], exposing its users to ranked malicious domains. As Quad9’s users expect harmful domains to be blocked, they will be even more under the impression that the site is safe to browse; this makes the manipulation of the list very interesting to attackers.

---

**Table I**  
**PRESENCE OF DOMAINS IN THE FOUR RANKINGS ON GOOGLE’S SAFE BROWSING LIST.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Malware</th>
<th>Social Engineering</th>
<th>Unwanted software</th>
<th>Potentially harmful application</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100K</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>10K</td>
<td>100K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexa</td>
<td>132 98 4 85 345</td>
<td>0 15 104 0 0</td>
<td>547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbrella</td>
<td>11 326 0 3 393</td>
<td>0 23 232 4 60</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majestic</td>
<td>130 1676 0 23 359</td>
<td>1 9 79 9 48</td>
<td>2162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantcast</td>
<td>3 76 0 4 105</td>
<td>0 4 41 0 2</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II
CATEGORIZATION OF RECENT SECURITY STUDIES USING THE ALEXA RANKING. ONE STUDY MAY APPEAR IN MULTIPLE CATEGORIES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>1K</th>
<th>10K</th>
<th>100K</th>
<th>1M</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitelist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. USAGE IN SECURITY RESEARCH

Whenever security issues are being investigated, researchers may want to evaluate their impact on real world domains. For these purposes, security studies often use and reference the top sites rankings. The validity and representativeness of these rankings therefore directly affects their results, and any biases may prohibit correct conclusions being made. Moreover, if forged domains could be entered into these lists, an adversary can control research findings in order to advance their own goals and interests.

A. Survey and classification of list usage

To assess how security studies use these top sites rankings, we surveyed the papers from the main tracks of the four main academic security conferences (CCS, NDSS, S&P, USENIX Security) from 2015 to 2017 and 2018 for NDSS. We classify these papers according to four purposes for the lists: prevalence if the rankings are used to declare the proportion of sites affected by an issue; evaluation if a set of popular domains serves to test an attack or defense, e.g. for evaluating Tor fingerprinting [64]; whitelisting if the lists are seen as a source of benign websites, e.g. for use in a classifier [75]; ranking if the exact ranks of sites are mentioned or used (e.g. to estimate website traffic [28]) or if sites are divided into bins according to their rank.

Alexa is by far the most popular list used in recent security studies, with 102 papers using the list for at least one purpose. Table II shows the number of papers per category and per fragment of the list that was used. The Alexa list is mostly used for measuring the prevalence of issues or as a evaluation set of popular domains. For the former purpose as well as for whitelisting and ranking or binning, the full list is usually used, while for evaluation sets, the fragment size used varies more widely.

Three papers from these conferences also used another ranking, always in tandem with the Alexa list. Borgolte et al. [18] designed a classifier to detect website defacement. They use Alexa’s, Majestic’s and Quantcast’s lists as (supposedly) undefaced websites in their training and evaluation, while they also mention the ranks of recently defaced websites. Zimmeck et al. [78] used sites from Quantcast’s list in evaluating cross-device tracking techniques, mentioning the ranks of sites with such trackers. Zhang et al. [77] used Alexa’s and Moz’s top 500 lists to evaluate a classifier for website fingerprinting.

Most studies lack any comment on when the list was downloaded, when the websites on the lists were visited and what proportion was actually reachable. This hampers reproducibility of these studies, especially given the daily changes in list compositions and ranks.

Two papers commented on the methodology of the rankings. Juba et al. [41] mention the rankings being “representative of true traffic numbers in a coarse grained sense”. Felt et al. [29] mention the “substantial churn” of Alexa’s list and the unavailability of sites, and refer to it as the ‘Alexa Million’ instead of ‘Alexa Top Million’, to express that sites ranked worse than 100000 do not truly reflect popular or top sites, by Alexa’s own admission [9]. However, in general the studies do not question the validity of the rankings, even though they may have properties that significantly affect their conclusions, and as we will show may be subject to manipulation.

B. Influence on security studies

Given the increasing interest in cybersecurity within our society, the results of security research can have an impact beyond academia. News outlets increasingly report on security vulnerabilities, often mentioning their prevalence or high-profile entities affected [32]–[34], [71]. Meanwhile, policy-makers and governments rely on these studies to evaluate secure practices and implement appropriate policies [16], [27]. Malicious actors may therefore risk exposure to a wider audience, while their practices may trigger policy changes, yielding them an incentive to directly influence security studies.

As we showed, security studies often rely on popularity rankings, so the ability for targeted manipulation of their composition would open up an opportunity for adversaries to affect security research. We develop different incentives for having such an influence on research, depending on the purpose and topic of the study. We highlight how pitfalls in the methodology of the popularity rankings could expose them to manipulation, and illustrate for a case study on website fingerprinting what level of manipulation an adversary who wants to change the results would have to achieve.

1) Incentives: An adversary may want to disguise malicious practices by executing them through domains that are regarded as benign, so that when studies design measures e.g. to detect malicious downloads by training a classifier [57], the weight of features that point to maliciousness will be altered, and the accuracy of classification will generally be reduced. If such a study assumes popular domains to be benign, promoting domains under the adversary’s control in a popularity ranking can lead to their particular malicious practices going undetected.

Conversely, ensuring that domains with malicious practices are not studied at all or are considered irrelevant may reduce the perceived importance of such practices and cause a more subdued response. Li et al. [45] studied the ecosystem of malicious advertisers through observations across Alexa’s list. Such a malicious actor may therefore want to promote other (existing) domains in order to remove their own from the list. Van Goethem et al. [72] studied the correlation between the popularity of a website and the presence of common
The seal providers could therefore promote or demote domains very low and well within reach of larger providers, especially of a tracker domain from the list; reducing the prevalence of a provider.

