

A Study of the Landscape of Privacy Policies of Smart Devices

Aamir Hamid^{1,*}, Hemanth Reddy Samidi¹, Tim Finin¹, Primal Pappachan^{2,†}, Roberto Yus¹

¹University of Maryland, Baltimore County, ²Portland State University
{ahamid2, finin, hsamidi1, ryus}@umbc.edu, primal@pdx.edu

1 ABSTRACT

As the adoption of smart devices continues to permeate all aspects of our lives, user privacy concerns have become more pertinent than ever. Privacy policies outline the data handling practices of these devices. Prior work in the domains of websites and mobile apps has shown that privacy policies are rarely read and understood by users. In these domains, automatic analysis of privacy policies has been shown to help give users appropriate insights. However, there is a lack of such an analysis in the domain of smart device privacy policies. This paper presents a comprehensive study of the landscape of privacy policies of smart devices. We introduce a methodology that addresses the unique challenges of smart devices, by finding information about them, their manufacturers, and their privacy policies on the Web. Our methodology utilizes state-of-the-art analysis techniques to assess readability and privacy of smart device policies and compares it policies of e-commerce websites and mobile applications. Overall, we analyzed 4,556 smart devices, 2,211 manufacturers, and 819 privacy policies. Despite smart devices having access to more intrusive data about their users (using sensors such as cameras and microphones), more than 1,167 of the analyzed manufacturers did not have policies available. The study highlights that significant improvement is required on communicating the data management practices of smart devices.

2 INTRODUCTION

The Internet of Things (IoT) has gained rapid popularity in recent years. *Smart* IoT devices are now utilized in transportation, industrial processes, smart homes, and health care. Smart devices have advanced capabilities that include, in general, the collection of information, usage of cutting-edge technologies, such as Artificial Intelligence (AI) to process such data, and automation of tasks to provide personalized user experiences [1]. More than 40 million households in the US have adopted smart home devices, which is expected to reach 64.1 million by 2025 [2]. The growing use of smart technology also poses privacy risks [3, 4]. IoT devices collect large amounts of diverse data, and consumers sometimes do not understand what data is being collected in their environment [5]. Data collection from IoT devices could lead to unbounded profiling of customers by businesses or disruption of regular operations by malicious entities [6, 7]. Consequently, consumers are concerned about the privacy risks of owning and using IoT devices [8].

Privacy policies have traditionally provided information on the data collected/used/shared by services such as e-commerce and

mobile applications, and extensive analysis has been performed on them [9–11]. However, to the authors’ knowledge, privacy policies of IoT devices (e.g., smart home devices) have not received as much attention despite the privacy challenge they pose. Arguably, the most important work is that of the Mozilla Privacy Not Included project [12] in which human analysts study smart devices w.r.t their privacy, security, and usage of AI. However, manual analysis is not scalable to the increasing number of IoT devices in the market. Mozilla reported that their human analysts spent 68,160 minutes (47 days) reading and analyzing privacy policies in 2022. Hence, automatic collection and analysis of IoT privacy policies is required. While state-of-the-art analysis techniques for privacy policies used in other domains could be used for smart device policies, they present a unique challenge in finding and collecting them. In other domains where privacy policies have been studied, such as websites and mobile applications, the relevant policies are associated with the website or application of interest, making it relatively easy to find and collect those policies. For smart devices, this presents a unique challenge because while the devices are sold on e-commerce websites, their privacy policies resides on the manufacturer website. Thus finding and collecting policies in the smart devices domain requires an entirely new approach.

