

A Comprehensive Framework for Geological Engineering Specializations and Their Emerging Applications

Azizbek Karimov

Department of Engineering and Technology, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Dilnoza Tursunova

Department of Mechanical Engineering, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

Received: 12 August 2026 | Received Revised Version: 04 September 2026 | Accepted: 16 September 2026 | Published: 19 October 2026

Volume 08 Issue 10 2026 |

Abstract

Geological engineering integrates geological sciences, engineering principles, computational modeling, and risk assessment to address challenges associated with subsurface conditions, mineral resources, infrastructure development, environmental protection, and geohazard mitigation. However, its expanding scope creates a need for a structured framework that connects specialized disciplines with emerging analytical and technological applications. This review develops a conceptual framework for organizing geological engineering specializations around geological characterization, engineering analysis, computational simulation, risk monitoring, and decision support. A structured conceptual synthesis is employed to examine how systems architecture, network simulation, anomaly detection, and performance evaluation concepts from the supplied literature may inform the design of integrated geological engineering workflows. The framework emphasizes the relationship between geological data acquisition, model development, uncertainty assessment, engineering intervention, and continuous monitoring. Particular attention is given to the potential use of digital models, automated monitoring, multidisciplinary data integration, and adaptive risk-management systems. The findings suggest that a systems-oriented approach can provide a useful organizational basis for integrating geological investigations with engineering decisions, although its effectiveness in geological applications remains untested. The study establishes a conceptual foundation for future empirical research while identifying the need for geological field data, validated numerical models, and domain-specific performance indicators.

Keywords: Geological Engineering, Engineering Geology, Geotechnical Analysis, Geological Modeling, Geohazard Assessment, Computational Simulation, Risk Management, Environmental Monitoring, Decision Support.

© 2026 Azizbek Karimov, & Dilnoza Tursunova. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). The authors retain copyright and allow others to share, adapt, or redistribute the work with proper attribution.

Cite This Article: Azizbek Karimov, & Dilnoza Tursunova. (2026). A Comprehensive Framework for Geological Engineering Specializations and Their Emerging Applications. The American Journal of Engineering and Technology, 8(10), 102–109. Retrieved from <https://theamericanjournals.com/index.php/tajet/article/view/8512>

1. Introduction

Geological engineering applies geological knowledge to engineering problems involving the Earth's materials, structures, processes, and subsurface conditions. Its

relevance extends to foundation design, tunnels, dams, transportation corridors, mining operations, groundwater development, slope stabilization, and environmental remediation. Unlike approaches that treat geological

conditions as fixed background information, geological engineering evaluates how geological variability interacts with construction methods, material behavior, environmental processes, and operational requirements. The discipline encompasses several interrelated specializations, including engineering geology, geotechnical engineering, hydrogeology, rock mechanics, mineral-resource engineering, geological hazard assessment, and environmental geoscience. These areas differ in their primary objectives but share a dependence on reliable geological characterization and the interpretation of uncertain natural systems. A rock mass, for example, may simultaneously influence tunnel stability, groundwater movement, excavation costs, and long-term environmental performance. Consequently, decisions based on isolated disciplinary assessments may overlook interactions that become important during construction or operation.

The increasing availability of remote sensing, geographic information systems, computational modeling, sensor networks, and data-driven analytical techniques creates opportunities to improve geological engineering practice. Nevertheless, integrating these technologies requires more than collecting additional data. Engineers must establish appropriate data structures, evaluate model reliability, distinguish abnormal observations from natural variability, and connect analytical results to actionable decisions.

A useful analogy can be drawn from systems engineering and computational infrastructure research. De Oliveira et al. (2014) examine Mininet as a platform for emulating and prototyping software-defined networks. Although their work is unrelated to geological engineering, the underlying distinction between system representation and real-world validation is relevant when considering computational prototypes for geological investigations. A simulated geological environment, similarly, must not be treated as a complete substitute for field measurements or validated engineering models.

The principal objective of this review is to develop a conceptual framework that organizes geological engineering specializations according to their functions, data requirements, analytical methods, and emerging applications. The study also considers how computational integration and continuous monitoring could support multidisciplinary decision-making while recognizing the limitations of transferring concepts from unrelated technical fields.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Systems Architecture and Multidisciplinary Integration

The supplied literature examines distributed architectures and the coordination of technical components. Berde et al. (2014) discuss ONOS as an open, distributed software-defined networking operating system, while Chowdhary et al. (2016) consider a scalable moving-target defense solution for cloud networks. These studies concern network infrastructure rather than geological systems, but they illustrate the broader technical problem of coordinating multiple components within an interconnected architecture.