Moreover, this is an upper bound needed to remove all instances given the incentive of being able to stealthily continue tracking. Need less than 100 000 manipulated domains to disappear from the Alexa list if a given number of domains were pushed above all fingerprinting providers employ secure practices through a comparison with similar sites without seals that are nearby in Alexa’s ranking. The seal providers could therefore promote or demote domains to alter the results of this comparison.

Finally, studies that measure the security of service providers can give these providers a reputational and even commercial incentive to alter their results: having their offer or that of a competitor appear secure and insecure respectively can persuade security-minded customers to prefer the former provider. Van Goethem et al. [73] studied whether buyers of security seal providers employ secure practices through a comparison with similar sites without seals that are nearby in Alexa’s ranking. The seal providers could therefore promote or demote domains to alter the results of this comparison.

2) Case study: The issue of online tracking and fingerprinting has been studied on multiple occasions for Alexa’s top one million [28], [43], [46], [47], [58]. Users may want to avoid organizations that perform widespread or invasive tracking, and therefore have an interest in new tracking mechanisms and/or specific trackers being found or named by these studies, e.g. to include them in blocklists. The trackers therefore have an incentive to avoid detection by not figuring among the domains being studies, e.g. by pushing these out of the popularity ranking used to provide the set of investigated domains.

We quantify the effort required to manipulate a ranking and therefore alter findings for the measurements of fingerprinting prevalence by Acar et al. [3] and Englehardt and Narayanan [28]. These studies published data on which domains included which scripts, mentioning the rank in Alexa’s list. We calculate how many domains minimally need to be moved up in order to push out the websites using a particular tracking provider.

Figure 5 shows how many fingerprinting providers would fully disappear from the Alexa list if a given number of domains are manipulated. We differentiate removal from the top one million and top 100 000; Acar et al. only investigated the latter. The smallest number of manipulated domains required is 7032 and 1652 for the top 1M and 100K respectively; 15 providers need less than 100 000 manipulated domains to disappear from the top 1M.

As we will show, the cost of such large-scale manipulation is very low and well within reach of larger providers, especially given the incentive of being able to stealthily continue tracking. Moreover, this is an upper bound needed to remove all instances of a tracker domain from the list; reducing the prevalence of a script requires only hiding the worst-ranked domains. Finally, it is not required to insert new domains: forging a few requests to boost sites already in the list is sufficient, further reducing the cost and even making the manipulation harder to detect.

Englehardt and Narayanan highlighted how “the long tail of fingerprinting scripts are largely unblocked by current privacy tools,” reinforcing the potential impact of exposing these scripts. A malicious party can therefore gain an advantage by actively manipulating the rankings of popular domains. As we will show in the next section, such manipulation is actually feasible across all four lists, usually even on a sufficiently large scale without the need for significant resources.

V. FEASIBILITY OF LARGE-SCALE MANIPULATION

The data collection processes of popularity rankings rely on a limited view of the Internet, either by focusing on one specific metric or because they obtain information from a small population. This implies that targeted small amounts of traffic can be deemed significant on the scale of the entire Internet and yield good rankings. Moreover, the ranking providers generally do not filter out automated or fake traffic, or domains that do not represent real websites, further reducing the share of domains with real traffic in their lists.

Consequently, attacks that exploit these limitations are especially effective at allowing arbitrary modifications of the rankings at a large scale. We showed how adversaries may have incentives to skew the conclusions of security studies, and that security researchers and practitioners often use popularity rankings to drive the evaluation of these studies. Manipulating these rankings therefore becomes a prime vector for influencing security research, and as we will show, the small costs and low technical requirements associated with this manipulation make this approach even more attractive.

For each of the four studied popularity rankings, we describe techniques that manipulate the data collection process through the injection of forged data. To prove their feasibility, we execute those techniques that conform to our ethical framework and that have a reasonable cost, and show which ranks can be achieved. In Table III, we summarize the techniques and the cost they incur on three aspects: money, effort and time required. Through this cost assessment, we identify how these manipulations could be applied at scale and affect a significant portion of these lists.

These techniques can be applied to both new domains and domains already present in the lists, e.g. when those domains bear the properties that could skew certain studies; a domain that has been ranked for a longer period of time may enjoy a higher trust or importance. In our work, we focus on techniques that directly influence the rankings’ data at a modest cost. An alternative approach could be to buy expired or parked domains already in the list [55]. However, expired domains are usually bought up very quickly by “drop-catchers” [44], leaving a limited number of ranked domains open for registration [66]. Meanwhile, popular parked domains can command prices upwards of 1 000 USD [66]. This approach therefore incurs a prohibitive cost, especially at a large scale.
TABLE III
SUMMARY OF MANIPULATION TECHNIQUES AND THEIR ESTIMATED COST.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Monetary</th>
<th>Effort</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexa</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certify</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbrella</td>
<td>Cloud providers</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majestic</td>
<td>Backlinks</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantcast</td>
<td>Reflected URLs</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantified</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Alexa

Alexa ranks domains based on traffic data from two sources: their “Traffic Rank” extension whose users report all visited pages, and the “Certify” analytics service that uses a tracking script to count all visits on subscribing websites. We forge traffic data to both sources and determine the ranks achieved.

1) Extension: The “Alexa Traffic Rank” extension collects data on all pages that its users visit. The extension also shows users information on the rank and traffic of the visited site, which may serve as an incentive to install the extension.

We submitted page visits for both registered and nonexistent test domains previously unseen by Alexa. We generated profiles for all 1 152 possible configurations, i.e. the demographic details that are requested when installing the extension, and this within a short timeframe from the same IP address; Alexa did not impose any limits on the number of profiles that could be created. We submitted visits to one domain per profile; as visits to the same page by the same profile are only counted once [9], we generated exactly one visit per page to the homepage and randomly generated subpages. We varied the total number of page views to one test domain between 1 and 30.