This study aims to bridge the existing knowledge gap by providing an in-depth analysis of smart device privacy policies. We are specifically interested in understanding how easy it is for users to find these policies at the time of purchasing a smart device, how difficult these policies are to be processed, what these policies describe about the data collection practices, and how these policies compare with established domains such as mobile apps and Web services. Accordingly, our study aims to answer two main research questions: **What is the state of smart device privacy policies?** and **How do smart device privacy policies compare to those of more consolidated domains?** To answer the questions, we integrate smart device privacy policy collection techniques with existing methodologies for analysis to derive insights. In particular, we develop and implement a framework, PrivacyLens, based on state-of-the-art techniques, which automates the collection, analysis, and publication of insights about smart device privacy policies. PrivacyLens searches e-commerce websites for smart devices, extracts metadata, finds their manufacturers’ websites, and retrieves privacy policies from them. It uses the Wayback Machine [13] to obtain archived past privacy policies for the manufacturers to enable longitudinal analysis, such as policy evolution and the impact of privacy regulations. Using natural language processing (NLP) and machine learning (ML) techniques, PrivacyLens extracts different features of each privacy policy, including their overall quality, readability, and ambiguity. In summary, the main contributions of this paper are as follows:

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.



YYYY(X), 1–22

© YYYY Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

YYYY(X)

- This is, up to the author’s knowledge, the first comprehensive analysis of the landscape of privacy policies of smart devices involving more than 4,556 smart devices from 28 categories, 2,211 manufacturers, and 1,131 privacy policies (from which 312 are archived versions).
- We compare smart device policies against 100 privacy policies of the major e-commerce websites and 350 privacy policies of current Android applications.
- We introduce a methodology to find, extract, and analyze smart device privacy policies, including past versions, using state-of-the-art techniques.
- We develop an open source framework implementing this methodology that can be used for future analysis.

Additionally, we provide a discussion with several important observations from the study focusing on the challenges that customers might face finding and understanding the privacy policies of smart devices. We also discuss about the observed similarities with other domains which indicate the usage of policy ‘templates’.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 3 reviews the state of the art in privacy policy collection and analysis. Section 4 describes the methodology used to conduct the study. Section 5 and Section 6 explain findings and insights from privacy policies. In Section Section 7, we provide a discussion on challenges and opportunities. Finally, Section Section 8 concludes the paper and presents directions for future research

3 RELATED WORK

Privacy policy research increasingly relies on automated frameworks and content analysis to thoroughly assess policy clarity, compliance, data practices, and user-centric aspects across different sectors. While e-commerce and mobile applications have been extensively studied, the smart device domain remains less explored. The notable exception is the work of Kuznetsov et al. [14], who analyzed 592 privacy policies from various IoT device manufacturers. Our approach, similar to theirs, utilizes e-commerce websites to identify smart devices and extract relevant manufacturer privacy policies. However, our collection framework includes unique features: a module to determine if a device qualifies as “smart” (which resulted in a larger number of products analyzed), language detection to ensure policy texts are in English, and automatic segmentation of privacy texts. Diverging from Kuznetsov et al., we also collect and analyze historical versions of these policies to trace their evolution. Our analysis not only examines the readability of the privacy policies but also delves into their data management practices and updates, offering a comprehensive overview of the privacy landscape in the smart device sector.

As mentioned before, e-commerce and websites have received special attention. For instance, in [15] the authors examined the impact of privacy policy formats on user trust in online services. Their study involved 717 participants and compared conventional policies against those offering greater user control and personalization. In [16], the authors analyzed privacy policies from e-commerce websites to understand data collection and use purposes. Employing content analysis, they identified six unique data purpose categories and observed specific language patterns for expressing these. In [11]

the authors investigated various quantitative approaches to measure privacy policy readability. It identified the challenge of varying results based on measurement methods and proposed a combined system for a comprehensive company assessment. In [17], the authors investigated the prevalence and quality of privacy policies for mobile health apps on iOS and Android platforms. They reviewed 600 apps to assess the availability, scope, and transparency of their privacy policies. [18] investigated the impact of privacy policies on users’ understanding of privacy practices. The authors analyzed the effects of data practice annotation, highlighting and describing the extracted data practices to help users better understand privacy-policy documents.