In geological engineering, comparable organizational challenges arise when borehole records, geological maps, laboratory measurements, geophysical surveys, groundwater observations, and numerical simulations are maintained in separate systems. A coordinated analytical environment could connect these information sources while preserving their spatial references, measurement conditions, uncertainty estimates, and update histories. Such integration would facilitate consistency checks and improve the traceability of engineering decisions.

However, distributed architecture alone does not ensure geological accuracy. Geological datasets often differ in spatial resolution, temporal coverage, sampling density, and measurement reliability. Integration therefore requires explicit rules for data quality, coordinate systems, model versioning, and the treatment of conflicting observations.

2.2 Monitoring, Anomaly Detection, and Risk Identification

Several supplied studies examine the identification of abnormal or potentially harmful behavior in computer networks. Giotis et al. (2014) investigate anomaly detection and mitigation in software-defined networking environments, while Le and Zincir-Heywood (2021) examine unsupervised ensembles for insider-threat detection. Nicolaou et al. (2020) consider bio-inspired models for mitigating insider threats.

These studies cannot establish the effectiveness of anomaly-detection methods for geological hazards. Nevertheless, they provide examples of how analytical systems can be designed to identify deviations from expected behavior and support subsequent investigation. A potential geological application would involve detecting unusual changes in slope displacement, groundwater pressure, tunnel deformation, or excavation-induced vibration. Unlike cybersecurity anomalies, geological anomalies may result from seasonal processes, instrument errors, changing

environmental conditions, or genuine instability. Consequently, a geological monitoring system would require physically informed thresholds, baseline characterization, sensor validation, and expert interpretation before triggering engineering interventions.

Park et al. (2018) discuss cyber-deception architecture and decoy injection for mitigating insider threats. Its specific technique has no direct geological equivalent established by the supplied evidence. Its relevance is therefore limited to the broader principle that monitoring-system reliability depends on understanding the behavior and limitations of the system being observed.

2.3 Simulation, Performance Evaluation, and System Reliability

De Oliveira et al. (2014) provide the most relevant methodological analogy for this paper because their study addresses emulation and prototyping. Computational prototyping can help investigators evaluate system configurations before implementing them in operational environments. In geological engineering, analogous approaches include testing alternative slope geometries, tunnel-support configurations, groundwater-control scenarios, and excavation sequences using appropriately validated numerical models.

Yet simulation fidelity depends on the quality of input data and the suitability of the governing assumptions. A model that reproduces an assumed geological structure may still be unreliable if faults, discontinuities, groundwater pathways, or material properties have been poorly characterized. Geological models must therefore be evaluated against field observations and, where possible, independent measurements.

Performance assessment also matters when computational systems are deployed in operational environments. Yan et al. (2018) examine the relationship between workload and resource consumption in a commercial web server. Although this is not a geological study, it illustrates why computational demand and system performance should be considered when designing data-intensive analytical workflows. Geological applications involving high-resolution terrain models, three-dimensional subsurface representations, or continuous monitoring may similarly require attention to processing time, storage, and computational scalability.

2.4 Research Gap and Theoretical Positioning

The principal gap addressed here is organizational rather than an established geological research gap demonstrated

by the supplied references. The references do not directly compare geological engineering specializations or evaluate emerging geological technologies. They therefore cannot support conclusions about the relative effectiveness of particular geological methods.

This review positions geological engineering as an interconnected decision system comprising observation, characterization, analysis, intervention, and verification. Its theoretical contribution is a conceptual structure for connecting geological specializations to shared analytical functions. Its practical value remains a proposition requiring testing with geological datasets and established engineering methods.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study adopts a conceptual review and framework-development approach. The objective is to organize geological engineering specializations and identify possible points of integration rather than to estimate quantitative effects or report new field observations.

The supplied references were examined according to their relevance to four transferable methodological themes: systems integration, computational prototyping, anomaly detection, and performance evaluation. Because the references address computer networks and cybersecurity, their findings were not treated as direct evidence about geological processes. Instead, their methodological concepts informed the structure of a proposed geological engineering framework.

No field survey, laboratory experiment, numerical simulation, or statistical hypothesis test was conducted. Accordingly, the findings represent conceptual deductions and proposed applications, not empirically validated performance improvements.

3.2 Classification of Geological Engineering Specializations

The proposed framework groups geological engineering into six interconnected functional areas.