We installed the extension in a real Chrome browser instance and then generated page visits to our test domain, simulating a realistic usage pattern by spacing out page visits between 30 and 45 seconds, and interspersing them with as many visits to domains in the top 1000. Through inspection of the extension’s source code and traffic, we found that upon page load, a GET request with the full URL of the visited page is sent alongside the user’s profile ID and browser properties to an endpoint on data.alexa.com. This means these requests can also be generated directly without the need to use an actual browser, greatly reducing the overhead in manipulating many domains on a large scale.

From May 10, 2018 onward, Alexa appears to block data reporting from countries in the European Union (EU) and European Economic Area (EEA), as the response changed from the visited site’s rank data shown to the user to the string “Okay”. This is likely due to the new General Data Protection Regulation coming into force. While we were able to circumvent this block through a VPN service, Alexa may be ignoring traffic in EU and EEA countries, further introducing a bias towards traffic from other countries.

For 20% of our profiles/domains, we were successful in seeing our page views counted and obtaining rankings within the top million. Alexa indicates that it applies statistical processing to its data [76], and we suspect that some of our requests and generated profiles were pruned or not considered sufficient to be ranked, either because of the profile’s properties (e.g. a common browser configuration or an overrepresented demographic) or because only a subset of traffic data is (randomly) selected. To increase the probability of getting domains ranked, an adversary can select only the successful profiles, or generate page views to the same site with different profiles in parallel, improving the efficiency of their manipulation.

Figure 6(a) lists our 224 successful rankings grouped per day, to show the relation between ranks and number of visits. We performed our experiments between July 25 and August 5, 2018. As during this period Alexa averaged traffic over one day, there was only a delay of one day between our requests and the domains being ranked; they disappeared again from the list the following day. This means that it is not necessary to forge requests over a longer period of time when the malicious campaign is short-lived.

What is most striking, is the very small number of page visits needed to obtain a ranking: as little as one request yielded a rank within the top million, and we achieved a rank as high as 370 461 with 12 requests (albeit in the week-end, when the same number of requests yields a better rank). This means that the cost to manipulate the rankings is minimal, allowing adversaries to arbitrarily alter the lists at large scale for an extended period of time. This ensures continued ranking and increases the likelihood of a list containing manipulated domains being used for research purposes, despite the large daily change.

The low number of required requests is further confirmed by large blocks of alphabetically ordered domains appearing in the ranking: these point towards the same number of visits being counted for these domains. We use these blocks as well as the processed visitor and view metrics retrieved from the Alexa Web Information Service [14] to estimate the required visit count for better ranks.

Figure 7 shows the number of requests needed to achieve a
certain rank; we consider this an upper bound as Alexa ranks domains that see more unique visitors better than those with more page views, meaning that manipulation with multiple profiles would require less requests. This analysis shows that even for very good ranks, the amount of requests required and accompanying cost remains low, e.g., only requiring 1,000 page views for rank 10,000. This model of Alexa’s page visits also corresponds with previous observations of Zipf’s law in web traffic [4], [24].

Alexa’s list is also susceptible to injection of nonexistent domains; we were able to enter one such domain. Furthermore, we confirmed in our server logs that none of our test domains were checked by Alexa while we forged page visit requests. The ability to use fake domains may reduce the cost to manipulate the list at scale even further: an attacker is not required to actually purchase domain names and set up websites for them.

Even though Alexa’s statistical postprocessing may prune some visits, the low number of required visits, the ability to quickly generate new profiles and the lack of filtering of fake domains allows an attacker to still easily achieve significant manipulation of Alexa’s list.

2) Certify: Alexa’s “Certify” service offers site owners an analytics platform, using a tracking script installed on the website to directly measure traffic. The service requires a subscription to Alexa’s services, which start at USD 19.99 per month for one website.

As Alexa verifies installation of its scripts before tracking visits, we installed them on a new test website. From the JavaScript part of this code, we extracted its reporting algorithm and repeatedly forged GET requests that made us appear as a new user visiting the website, therefore avoiding the need to retain the response cookies for continued tracking. To diversify the set of IP addresses sending this forged traffic, we sent these requests over the Tor network, which has a pool of around 1,000 IP addresses [70]. We sent at most 16,000 requests per 24 hours, of which half were purported to be to the root page of our domain, and the other half to a randomly generated path.

Figure 6(b) lists the ranks of our test domain and the number of visits that were logged by Alexa across 52 days. For 48 days, we reached the top 100,000 (purported to more accurately reflect popularity), getting up to rank 28,798. Not all our requests were seen by Alexa, but we suspect this is rather due to our setup (e.g., by timeouts incurred while sending requests over Tor). Alexa’s metrics report that our site received “100.0% real traffic” and that no traffic was excluded, so we suspect that Alexa was not able to detect the automated nature of our requests.

After subscription to the service, Alexa will only calculate (and offer to display) the Certified rank of a website after 21 days. Since no visits to our site were being reported through Alexa’s extension, no ‘normal’ rank was achieved in the meantime, and therefore there was a large delay between Alexa’s tracking and the computation of the website’s rank.

The disadvantage of this technique is that the cost of manipulation at scale quickly becomes prohibitive, as for each site that needs to be inserted into the list, a separate subscription is required. Given Alexa’s verification of the tracking script being installed, the domain needs to be registered and a real website needs to be set up, further reducing the scalability of the technique. However, we were able to achieve better ranks with a more consistent acceptance of our forged requests. Depending on the attacker’s goal, it is of course still possible to artificially increase the ranking of specific websites who already purchased and installed the Alexa Certify service.

We obtained a rank even though we did not simulate traffic to this test domain through the Alexa extension, which strongly suggests that Alexa does not verify whether ‘Certified’ domains show similar (credible) traffic in both data sources. Based on this observation, we found one example where we suspect manipulation of the tracking script is already ongoing on a very significant scale: for a top 100 site, Alexa reports its extension recording barely any or even no traffic. As some studies only use Alexa’s top 100 domains, this website can have considerable impact on their results and conclusions.