The approach in [19] enhances previous research in NLP, privacy preference modelling, crowdsourcing, and privacy interface design, specifically targeting website privacy policies. It extends existing research on user preference modelling in website privacy policies and incorporates innovative approaches such as semi-automated feature extraction and privacy notice design based on extracted policy features. Polisis [20] uses a neural network hierarchy to extract high-level privacy practices and precise data from 130k website privacy policies and has an interface for both structured and free-form querying of privacy policies. PI-Extract [18] is a fully automated system to extract fine-grained personal data phrases and their corresponding practices from website privacy policies. It is based on a neural model that outperforms rule-based baselines in accurately extracting privacy practices. In study[21], the authors investigated user attitudes and perceptions toward privacy policies to enhance user awareness and understanding. They analyzed data from 655 participants to understand the factors influencing users’ willingness to read privacy policies, including the effects of prior experiences like cyber-attacks and data-sharing practices. In [22], the authors deal with the problem of extracting transparency information from website privacy policies by proposing a ‘Human-in-the-Loop’ approach that combines machine learning-generated suggestions with human annotation decisions. Their prototype system streamlines the annotation process by providing meaningful predictions to users, resulting in improved performance compared to other extraction models for legal documents. In [23], the authors propose a method for analyzing privacy policies through an integrated approach. They introduce PoliGraph, a knowledge graph for mapping relations within privacy policy texts, and PoliGraph-er, an NLP tool for automatic PoliGraph generation. This study redefines ontologies to understand the context of privacy policies and application domains.

As we will describe in the following sections, we leverage and adapt some of the previously reviewed state-of-the-art techniques and combine them into a single framework to collect and analyze smart device privacy policies.

4 METHODOLOGY

Our study’s methodology (illustrated in Figure 1) follows the conventional two-step process of policy collection and analysis, as established in prior research [11, 16, 17]. We have developed a framework, PrivacyLens, encapsulating all these steps. This framework is publicly available to support further privacy policy studies¹.

¹<https://anonymous.4open.science/r/privacy-lens-81F4>




Figure 1: A high-level overview of our methodology to find, collect, and analyze smart device privacy policies.

Besides analyzing smart device privacy policies, we also use this tool to examine 350 Android app privacy policies (from [24]) and 100 policies from top e-commerce websites listed on *semrush*². We also expanded our dataset by incorporating policies from 10 smart connected cars, recognizing them as integral components of the broader smart device ecosystem. These additional analyses facilitate a comparative study.

4.1 Policy Collection

IoT product information extraction. We designed and implemented a multi-threaded web scraper with a specialization in extracting data related to smart devices from popular e-commerce platforms such as Amazon and Walmart. The web scraper’s code establishes a connection, utilizing *WebDriverManager*³, to a Firefox browser for data extraction. Subsequently, it uses *Selenium*⁴ to manipulate the web browser programmatically, initiating searches for smart devices based on a predefined list of relevant categories as search queries. This list incorporates keywords prefixed with the terms ‘Smart’, ‘Connected’, ‘WiFi-Enabled’, ‘Internet-Ready’, ‘IoT’, ‘Wireless’, ‘Cloud-Based’, ‘Bluetooth-Enabled’, ‘Remote-Controlled’, ‘Networked’, ‘Digital’. These prefixes are combined with various product types, including body scanners, cameras, connected vehicles, doorbells, entertainment devices, fitness equipment, gaming technology, health trackers, home devices, lights, location trackers, locks, monitors, mounts, networking devices, projectors, scales, security systems, sensors, speakers, thermostats, TVs, and watches, resulting in a total of 53 search keywords.

After executing each search, the system parses the resulting HTML code using *BeautifulSoup*⁵ to extract the URLs of individual products listed on the web page. We explore the first 40 pages of results per keyword. The system then navigates to each product’s

URL using the web driver to collect metadata, including the manufacturer’s name and country of origin, from the HTML markup. Furthermore, the system extracts additional information, when available, to determine whether a specific product qualifies as a “smart” device. This determination is essential because e-commerce platforms sometimes return products that lack Internet connectivity and do not meet the criteria for being classified as “smart”. For example, on Amazon, we aim to extract information contained in the description fields related to *connectivity technology*, *connectivity protocol*, and *wireless communication technology*. Additionally, the system leverages textual descriptions of the products through preprocessing steps such as lemmatization, tokenization, removal of stopwords, and TF-IDF vectorization. Each product is assigned a score based on the frequency and importance of IoT-relevant keywords in its description, including “wifi”, “bluetooth”, “voice-controlled”, and “app-controlled” (the complete list is available in Appendix Table 11). To classify a product as a smart device, a threshold score of 0.4, determined experimentally, is employed. This threshold balances precision and comprehensive coverage in the identification process.