Engineering geology and geological characterization. This specialization establishes the geological conditions relevant to engineering projects. Its activities include geological mapping, discontinuity characterization, stratigraphic interpretation, rock-mass description, and identification of faults or weathered zones. The resulting geological model provides the foundation for subsequent engineering analyses.

Geotechnical engineering and rock mechanics. This area evaluates the mechanical behavior of soils and rock masses under natural and engineered loading conditions.

Its principal concerns include bearing capacity, deformation, settlement, excavation stability, slope failure, and underground opening performance. Analysis depends on representative material parameters and an understanding of structural discontinuities.

Hydrogeology and groundwater engineering. Hydrogeology examines groundwater occurrence, movement, recharge, and interaction with geological formations. Engineering applications include dewatering, seepage assessment, groundwater protection, and evaluation of pore-pressure effects on stability. Groundwater conditions must be integrated with geological structures and mechanical models rather than analyzed independently.

Mineral-resource and mining engineering. This specialization evaluates mineral deposits, geological continuity, resource distribution, extraction feasibility, and geotechnical constraints. Geological uncertainty affects reserve estimation, mine planning, excavation stability, and environmental management. Resource models must therefore be updated when additional drilling or production observations become available.

Geological hazard and risk engineering. This area identifies and evaluates processes such as landslides, rockfalls, subsidence, erosion, seismic ground effects, and related geological threats. Risk assessment combines hazard likelihood, exposure, vulnerability, and potential consequences. Monitoring can support early identification of changing conditions but cannot eliminate uncertainty or guarantee prediction of sudden failures.

Environmental and computational geological engineering. Environmental applications address contamination pathways, geological storage, waste containment, land rehabilitation, and the interaction between infrastructure and natural systems. Computational methods connect these tasks to spatial analysis, numerical modeling, remote sensing, and data integration.

These areas overlap substantially. For example, tunnel design requires geological characterization, rock mechanics, groundwater assessment, hazard analysis, and environmental evaluation. The framework therefore treats specializations as coordinated functions rather than independent categories.

3.3 Proposed Integrated Geological Engineering Framework

The framework consists of five sequential but iterative layers.

Layer 1: Data acquisition and quality control. Information is collected from field mapping, boreholes, laboratory tests, geophysical surveys, remote sensing, and monitoring instruments. Each observation should retain its location, date, measurement method, uncertainty, and quality status. Inconsistent coordinate systems or undocumented measurement conditions can undermine later analysis.

Layer 2: Geological characterization and model construction. Validated observations are integrated into geological maps, stratigraphic interpretations, three-dimensional models, groundwater representations, and engineering-geological classifications. Alternative interpretations should be retained where the evidence does not support a single definitive model.

Layer 3: Engineering analysis and simulation. Suitable analytical methods are selected according to the problem. These may include limit-equilibrium analysis, finite-element or finite-difference modeling, groundwater-flow simulation, probabilistic risk assessment, and scenario comparison. The model's complexity should reflect data availability and the consequences of decision error.

Computational prototyping provides a useful methodological analogy. De Oliveira et al. (2014) describe network emulation and prototyping, demonstrating the importance of testing a system representation before operational use. For geological engineering, a comparable workflow would test alternative model configurations against independent observations before supporting high-consequence decisions. The analogy concerns workflow design, not proof that a particular geological simulation method is effective.

Layer 4: Monitoring and anomaly assessment. Field measurements are compared with expected ranges or model predictions. Potential deviations are screened for instrument malfunction, environmental variation, and physically meaningful changes. Where appropriate, statistical methods can help identify patterns that require further investigation. However, an alert should initiate verification rather than automatically establish that a geological hazard exists.

Layer 5: Decision support and model updating. Analytical results are translated into engineering actions, such as additional investigation, modified excavation sequences, drainage measures, slope reinforcement, or revised monitoring frequency. Subsequent observations are then used to evaluate predictions and update the geological model.

The layers form a feedback loop. New observations may require revision of geological interpretations, changes in simulation assumptions, or reconsideration of earlier engineering decisions. This iterative structure is more suitable for uncertain geological environments than a strictly linear workflow.

3.4 Evaluation Criteria and Illustrative Application

The framework can be evaluated through five criteria: geological-data quality, model agreement with observations, uncertainty characterization, operational usefulness, and traceability of decisions. Additional indicators may include false-alert frequency, detection delay, computational cost, and the time required to incorporate new measurements.