B. Cisco Umbrella

Umbrella ranks websites on the number of unique client IPs issuing DNS requests for them. Obtaining a rank therefore involves getting access to a large variety of IP addresses and sending (at least) one DNS request from those IPs to the two open DNS resolvers provided by Umbrella.

1) Cloud providers: Cloud providers have obtained large pools of IP addresses for distribution across their server instances; e.g., Amazon Web Services (AWS) owns over 64 million IPv4 addresses [15]. These can be used to procure the unique IP addresses required for performing DNS requests, but due to their scarcity, providers restrict access to IPv4 addresses either in number or by introducing a cost.

In the case of AWS, there are two options for rapidly obtaining new IPv4 addresses. Continuously starting and stopping instances is an economical method, as even 10,000 different IPs can be obtained for less than USD 1 (using the cheapest instance type), but the overhead of relaunching instances reduces throughput: on the cheapest t2.nano instance, we were able to obtain a new IP on average every minute. Moreover, the number of concurrent running instances is limited, but by using instances in multiple regions or even multiple accounts, more instances are accessible. Keeping one instance and allocating and deallocating Elastic IP addresses
We only sustained DNS traffic for one day at a time, but it when OpenDNS processes around 30% less DNS traffic [60], with only a thousand unique IP addresses, albeit in the weekend, (i.e. addresses permanently assigned to a user) yields higher throughput, at 10 seconds per IP. However, AWS and other providers such as Microsoft Azure discourage this practice by attaching a cost to this ‘remap’ operation: for AWS, a remap costs USD 0.10, so a set of 10 000 IPs incurs a prohibitive cost of USD 1 000.

Figure 8 shows the relation between the number of issued DNS requests and the obtained rank; all of our attempts were successful. We were able to obtain ranks as high as 200 000 with only a thousand unique IP addresses, albeit in the weekend, when OpenDNS processes around 30% less DNS traffic [60]. We only sustained DNS traffic for one day at a time, but it appears that Umbrella counts this traffic (and therefore ranks the domain) for two days, reducing the number of requests needed per day to either rank a domain highly or rank many domains.

Given the relatively high cost per IP, inserting multiple domains actually is more economical as several DNS requests can be sent for each IP instantiation. As the target of the DNS request can be chosen freely, inserting fake domains is also possible; the high number of invalid entries already present shows that Umbrella does not apply any filtering. This further improves scalability of this technique, as no real websites need to be set up in order to manipulate the list.

The effort to generate many ranked entries is further reduced by the inclusion of subdomains, as all subdomains at lower depths are automatically ranked: we were able to rank 12 subdomains simultaneously with one set of requests. Furthermore, the number of requests is aggregated per subdomain, so a low number of requests to many subdomains can result in both many ranked subdomains and a good rank for the pay-level domain.

Combining the ability to insert fake domains with the low overhead of requests to additional domains, the inclusion of subdomains and the lack of any filtering or manipulation detection means that the scale at which an attacker can manipulate Umbrella’s list can be very large.

2) Alternatives:

- **Tor:** The Tor service provides anonymous communication between a user and the service they use. Traffic is relayed across multiple nodes before being sent to the destination from an exit node, meaning that the destination observes traffic originating from that node’s IP address. This set of exit nodes provide a pool of IP addresses, and by switching the routing over the Tor network, DNS requests can be altered to appear to originate from multiple IP addresses in this pool. However, as there are less than 1 000 exit nodes at any given point in time [70], it will be possible to inject domains in the list, but infesable to obtain a high rank solely through this technique.

  - **IP spoofing:** IP packets contain the IP address of its sender, that can however be arbitrarily set in a technique known as IP spoofing. We could leverage this technique to set the source IP of our DNS packets to many different addresses, in order for our requests to appear for Umbrella to originate from many unique IPs. As IP spoofing is often used during denial-of-service attacks, many ISPs block outgoing packets with source IPs outside their network. Leveraging IP spoofing for sending DNS requests therefore requires finding a network that supports it. Karami et al. [42] found that certain VPS providers allow IP spoofing; as such these could be used for our experiment.

  Due to the ethical concerns that are raised by leveraging IP spoofing (the responses of our DNS requests would arrive at the users of the forged source IPs, and the associated traffic may cause the VPS provider to be flagged as malicious), we did not further explore this technique. It is important to note however that an adversary only needs to find a single provider or network that does not prevent IP spoofing in order to send a very large number of DNS requests to Umbrella’s resolvers and thus manipulate the list at a very high scale.

C. Majestic

Majestic’s ranking is based on the number of subnets hosting a website that links to the ranked domain. Therefore, we cannot construct data reporting requests sent directly to Majestic, but must use techniques where website owners knowingly or unknowingly serve a page that contains a link to our domain and that is then crawled independently by Majestic.

1) Backlinks: Backlink providers offer a paid service where they place links to a requested website (‘backlinks’) on various sites. The goal of this service is usually to achieve a higher position in search engine rankings, as part of search engine optimization (SEO) strategies; the deceptive nature of this technique makes that this is considered ‘black-hat’ SEO. Backlinks are priced differently according to the reputation of the linking site. While we need a sufficiently diverse set of websites hosted on different subnets, Majestic does not take the quality of our backlinks into account when ranking domains. This means we can reduce our cost by choosing the cheapest type of backlink. Moreover, we have the choice of removing backlinks after they have been found, as these are no longer billed but still count towards the subnets for a period of at most 120 days, reducing monetary cost.

We use the services of BackLinks.com, as they operate only on sites under their control, therefore avoiding impact of our experiment on unaware site owners. The choice for this particular backlink provider brings about certain constraints (such as the pool of available backlink sites, or a limit on daily backlink deletions), but these can be alleviated by using other and/or multiple backlink providers. We buy backlinks if they are located in a subnet not covered by any site, but have to
use OCR as the URLs on which links would be placed are only available as a warped image. We therefore curated the set of backlinks through manual verification to compensate for any errors, increasing our required effort.