At the conclusion of this stage, the system provides, for each identified smart device, its respective e-commerce URL, name, manufacturer, and country of origin. The initial set of 53 search keywords underwent a meticulous analysis and condensation process, resulting in the creation of 28 distinct categories, each dedicated to a specific type of device.

Manufacturer’s website extraction. To locate the manufacturer’s website, PrivacyLens executes a Google search query that combines the manufacturer’s name and device type (e.g., ‘fitbit’ + ‘smart watch’). Next, the web scraper analyzes the HTML markup of the first page of results to identify all URLs. For each URL, PrivacyLens calculates a value representing the likelihood of it being the official manufacturer’s website. This determination is made by comparing the manufacturer’s name to the domain using the

²<https://www.semrush.com/blog/most-visited-websites/>

³<https://bonigarcia.dev/webdrivermanager/>

⁴<https://www.selenium.dev>

⁵<https://www.crummy.com/software/BeautifulSoup/>

YYYY(X)

Ratcliff/Obershelp algorithm [25]. The URL with the highest calculated value is selected if it surpasses a predefined threshold (0.8), which we determined experimentally (see Appendix C.2 for further details).

Privacy policy extraction and cleaning. Once the website’s URL is obtained, our system proceeds to parse its HTML content using BeautifulSoup. The goal is to identify "href" elements that are likely to point to privacy policies. To achieve this, the system employs a predefined set of keywords, which includes terms like "privacy", "policy", "data", and "protection". This keyword search is further enriched with multilingual options to broaden the scope of the search. The script analyzes both hyperlink texts and URLs using a two-step approach, English and Multilingual, alongside a contextual analysis that assesses the adjacent text and HTML structure to determine link relevance to privacy policies. Following this analysis, a validation and normalization process is applied to correct any relative links. This ensures that all links are appended to the site’s base URL, guaranteeing the accurate retrieval of complete and functional privacy policy URLs.

The text extraction task is carried out using boilerpy3⁶, a version of the Boilerpipe library, and it employs the Canola extractor⁷ due to its efficiency in isolating relevant content from web pages. The process begins with a GET request to each URL, and the module handles issues such as malformed URLs or incorrect HTTP responses adeptly. The Canola extractor then analyzes the web page, effectively separating the main content from extraneous elements such as ads, navigation links, and headers. It utilizes algorithms that assess text density, page layout, and HTML indicators to precisely identify the core text. This identified text is processed using the Canola extractor’s "get_content" function, which is essential for detecting and rectifying any extraction errors. The resulting output is a clean and accurate extraction of the text content, prepared for further analysis.

Language detection. The objective of language detection was to ensure that we exclusively review privacy policies that are available in English. Our language detection method employs a majority voting system combining six libraries: Langdetect⁸, CLD3⁹, LangID¹⁰, Guess-language¹¹, fastText¹², and Textacy¹³. Each has a unique approach: Langdetect uses n-gram models and probabilistic algorithms; CLD3 excels in web content with compact algorithms; LangID and Guess-language offer quick identification with heuristic methods; FastText’s deep learning is effective for context-rich text; Textacy analyzes linguistic features. The system aggregates each library’s independent language predictions, determining the final language based on the most common prediction.