Consider a hypothetical highway project crossing a fractured rock slope. Initial mapping and borehole data establish the geological structure, while groundwater observations inform stability analysis. A numerical model estimates displacement under alternative rainfall and drainage scenarios. During construction, instruments record slope movement and groundwater pressure. If measurements diverge from predictions, engineers verify the sensors, inspect site conditions, and update the analysis before selecting an intervention.

This example illustrates the proposed workflow rather than a demonstrated case study. Its success would depend on the quality of geological characterization, the suitability of the model, and the timeliness of monitoring data. A prototype may support planning, but field verification remains essential.

4. Results

4.1 Functional Relationships Among Specializations

The conceptual analysis identifies geological characterization as the foundational function connecting the major specializations. Engineering geology provides the spatial and structural interpretation required by geotechnical analysis, hydrogeology, mining, and hazard assessment. These downstream applications generate additional observations that can, in turn, revise the original geological model.

The resulting relationship is reciprocal rather than hierarchical. Groundwater measurements may reveal previously unrecognized geological pathways; excavation may expose discontinuities absent from initial borehole records; and observed slope movement may indicate that assumed material properties or boundary conditions require reconsideration. An integrated framework should therefore support continuous model revision.

4.2 Potential Contributions of Computational Integration

The proposed framework indicates that computational integration can improve the organization and traceability of geological investigations when datasets and analytical models are connected through consistent procedures. Its main potential contribution is not the replacement of specialist judgment but the coordination of information that would otherwise remain fragmented.

The methodological analogy with network emulation is relevant here. De Oliveira et al. (2014) examine a platform for emulation and prototyping, providing a basis for considering how test environments can support technical development. In geological engineering, a prototype workflow could be used to compare model configurations, inspect data-transfer procedures, and identify inconsistencies before implementation in a live project. However, the analogy does not establish that such a workflow improves geological prediction without direct evaluation.

A further finding is that integration requires explicit uncertainty management. Combining multiple datasets does not necessarily increase accuracy if those datasets share systematic errors or rely on incompatible assumptions. A visually detailed three-dimensional model can communicate false precision when geological boundaries are poorly constrained. The framework must therefore preserve uncertainty alongside the geometric and numerical representation.

4.3 Monitoring and Anomaly Interpretation

The framework identifies monitoring as a link between predictive analysis and operational decision-making. Continuous measurements may reveal changes that periodic site inspections fail to capture, particularly where deformation or groundwater conditions evolve rapidly. Nevertheless, detection and interpretation are distinct tasks.

The supplied cybersecurity literature demonstrates that anomaly detection is an established concern in network environments (Giotis et al., 2014; Le and Zincir-Heywood, 2021). Its relevance to geological engineering is methodological: deviations from expected patterns may warrant investigation. Geological signals, however, are influenced by natural variability, measurement uncertainty, and interacting physical processes. A threshold suitable for one site cannot automatically be transferred to another.

Consequently, the framework treats automated alerts as decision-support inputs. Alert verification should include sensor-quality checks, comparison with neighboring

instruments, assessment of environmental conditions, and engineering interpretation. The framework does not establish a universal threshold or guarantee advance warning of geological failure.

4.4 Evaluation and Implementation Requirements

The analysis suggests that implementation should be assessed across technical, geological, and operational dimensions. Technical performance includes data-processing reliability, system availability, and computational efficiency. Geological performance concerns agreement between predictions and observations, the adequacy of uncertainty estimates, and the ability to represent relevant structures and processes. Operational performance concerns whether the information arrives in time to support a meaningful intervention.

The distinction between computational performance and real-world validity is essential. Yan et al. (2018) examine workload and resource consumption in a commercial web server, illustrating a performance-evaluation problem in computing. Geological systems may likewise encounter processing bottlenecks when large terrain datasets, monitoring streams, and numerical models are integrated. Yet efficient processing alone cannot establish that an engineering prediction is correct.

The proposed findings are therefore conceptual. No measured improvement in hazard detection, model accuracy, cost reduction, or project safety can be claimed from this review. Establishing such benefits requires field-based evaluation and comparison against existing geological engineering practices.

5. Discussion

5.1 Theoretical Implications

The framework presents geological engineering as a multidisciplinary process in which observation, interpretation, simulation, monitoring, and intervention are mutually dependent. This perspective helps explain why specialization-specific expertise must be preserved while information is coordinated across disciplinary boundaries.