The cheapest type of backlink costs USD 0.25 a month, but since there was not a sufficient amount of such pages to cover the necessary number of subnets, more expensive backlinks were also required. The backlinks were partially found organically by Majestic; in this case there is no additional cost. Through a subscription on Majestic’s services, backlinks can also be submitted explicitly for crawling: the minimum cost is USD 79.99 for one month Lite.

We bought backlinks for our test domain and curated them for two and a half months, in order to capture as many subnets as possible while managing the monetary cost. Our total cost was USD 500. We successfully inserted our domain, with Figure 9 showing the achieved rankings on top of the relation between the rank and the number of found subnets for all ranked sites as published by Majestic.

There exists a trade-off between the cost and the time required to enter the rank: if the monetary cost should be kept low, more time is needed as the set of eligible backlink pages is smaller and backlinks will need to be deleted. Alternatively, a higher number of possibly more expensive backlinks would allow to achieve the necessary number of subnets more quickly, but at a higher monetary cost. Conversely, because Majestic considers links for at least 120 days, the cost for long-term manipulation is relatively limited: even though we stopped buying backlinks and these subsequently disappeared, our ranking was still maintained for more than two months as previously found backlinks were still counted.

2) **Reflected URLs**: An alternative technique that we discovered, for which it is not required to purchase services from external parties, is to leverage websites that reflect a GET parameter into a link. Note that for our purpose, reflected cross-site scripting (XSS) attacks could also be used; however, this technique is more intrusive as it will inject HTML elements, so we did not evaluate it out of ethical considerations. To discover web pages that reflect a URL passed as a parameter, we started crawling the 2.8 million domains from the four lists, finding additional pages by following links from the homepage of these domains. If GET parameters were found on the page, we replaced each one with a URL and tested whether this URL was then included in the href tag of a link on the page.

Through this crawl, we found that certain MediaWiki sites were particularly susceptible to reflecting URLs on each page, depending on the configuration of the site. We therefore tested this reflection on the wikis from a number of data sources: the root domains as well as the subdomains containing wiki of the four top lists, the set of wikis found by Pavlo and Shi in 2011 [62] and the wikis found by WikiTeam\(^{10}\). As the reflection is purely achieved through altering the GET parameters, we do not permanently alter the wiki.

Given the special construction of their URLs, the pages reflecting our domain will not be found organically by Majestic. The list of affected URLs can be submitted directly to Majestic, but this requires a subscription. The links can also be placed on one aggregating web page: by verifying ownership of the hosting domain with Majestic, a crawl of this page and subsequently of the links placed on it can be triggered for free; alternatively, using Majestic's site to request the freely available subset of backlinks data for this special web page also seems to trigger this crawl.

Through our crawls, we found 1 041 pages that reflected the URL of our test domain when passed in a GET parameter. Through submitting these reflecting URLs to Majestic’s crawler, we successfully inserted our domain, with Figure 9 showing the achieved rankings over time. Through this technique, we also successfully had one backlink to a non-existing domain crawled and counted as a referring subnet. By scaling this up to the number of subnets required to be ranked, this implies that Majestic’s list ranking is also susceptible to fake entries; as there are unavailable sites in the list, Majestic likely does not actively check whether entries in the list are real.

This technique allows to construct backlinks at no monetary cost, but requires a high effort to find appropriate pages. We found only small subsets of wikis and domains in general to reflect our URL, so the number of pages and subnets that can be discovered using this technique may not be sufficient to achieve very high rankings. Given a deeper crawl of pages, more sites that reflect URLs passed through a GET parameters may be found, more subnets can be covered and a higher ranking can be achieved. Moreover, an attacker can resort to more ‘aggressive’ techniques where URLs are permanently stored on pages or XSS vulnerabilities are exploited.

Once found however, a reflecting URL will be counted indefinitely: a site would effectively have to be reconfigured or taken offline in order for the backlink to disappear. This means maintaining a rank comes at no additional cost. Furthermore, every website that is susceptible to URL reflection can be leveraged to promote any number of attacker-chosen (fake) domains, at the cost of submitting more (crafted) URLs to Majestic. This means that manipulation of Majestic’s list is also possible on a large scale.

3) **Alternatives:**

- **Hosting own sites.** Using a large set of domains obtained from passive DNS measurements, Tajalizadehkhoob et al. [69] identified 45 434 hosting providers in 2016, and determined their median address space to contain 1 517 IP addresses. Based

\(^{10}\) [https://github.com/WikiTeam/wikiteam](https://github.com/WikiTeam/wikiteam)
on these figures, we can assume that the number of subnets available through hosting providers is well above the threshold to be ranked by Majestic. An attacker could therefore set up websites on a sufficient number of these providers, all with a link back to the domain to be ranked. By making all the websites link to each other, a larger set of domains could easily be ranked. This technique incurs a high cost however: in effort, as setting up accounts with these providers is very likely to require a lot of manual effort, as well as in monetary cost, as for each hosting provider a subscription needs to be bought.

- **Pingbacks.** Content management systems such as WordPress provide a pingback mechanism for automatically reporting URLs that link to one of the pages hosted on that system. Many sites will then insert a link back to the reported URL on that page. By finding a set of domains supporting pingbacks (similar to finding wikis) and reporting a URL on the domain we want to see ranked, we could again see that domain linked to from a large set of domains and therefore subnets. However, this permanently changes pages on other websites, and although enabling the pingback feature implies some consent, we opted to not explore this technique for ethical reasons.

**D. Quantcast**

1) **Quantified:** Quantcast mainly obtains traffic data through its tracking script that webmasters install on their website. We extracted the reporting algorithm from the tracking script, and automatically sent requests to Quantcast from a set of 479 VPN servers located in the United States, as Quantcast’s ranking only takes US traffic into account. We sent requests for 400 generated users per day, presenting ourselves as a new user on the first request and subsequently reusing the generated token and received cookie in four more requests. As opposed to Alexa’s tracking script, only reporting view pages for new users did not result in any visits being counted.