Policy detection. We employ the method outlined in [26] for policy detection, focusing on key-phrase extraction and efficient feature selection. This approach uses a uniform threshold for key

⁶<https://pypi.org/project/boilerpy3/>

⁷<https://rdr.io/rforge/boilerpipeR/man/CanolaExtractor.html>

⁸<https://pypi.org/project/langdetect/>

⁹<https://pypi.org/project/pyclD3/>

¹⁰<https://pypi.org/project/langid/>

¹¹<https://pypi.org/project/guess-language/>

¹²<https://pypi.org/project/fasttext/>

¹³<https://pypi.org/project/textacy/>

phrase extraction across different algorithms, complemented by comprehensive lemmatization to minimize feature redundancy. Adopting a binary feature matrix, which marks the presence or absence of key phrases, avoids the limitations of frequency-based methods. Feature selection through ANOVA F-value is instrumental in isolating the most relevant phrases. Additionally, an ensemble soft voting classifier, combining multiple models like the linear support vector machine, random forest, and logistic regression, enhances accuracy and adaptability in diverse linguistic contexts. Our application of these techniques aims to achieve a more precise identification of privacy and cookie policies.

Past privacy policy extraction. To gather historical privacy policies, PrivacyLens uses the Wayback Machine [13], an Internet archive containing older snapshots of websites. For each manufacturer URL obtained in the previous step, PrivacyLens queries the Wayback Machine to get snapshots at different points in time¹⁴. PrivacyLens initiates one query per year for the past ten years, in addition to additional queries for the months leading up to and following the implementation of significant data privacy regulations, such as the GDPR [27] and CCPA [28]. Once the different snapshots are retrieved, PrivacyLens uses the process explained before to locate the privacy policy within the website and then clean it for further analysis.

4.2 Policy Analysis

Our methodology employs Natural Language Processing (NLP) and Machine Learning (ML) techniques to analyze privacy policies, extracting key insights. The objective is to assess the document’s readability and evaluate its compliance with privacy standards.

4.2.1 Privacy Analysis. We extract the following privacy features of a smart device policy.

Topic Coverage and Keyword Usage. We employed Natural Language Processing (NLP) techniques, including stop words removal and lemmatization, to preprocess privacy policy texts. Our methodology integrated seed keywords, drawing on previous research [29, 30], and added two new categories focusing on IoT-related data practices [31] and legal compliance (as detailed in Table 5). We used Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) for topic modeling to uncover thematic structures within the privacy policies, enabling comparisons of keyword coverage across datasets. For quantitative analysis, sklearn’s CountVectorizer tool¹⁵ measured the frequency of our extended seed keywords. This facilitated a systematic comparison of keyword prevalence and thematic emphasis across different privacy policy categories, providing a comprehensive understanding of their content focus.

Privacy Policy Similarity and Clustering. Our methodology uses a mixed-methods approach to analyze and cluster privacy policies from diverse digital platforms, including smart devices, mobile apps, and e-commerce websites. The approach combines semantic text

¹⁴We opt to use the manufacturer’s URL rather than the privacy policy URL since we observed that privacy policy URLs changed over the years on a significant number of sites.

¹⁵https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.feature_extraction.text.CountVectorizer.html

similarity with quantitative clustering techniques. For the semantic text similarity analysis, we encoded privacy policy texts using the SentenceTransformer model *all-MiniLM-L6v2*¹⁶. This model is particularly adept at mapping sentences and paragraphs to a dense vector space, facilitating a detailed analysis of semantic similarities. The choice of this model was driven by its advanced capabilities in semantic understanding, essential for accurately interpreting the complex language often found in privacy policies. The resulting tensor-encoded texts were then analyzed using a cosine similarity metric, with the findings visualized in a heatmap. This visualization clearly represented the semantic relationships between different policies, aiding in identifying common patterns and structures.

In the second phase, we concentrated on clustering the privacy policies. This involved categorizing the policies and processing them for textual analysis, followed by using sklearn's CountVectorizer to filter out stopwords, ensuring a clean dataset for subsequent steps, and adjusting the data to align with the corpus' structure, which revealed around 7,000 distinct features per policy. We employed UMAP[32], known for its efficiency in handling complex data, to transform the texts for clustering analysis. We choose HDBSCAN[33] for its ability to handle complex, hierarchical data structures in an unsupervised clustering approach. Our analysis utilized two clustering methods: one based on the textual content of the policies and the other incorporating additional extracted features like reading level and entropy. This dual approach enabled us to compare the effectiveness of text-based clustering against a feature-enhanced clustering method, providing a comprehensive understanding of the underlying groupings in privacy policy texts.