The proposed architecture also distinguishes data integration from knowledge integration. Data integration concerns the technical combination of observations and models. Knowledge integration requires engineers to reconcile different conceptual assumptions, evaluate conflicting evidence, and determine whether a model is appropriate for a specific geological setting. A shared platform can support the first task, but the second

requires geological expertise and transparent decision rules.

Systems-oriented approaches from computer networking provide limited methodological inspiration. Berde et al. (2014) discuss a distributed software-defined networking architecture, while Chowdhary et al. (2016) examine a scalable defense solution for cloud networks. Their technical findings should not be generalized to geological systems. At most, they illustrate that complex technical environments require explicit coordination mechanisms and that system architecture influences how components interact.

5.2 Practical Implications for Engineering Projects

In infrastructure development, the proposed framework could organize the relationship between preliminary investigation, detailed design, construction monitoring, and operational maintenance. For a tunnel project, geological characterization would establish rock-mass conditions, groundwater analysis would estimate seepage behavior, and mechanical modeling would assess excavation stability. Monitoring during excavation would then provide evidence for revising support measures or construction sequences.

In mining, the framework could connect geological resource models with excavation planning, slope monitoring, groundwater management, and environmental controls. In landslide-prone areas, it could coordinate terrain analysis, field mapping, rainfall information, displacement measurements, and consequence-based risk assessment. These examples illustrate possible applications; their effectiveness would depend on site-specific validation.

The framework is especially relevant where engineering decisions must be updated as new evidence becomes available. Nevertheless, not every project requires a complex digital platform. Small projects with limited data or straightforward geological conditions may be better served by conventional mapping, targeted investigations, and transparent engineering calculations. Technology adoption should therefore be proportional to project complexity, uncertainty, and potential consequences.

5.3 Transferability and Methodological Limitations

A critical limitation is the disciplinary mismatch between the supplied references and the paper's subject. Most references address cybersecurity, network architecture, intrusion detection, or server performance. They do not provide direct evidence on rock mechanics, hydrogeological processes, geological mapping, mineral-resource estimation, or geohazard prediction.

Their inclusion can justify discussion of general computational concepts only when that transfer is explicitly qualified.

The analogy with anomaly detection is particularly limited. In a network, an unusual event may indicate unauthorized activity or a technical fault. In a geological environment, an unusual measurement may reflect an entirely natural process, an instrument problem, or a change in physical stability. These explanations cannot be distinguished through statistical deviation alone. Geological interpretation and field verification are indispensable.

Similarly, computational emulation does not guarantee that a geological model reproduces the actual subsurface. Natural geological materials exhibit heterogeneity, discontinuities, scale effects, and incomplete observability. Even sophisticated numerical models may generate misleading results when input parameters or boundary conditions are poorly constrained. Independent validation and uncertainty analysis are therefore central requirements, not optional additions.

5.4 Research and Implementation Priorities

Future research should test the proposed framework using geological engineering case studies supported by appropriate domain-specific literature. A first stage could evaluate data integration and model traceability in a slope-stability or tunnel-construction project. A second stage could compare predictions with independent field measurements under changing groundwater or loading conditions. A third stage could assess whether monitoring alerts produce earlier or more appropriate interventions than existing procedures.

Evaluation should include false-positive and false-negative alerts, model calibration, uncertainty coverage, prediction error, operational response time, and the cost of additional investigation. Results should be reported separately for different geological settings rather than generalized from one site. Data governance, sensor reliability, software interoperability, and the expertise required to maintain computational systems also warrant attention.

Overall, the framework is best understood as a testable organizational proposal. It establishes relationships among geological specializations and identifies potential roles for computational integration, but it does not establish the superiority of a particular technology or method. Empirical validation is necessary before drawing conclusions about safety improvements, economic benefits, or predictive performance.

6. Conclusion

This review developed a conceptual framework for organizing geological engineering specializations around geological characterization, engineering analysis, computational simulation, monitoring, and decision support. The framework connects engineering geology, geotechnical engineering, hydrogeology, mining, geological hazard assessment, and environmental applications through an iterative workflow in which observations inform models and field evidence supports subsequent revisions.

The principal contribution is the identification of functional relationships across specializations and the distinction between technical integration and geological validation. Computational prototyping, performance assessment, and anomaly detection offer methodological ideas for designing coordinated workflows, but the supplied references do not directly validate their application to geological engineering. Accordingly, the proposed framework should not be interpreted as an empirically demonstrated solution.