Our forged requests were acknowledged by Quantcast and its analytics dashboard reports that on May 30, 2018, “the destination reaches over 6,697 people, of which 6,696 (100%) are in the U.S.” The latter metric is used to determine the rank. However, our test domain has not appeared in the ranking. This is likely due to the short age of our domain; although we have sent requests for more than a month, Quantcast’s slow update frequency means its ranking algorithm may not take our domain into account yet.

As Quantcast publishes the number of visits counted for each ranked domain, the relation between the desired rank and required effort is known as shown in Figure 10. Up to around 5,000 visits, the achieved rank remains relatively low; this tail contains primarily quantified sites that are ranked even with almost no visits. Above 5,000 visits, Quantcast’s list includes many more domains for which a rank is estimated; especially at worse ranks, large blocks of estimated domains are interspersed with quantified domains, so increasing the number of visits to jump across such a block gives a large improvement in rank. If a rank were to be assigned to our domain, we can determine that we would theoretically be given a rank around 367,000.

Achieving higher ranks only requires submitting more forged requests, so the increased cost in time and effort is minimal.

Quantcast will only start processing traffic data once it has verified (through crawling) that its tracking pixel is present on the domain. It is therefore required to register the domain and set up a real website to manipulate the rankings, so scaling to multiple domains incurs a higher cost; Quantcast’s analytics platform itself is free however, limiting the additional cost. As Quantcast performs the check only once, the domain and the website also do not need to be sustained. Merely registering for tracking may even suffice to be ranked: over 2,000 domains are ranked but reported to have 0 visits, with over half registered with less than 10 visits. Over 50% of these websites are in the U.S. The latter metric is used to determine the rank. However, our test domain has not appeared in the ranking.

2) **Alternatives:** Quantcast states that it also uses traffic data from “ISPs and toolbar providers” [67]. ISPs are known to sell traffic data to third parties [19], and Quantcast may be buying these services to generate the number of page visits and therefore the rank for non-Quantified websites. However, we cannot determine which ISPs may be used. As for extensions, we were unable to discover any extensions reporting to a URL that was obviously related to Quantcast.

**Ethical considerations:** Because our experiments may have a large impact on the reputation of the rankings as well as potentially affect third parties, we conduct an ethical review of our experimental methodology. Such reviews have been advocated for by the academic community [61] and ensure that the potential damage inflicted is minimized. We base this review on the ethical principles outlined in the Menlo Report [26], which serves as a guideline within the field of ICT research; we apply the principle of beneficence in particular: identifying potential benefits and harms, weighing them against each other and minimizing the risk of inflicting harm.

Because of their commercial nature, the providers of popularity rankings have an economic interest in these being accurate. We show that these lists can be manipulated, negatively affecting their perceived reputability. Our findings are however of value to the providers: by evaluating the various techniques and reporting our findings, the providers become aware of the potential threats, may take actions to thwart attackers and can improve the correctness of their rankings.

We have disclosed our findings and proposals for potential remedies to the four providers, alongside a list of manipulated domains for them to remove from their datasets and past and present rankings. Alexa and Majestic provided statements regarding the value of their rankings and the (in)feasibility
of manipulation, but commercial interests prevent them from disclosing their methods or acknowledging our suggestions for improvement. Cisco Umbrella closed our issue without any statement, and we received no response from Quantcast.

We minimize the impact of our experiments by only significantly manipulating the ranking of our own, purposefully registered domains. Our sites also contained an explanation of our experiment and contact details for affected parties.

VI. AN IMPROVED TOP WEBSITES RANKING

As we showed, the different methodologies used to generate popularity rankings cause undesirable effects on their properties that can potentially sway the results and conclusions of studies. In addition, we showed that researchers are prone to ignore or be unaware of these effects. We also proved that these rankings show several pitfalls that leave them vulnerable to large-scale manipulation, further reducing their reliability and suitability to research.

A. Defending existing rankings against manipulation

Even though the methodologies of data collection and processing for the existing lists are usually unknown, our experiments suggest that their providers employ little defense against large-scale manipulation. We outline techniques that the providers could use to make these lists more resilient to attacks.

Detecting and deterring singular instances of fraud ensures that all data used to rank domains is deemed valid. Alexa and Quantcast rely on the reporting of page visits; within the realm of online advertising, techniques have been designed to subvert click inflation. Blundo et al. [17] present an overview of secure metering schemes, relying mostly on cryptographic methods. However, these may be too resource intensive and require elaborate key management [2], or have a large impact on user privacy and require user cooperation [53]. Metwally et al. [53] propose approaches to detect fraudulent traffic using statistical data analysis; they do note that this detection becomes less effective when attackers have access to multiple profiles and IP addresses, which are now easy to obtain (e.g. through cloud providers). As we saw that not all attempts at manipulating Alexa’s ranking were successful, this may imply that Alexa already employs some of these tactics.

To deter large-scale manipulation, ranking providers could employ tactics that increase the effort and resources required to affect many domains to prohibitive levels. This therefore avoids significant influence on research results, even if these tactics may not be sufficient to stop small-scale manipulation.

For a traffic reporting extension, the profile setup could be tied to an account at a web service; while a normal user can easily create one account, creating many accounts in an automated way can be countered by techniques that try to detect fake accounts [22]. In the case of Alexa, given its ownership by Amazon, a natural choice would be to require an Amazon account; in fact, a field for such an account ID is available when registering the extension, but is not required. This technique is not useful for tracking scripts, since no user interaction can be requested, and fraud detection as discussed earlier may be required. For providers that use both, the two metrics can be compared to detect anomalies where only one source reports significant traffic numbers, as we suspect such manipulation is already happening for Alexa Certify.