Tracking Changes in Privacy Policies. Regular updates to privacy policies are crucial for keeping users informed about the handling and use of their data. Our method uses advanced NLP techniques, including context analysis and pattern matching, to pinpoint the exact dates of policy updates and monitor any changes, offering a detailed overview of these modifications. The introduction of new data protection laws is a key factor influencing policy changes. Presently, over 150 countries have enacted such regulations [34]. PrivacyLens leverages a deep learning approach with the Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT) model [35], fine-tuned using the Semantic Textual Similarity Benchmark dataset (STS-B) [36]. This method assesses alterations in smart device privacy policies before and after the implementation of specific regulations (e.g., GDPR). By computing a semantic similarity score for policy pairs (pre- and post-event), we quantitatively measure the extent of these changes.

4.2.2 Readability Analysis. PrivacyLens analyzes policy readability extracting eight features.

Entropy. In privacy policy analysis, entropy is a vital metric quantifying textual uncertainty and complexity, highlighting potential interpretive challenges for users. It represents the average information produced per letter in a text, reflecting the uncertainty or disorder within a document. We use Shannon's method to calculate the entropy of English text [37].

Reading Time. Privacy policies, often lengthy and time-consuming, challenge users in making informed decisions [38]. PrivacyLens calculates reading time using an average pace of 238 words per minute (WPM) [39].

Unique Words. Privacy policies often utilize technical jargon to explain data usage and control, making them difficult for consumers to understand. Unique, low-frequency words in these documents are key to understanding, as they provide essential context and learning aspects [40]. However, their rarity makes comprehension challenging, as it requires a deep understanding of specialized vocabulary. To analyze these policies, the text is first converted to lowercase, with stop words, punctuation, and numbers removed. It is then tokenized [41] for standardization using the Spacy library [42]. Afterwards, PrivacyLens identifies unique words – those with distinct character sequences – and counts them to determine the document's distinct vocabulary size. Additionally, the system calculates the ratio of unique word count to total word count, providing a quantitative measure of the text's lexical diversity.

Coherence Score. Topic modeling uses a coherence score, to measure how comprehensible a topic is to people, based on word similarity within a topic and their document frequency [43]. The Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) method, a form of unsupervised machine learning, assists in text analysis by determining the most representative topics [44]. This technique creates a Dirichlet distribution for documents across topics, with topics and words emerging from multinomial distributions. The coherence score, summing up scores between all word pairs, assesses the quality of topics learned. The CV measure, which utilizes cosine similarity and normalized pointwise mutual information (NPMI) based on word co-occurrences, calculates this score. The overall coherence of a privacy policy is then computed as $\sum_{i < j} \text{score}(w_i, w_j)$, where w_i and w_j are words at positions i and j , respectively, in the text. Regarding readability, a high coherence score implies a well-structured and clear flow of ideas, enhancing readability. Conversely, a low score might indicate a disjointed or unclear thought progression, making the text harder to comprehend.

Frequency of Imprecise Words. Vague language, using words like "commonly" or "normally," can lead to ambiguity in understanding a service provider's operations. PrivacyLens utilizes NLTK for text tokenization and regex to count the frequency of such imprecise words (see Table 3 for the full list), thereby quantifying their presence in a privacy policy.

Connective Words Frequency. Although connective words like "and" or "then" aid in forming coherent sentences, their excessive use can lead to text complexity. PrivacyLens counts the frequency of such connective words, using a predefined list (see Table 4), similar to the approach used for the previous feature.

Grammatical Errors. The integrity of a work depends on proper grammar, much as it does on word spelling [45]. PrivacyLens takes privacy document as input and then uses the NLTK library for tokenization (i.e., breaking the text into sentences) and the language_tool_python library to check for grammatical errors. It counts the

¹⁶<https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/all-MiniLM-L12-v2>

YYYY(X)

total number of sentences and the number of sentences that contain at least one mistake, providing a measure of the grammatical correctness of the input text.