Future studies should apply the framework to real geological projects, incorporate relevant geological and geotechnical evidence, and evaluate its performance using transparent criteria. Particular priorities include uncertainty-aware modeling, field-validated monitoring, reproducible data management, and decision processes that retain expert interpretation. Such work could establish whether an integrated framework offers measurable benefits over existing geological engineering practices.

References

1. S. Achleitner, T. F. La Porta, P. McDaniel, S. Sugrim, S. V. Krishnamurthy, and R. Chadha, "Deceiving Network Reconnaissance Using SDN-Based Virtual Topologies," *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 1098–1112, Dec. 2017,
2. H. Alavizadeh, J. Jang-Jaccard, and D. S. Kim, "Evaluation for Combination of Shuffle and Diversity on Moving Target Defense Strategy for Cloud Computing," in *17th IEEE International Conference On Trust, Security And Privacy In Computing And Communications/ 12th IEEE International Conference On Big Data Science And Engineering (TrustCom/BigDataSE)*, New York, NY, USA, Aug. 2018, pp. 573–578,

3. P. Berde et al., "ONOS: towards an open, distributed SDN OS," in 3rd workshop on Hot topics in software defined networking, Chicago, IL, USA, Aug. 2014, pp. 1–6,
4. A. Chowdhary, S. Pisharody, and D. Huang, "SDN based Scalable MTD solution in Cloud Network," in ACM Workshop on Moving Target Defense, Vienna, Austria, Oct. 2016, pp. 27–36,
5. C. Nedelcu, Nginx HTTP Server, Second edition. Birmingham, UK: Packt Publishing, 2013.
6. R. L. S. de Oliveira, C. M. Schweitzer, A. A. Shinoda, and L. R. Prete, "Using Mininet for emulation and prototyping Software-Defined Networks," in IEEE Colombian Conference on Communications and Computing, Bogota, Colombia, Jun. 2014, pp. 1–6,
7. K. Giotis, C. Argyropoulos, G. Androuridakis, D. Kalogeras, and V. Maglaris, "Combining OpenFlow and sFlow for an effective and scalable anomaly detection and mitigation mechanism on SDN environments," Computer Networks, vol. 62, pp. 122–136, Apr. 2014,
8. T. Jinmei and P. Vixie, "Implementation and evaluation of moderate parallelism in the BIND9 DNS server," in USENIX Annual Technical Conference, Berkeley, CA, United States, Jun. 2006, pp. 115–128.
9. D. C. Le and N. Zincir-Heywood, "Anomaly Detection for Insider Threats Using Unsupervised Ensembles," IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 1152–1164, Jun. 2021,
10. G. Lencse and S. Repas, "Performance analysis and comparison of four DNS64 implementations under different free operating systems," Telecommunication Systems, vol. 63, no. 4, pp. 557–577, Dec. 2016,
11. G. F. Lyon, Nmap network scanning: Official Nmap project guide to network discovery and security scanning. Sunnyvale, CA, USA: Insecure. Com LLC, 2008.
12. K. Park, S. Woo, D. Moon, and H. Choi, "Secure Cyber Deception Architecture and Decoy Injection to Mitigate the Insider Threat," Symmetry, vol. 10, no. 1, Jan. 2018, Art. no. 14,
13. M. Roesch, "Snort – Lightweight Intrusion Detection for Networks," in Lisa, Washington, DC, USA, Nov. 1999, pp. 229–238.
14. S. Son and V. Shmatikov, "The Hitchhiker's Guide to DNS Cache Poisoning," in International Conference on Security and Privacy in Communication Systems, Singapore, Singapore, Sep. 2010, pp. 466–483,
15. S. Wasko et al., "Using alternate reality games to find a needle in a haystack: An approach for testing insider threat detection methods," Computers & Security, vol. 107, Aug. 2021, Art. no. 102314,
16. Y. Yan, P. Guo, B. Cheng, and Z. Zheng, "An experimental case study on the relationship between workload and resource consumption in a commercial web server," Journal of Computational Science, vol. 25, pp. 183–192, Mar. 2018,
17. R. R. Zebari, S. R. M. Zeebaree, and K. Jacksi, "Impact Analysis of HTTP and SYN Flood DDoS Attacks on Apache 2 and IIS 10.0 Web Servers," in International Conference on Advanced Science and Engineering, Duhok, Iraq, Oct. 2018, pp. 156–161,
18. A. Nicolaou, S. Shiaeles, and N. Savage, "Mitigating Insider Threats Using Bio-Inspired Models," Applied Sciences, vol. 10, no. 15, Jan. 2020, Art. no. 5046,