Data could be filtered on the IP address from which it originates. Ignoring requests from ranges belonging to cloud providers or conversely requiring requests to come from ranges known to belong to Internet service providers (e.g. through its autonomous system) does not block a single user from reporting their traffic. However, using many IP addresses concurrently is prevented as these cannot be easily obtained within the permitted ranges. This technique is particularly useful for Umbrella’s list; for the other lists, using many IP addresses is not strictly necessary for large-scale manipulation.

The relative difficulty of maliciously inserting links into pages on many IP subnets already reduces the vulnerability of link-based rankings to large-scale manipulation. Specific attacks where the page reflects a URL passed as a parameter could be detected, although this can be made more difficult by obfuscation and attacks that alter a page more permanently. The link-based rankings could be refined with reputation scores, e.g. the age of a linked page or Majestic’s “Flow Metrics” [50], to devalue domains that are likely to be part of a manipulation campaign.

Finally, requiring ranked domains to be available and to host real content increases the cost of large-scale manipulation, as domain names need to be bought and servers and web pages need to be set up. For Umbrella, not ranking domains where name resolution fails can significantly reduce unavailable (and therefore possibly fake) domains in the list. The other providers can perform similar availability checks in the DNS or by crawling the domain.

B. Creating rankings suitable for research

As we cannot ensure that providers will (want to) implement changes that discourage (large-scale) manipulation, we look at combining all currently available ranking data with the goal of improving the properties of popularity rankings for research, canceling out the respective deficiencies of the existing rankings. To this extent, we introduce TR ANCO, a service that researchers can use to obtain lists with such more desirable and appropriate properties. We provide standard lists that can be readily used in research, but also allow these lists to be highly configurable, as depending on the use case, different traffic sources or varying degrees of stability may be beneficial.

Moreover, we provide a permanent record to these new lists, their configuration and their methodology. This makes historical lists more easily accessible to reduce the effort in replicating studies based upon them, and ensures that researchers can be aware of the influences on the resulting list by its component lists and configuration.

Our service is available at https://tranco-list.eu. The source code is also openly published at https://github.com/DistriNet/tranco-list to provide full transparency of how our lists are processed.
1) Combination options and filters: We support creating new lists where the ranks are averaged across providers and across different days, and introduce additional filters, with the goal of improving these properties for our new lists.

In order to raise the rank of the domains that the lists agree upon, we allow to average ranks over the lists of some or all providers. We provide two combination methods: the Borda count where, for a list of length \( N \), items are scored with \( N, N-1, \ldots, 1, 0 \) points, and the Dowdall rule where items are scored with \( 1, 1/2, \ldots, 1/(N-1), 1/N \) points [30]. The latter reflects the Zipf’s law distribution that website traffic has been modeled on [4], [24]. Our standard list applies the Dowdall rule to all four lists. We also allow to filter out domains that appear only on one or a few lists, to avoid domains that are only marked as popular by one provider: these may point to isolated manipulation.

To improve the stability of our combined lists, we allow to average ranks over the lists of several days; our standard list uses the lists of the past 30 days. Again, we allow to filter out domains that appear only for one or a few days, to avoid briefly popular (or manipulated) domains. Conversely, if capturing these short-term effects is desired, lists based on one day’s data are available. When combining lists, we also provide the option to only consider a certain prefix for the input lists, to select domains that are more likely to actually be popular.

Differences in list composition complicate the combination of the lists. Umbrella’s list includes subdomains; we include an option to use a recalculated ranking that only includes pay-level domains. Quantcast’s list contains less than one million domains; we proportionally rescale the scores used in the two combination methods to the same range as the other lists.

We add filters to create a list that represents a certain desired subset of popular domains. A researcher can either only keep domains with certain TLDs to select sites more likely to be associated with particular countries or sectors, or exclude (overly represented) TLDs. To avoid the dominance of particular organizations in the list, a filter can be applied where only one domain is ranked for each set of pay-level domains that differ only in TLD. Finally, only certain subdomains can be retained, e.g. to heuristically obtain a list of authentication services by selecting login.* subdomains.

To allow researchers to work with a set of domains that is actually reachable and representative of real websites, we provide options to filter the domains on their responsiveness, status code and content length. We base these filters on a regular crawl of the union of all domains on the four existing lists. This ensures that the sample of domains used in a study yields results that accurately reflect practices on the web.

To further refine on real and popular websites, we include a filter on the set of around 3 million distinct domains in Google’s Chrome User Experience Report, said to be ‘popular destinations on the web’ [36]. Its userbase can be expected to be (much) larger than e.g. Alexa’s panel; however, Google themselves indicate that it may not fully represent the broader Chrome userbase [36]. Moreover, the list is only updated monthly and does not rank the domains, so it cannot be used as a replacement for the existing rankings.

To reduce the potential effects of malicious domains on research results (e.g. in classifier accuracy), we allow to remove domains on the Safe Browsing list from our generated lists.

2) Evaluation: We evaluate the standard options chosen for our combined lists on their improvements to similarity and stability. The representativeness, responsiveness and benignness of the included domains can be improved by applying the appropriate filters. We generate our combined lists from March 1, 2018 to June 30, 2018, to avoid distortions due to Alexa’s methodology change, and truncate them to one million domains, as this is the standard for current lists.

a) Similarity: To determine the weight of the four existing lists, we measure their intersection with our combined lists. For the list of 1 million domains, the overlap with Majestic is highest at 49.0%, while overlap with Alexa and Umbrella’s lists drops to 35.7% and 43.5% respectively. 29.8% of the combined list appears in Quantcast’s list, corresponding to 58.0% of Quantcast’s list appearing in the combined list. For smaller prefixes, Majestic’s and Alexa’s have similarly high overlaps at 46–53%, with those of Umbrella and Quantcast dropping to 31–41%. However, these overlaps are affected by the differences in list inclusion criteria: subdomains for Umbrella and the shorter list for Quantcast mean that these two lists have less entries potentially in common with Alexa and Majestic, reducing their weight. Overall, there is no list with a disproportionate influence in the combined list.

b) Stability: Averaging the rankings over 30 days is beneficial for stability: for the list combining all four providers, on average less than 0.6% changes daily, even for smaller prefixes. For the volatile Alexa and Umbrella lists, the improvement is even more profound: the daily change is reduced to 1.8% and 0.7% respectively. This means the data from these providers can be used even in longitudinal settings, as the set of domains does not change significantly.