Readability. Readability signifies how easily a text, like a policy, can be understood based on its vocabulary, syntax, and sentence structure. Various readability tests exist [46], devised by linguists, each considering different text aspects. We employed the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level [47], which presents the score as a U.S. grade level. This metric represents the educational level required to understand a text and is computed using the following formula:

$$FKGL = 0.39 \left(\frac{\text{total words}}{\text{total sentences}} \right) + 11.8 \left(\frac{\text{total syllables}}{\text{total words}} \right) - 15.59 \quad (1)$$

Here 0.39 and 11.8 are weights for the average sentence length and syllables per word, respectively, and -15.59 calibrates the score to U.S. grade levels.

Ambiguity. While privacy policies should clearly state the data handling practices, they often contain ambiguous language [48]. PrivacyLens uses a supervised learning approach to classify a privacy policy based on a scale with three ambiguity levels (*not ambiguous*, *somewhat ambiguous*, and *very ambiguous*) presented in [49]. We annotated 100 IoT device policies extracted from PrivacyLens and trained a random forest classifier [50] and a Support Vector Classifier [51] classifier. SVC works by finding the hyperplane that best separates different classes in the feature space, making it effective for complex classification problems. Random Forest is an ensemble learning method that builds multiple decision trees and merges them to get a more accurate and stable prediction, making it robust against overfitting and effective in handling large datasets with higher dimensionality. PrivacyLens applies both classifiers to each privacy policy and stores their output labels.

5 ANALYSIS OF SMART DEVICE POLICIES

This section analyzes the smart device privacy policies extracted and their historical evolution. The data used in this analysis can be accessed and visualized at <https://privacy-lens.web.app/home>.

5.1 How Difficult is it to Find the Policies?

Our methodology for privacy policy searching and collection (see Section 4) resulted in 4,556 smart devices (after filtering). Remember that this number of devices covers everything in the 40 first pages of results of the e-commerce platform for each of the 53 search queries run. Hence, we believe that this dataset contains the majority of smart devices in the market at the moment the study was performed. We split the smart devices into 28 categories, including smart cameras, smart home devices, and smart lights (see Appendix Table 13 for all the categories).

From the list of devices, we identified 2,211 unique manufacturers. The minimum, maximum, and median number of devices per manufacturer are 1, 237, and 1, respectively. Among these manufacturers, we found a website for 1,044 (47%) and could only find links to privacy policies in 906 (40%). Additionally, in our experiment, we could only access 819 of those links (37% of the manufacturers). Some were inaccessible due to broken links, HTTP errors, or removed content. This highlights an important problem with smart devices and privacy: most manufacturers do not have an online

privacy policy for their products that customers can access before a purchase. We acknowledge that, in some cases, the privacy policy might be available in some other form once the device is purchased.

Of 819 smart device privacy policies, only 405 explicitly mention that the policy applies to the smart device itself. This shows that most of the privacy policies either do not explicitly mention or just describe the data management practices of the website. Figure 2 shows the number of privacy policies per smart device category and the number explicitly mentioning the device. “Smart Home Device” is the category with the largest number of products for which we could find a privacy policy followed by cameras and speakers. The distribution between explicit and non-explicit mentions of the device within the policy is balanced for the three. The categories with the highest percentage of policies with explicit mentions are “Smart Light” and “Smart Thermostat”, which generally are devices without sensors that people might consider intrusive (like cameras or microphones). On the other hand, categories like “Smart Sensor” and “Smart Doorbell” have relatively few mentions. In general, we observe that many of the policies related to devices that people might consider intrusive (e.g., cameras, speakers, assistants, health trackers) do not explicitly mention the devices.




Figure 2: Distribution of policies based on the type of smart device.