3) Reproducibility: Studies rarely mention the date on which a ranking was retrieved, when the websites on that list were visited and whether they were reachable. Moreover, it is hard to obtain the list of a previous date: only Cisco Umbrella maintains a public archive of historical lists [23]. These two aspects negatively affect the reproducibility of studies, as the exact composition of a list cannot be retrieved afterwards.

In order to enhance the reproducibility of studies that use one of our lists, we include several features that are designed to create a permanent record that can easily be referenced. Once a list has been created, a permanent short link and a preformatted citation template are generated for inclusion in a paper. Alongside the ability to download the exact set of domains that the list comprises, the page available through this link provides a detailed overview of the configuration used to create that particular list and of the methodologies of the existing rankings, such that the potential influences of the selected methodology can be assessed. This increases the probability that researchers use the rankings in a more well-founded manner.
4) Manipulation: Given that our combined lists still rely on the data from the four existing lists, they remain susceptible to manipulation. As domains that appear on all lists simultaneously are favored, successful insertion in all lists at once will yield an artificially inflated rank in our combined list.

However, the additional combinations and filters that we propose increase the effort required to have manipulated domains appear in our combined lists. Averaging ranks over a longer period of time means that manipulation of the lists needs to be maintained for a longer time; it also takes longer for the manipulated domains to obtain a (significant) aggregated rank. Moreover, intelligently applying filters can further reduce the impact of manipulation: e.g. removing unavailable domains thwarts the ability to use fake domains.

As each ranking provider has their own traffic data source, the effects of manipulating one list are isolated. As none of the lists have a particularly high influence in the combined list, all four lists need to manipulated to the same extent to achieve a comparable ranking in the combined list, quadrupling the required effort. For the combined list generated for June 30, 2018, achieving a rank within the top million would require boosting a domain in one list to at least rank 11 220 for one day or rank 336 629 for 30 days; for a rank within the top 100 000, ranks 979 and 29 402 would be necessary respectively. This shows that massive or prolonged manipulation is required to appear in our combined list.

In 2006, Lo and Sedhain [48] studied the reliability of website rankings in terms of agreement, from the standpoint of advertisers and consumers looking for the most relevant sites. They discussed three ranking methodologies (traffic data, incoming links and opinion polls) and analyzed the top 100 websites for six providers, all of which are still online but, except for Alexa, have since stopped updating their rankings.

In 2008, Vaughan [74] discussed the collection methodologies of Alexa and Compete for a survey of studies that correlate web traffic data with other metrics such as business performance. She does not provide any further comparison of different ranking lists.

Meusel et al. [54] published one-time rankings of websites\textsuperscript{11}, based on four centrality indices calculated on the Common Crawl web graph [25]. Depending on the index, these ranks vary widely even for very popular sites. Moreover, such centrality indices can be affected by manipulation [37], [59].

The work that is most recent and most closely related to ours is that of Scheitle et al. [65], who compared Alexa's, Majestic's and Umbrella's lists on their structure and stability over time, and discussed their usage in research through a survey of recent studies and examples of the potential impact of popularity rankings. We focus on the implication of these lists on security research, expanding the analysis to include representativeness, responsiveness and benignness. Moreover, we empirically validate that these lists can be manipulated, and propose a concrete solution to these shortcomings by providing researchers with improved and publicly available rankings.

\textsuperscript{11}http://www-ranking.webdatacommons.org/

VII. Conclusion

We find that 102 studies in recent main security conferences base their experiments on domains from commercial rankings of the 'top' websites. However, the data sources and methodologies used to compile these rankings vary widely and their details are unknown, and we find that hidden properties and biases can skew research results. In particular, through an extensive evaluation of these rankings, we detect a recent unannounced change in the way Alexa composes its list: their data is only averaged over a single day, causing half of the list to change every day. Most probably, this unknowingly affected research results, and may continue to do so. However, other rankings exhibit similar problems, e.g. only 49% of domains in Umbrella's list respond with HTTP status code 200, and Majestic's list, which Quad9 uses as a whitelist, has more than 2 000 domains marked as malicious by Google Safe Browsing.

The reputational or commercial incentives in biasing the results of security studies, as well as the large trust placed in the validity of these rankings by researchers, as evidenced by only two studies putting their methodology into question, makes these rankings an interesting target for adversarial manipulation. We develop techniques that exploit the pitfalls in every list by forging the data based upon which domains are ranked. Moreover, many of these methods bear an exceptionally low cost, both technically and in resources: we only needed to craft a single HTTP request to appear in Alexa's top million sites. This provides an avenue for manipulation at a very large scale, both in the rank that can be achieved and in the number of domains artificially inserted into the list. Adversaries can therefore sustain massive manipulation campaigns over time to have a significant impact on the rankings, and, as a consequence, on research and the society at large.

Ranking providers carry out few checks on their traffic data, as is apparent from our ability to insert nonexistent domains, further simplifying manipulation at scale. We outline several mitigation strategies, but cannot be assured that these will be implemented. Therefore, we propose new rankings based on combining the four existing lists, alongside the ability to filter out undesirable (e.g. unavailable or dangerous) domains. These combined lists show much better stability over time, only changing by at most 0.6% per day, and are much more resilient against manipulation, where even manipulating one list to reach the top 1 000 only yields a rank of 100 000 in our combined list. We introduce TRACO, an online service to access these rankings in a reproducible manner, so that researchers can continue their evaluation with a more reliable and suitable set of domains. This helps them in assuring the validity, verifiability and reproducibility of their studies, making their conclusions about security on the Internet more accurate and well founded.
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