We further investigate the distribution of policies depending on their mention type by country of origin of the smart device manufacturer (see Figure 3). Note that the figure’s Y-axis is on a logarithmic scale due to some countries’ small number of policies. We first observe that most manufacturers are from the USA (311) or China (144). The largest and lowest categories of devices manufactured by companies in the USA are “Smart Home Devices” (25.08%) and “Smart Lights” (6.43%). In the case of China, the categories are “Smart Cameras” (16.67%) and “Smart Lights” (11.81%). Most countries contained only one manufacturer in the extracted dataset (e.g., Australia, Cyprus, Finland, Indonesia, Jordan, Lithuania, Singapore, and Slovakia). The countries with the highest number of policies explicitly mentioning smart devices are China (50.6%) and the Netherlands (100%). Note that the countries with the lowest mentions within the European Union include France and the UK, which is unexpected due to the stringent privacy legislation in the EU (i.e., GDPR).

Since our analysis was executed in the US, we further explored whether the policies obtained would have been different from other




Figure 3: Distribution of policies based on manufacturer’s country.

regions. We randomly sampled 50 manufacturers and used VPNs to collect their policies simulating access from the country of origin of the manufacturer. We then used cosine distances to test for similarities. Our results, as shown in Figure 4, revealed that most smart devices (92%) had consistent policies across regions, with some exceptions (8%). In these cases, about 40% of the policy content was similar, indicating changes were more about additions or deletions rather than complete rewrites. These variations seem to be strategic adjustments by manufacturers to comply with local laws and consumer preferences, while keeping a consistent core framework. For example, Hyundai’s policies vary because the one showed in the US includes California-specific practices, in line with the state’s privacy laws. Toyota’s terms offer a broad legal framework, with additional details for the UK to comply with EU and UK data protection laws. AquaSound has a general privacy policy and a detailed cookie policy, likely due to EU GDPR requirements. Notably, most devices with regional policy differences are from Asia, reflecting manufacturers’ efforts to meet both regional legal requirements and local data privacy concerns.




Figure 4: Heatmap of Regional Policy Variations for Smart Device Manufacturers.

5.2 How Readable are the Policies?

Table 1 contains a summary of the readability metrics extracted for the 819 smart device privacy policies. The Coherence Score, ranging from 0.25 to 0.73, assesses the logical flow and consistency of the document. The Frequency of Imprecise Words (0 to 0.04) and Connective Words (0.00 to 0.08) indicate the use of vague terms and logical connectors, respectively, which can impact clarity and understanding. Reading Complexity, ranging from 4.70 to 26.99, reflects the text’s difficulty level, while Reading Time (1 to 130 minutes) estimates the time required for a complete read-through. Entropy, from 5.99 to 10.13, measures the variability or unpredictability in word usage, suggesting complexity in terms of information content. The Frequency of Unique Words (0.09 to 0.67) indicates the diversity of vocabulary, and the presence of Grammatical Errors (0.05 to 1) is a direct measure of linguistic accuracy. When analyzing the ambiguity of the policies, we note that the number of policies classified as not ambiguous, somewhat ambiguous, and very ambiguous is 471, 186, and 162, respectively. In particular, when focusing on privacy policies explicitly mentioning the smart device, we observe that the distribution based on ambiguity is 242, 106, and 81, respectively.

In summary, on one hand, we observe that the average smart device privacy policy’s text is not ambiguous, relatively short (it would take 11 minutes to be read), contains a very small number of imprecise words and grammatical errors, uses a minimal number of connective words (which translates into shorter sentences). On the other hand, we observe that the reading complexity is relatively high (a Flesch-Kincaid of 13 falls into the skilled level), and its coherence is relatively low. Considering an average reading speed of 240 words per minute for an 11-minute read, the document totals 2640 words. It has a 27% uniqueness in its vocabulary, which consists of approximately 715 words. Notably, the 8-bit entropy per word is high, indicating a diverse and unpredictable vocabulary usage.

Policy Features	Min Value	Median Value	Max Value
Coherence Score	0.25	0.31	0.74
Freq. of Imprecise Words	0.00	0.02	0.04
Freq. of Connective Words	0.00	0.04	0.08
Reading Complexity	4.70	12.71	26.99
Reading Time (Min)	1.00	11.00	130.00
Entropy	5.99	8.03	10.13
Freq. of Unique Words	0.09	0.27	0.67
Grammatical Errors	0.0	0.007	0.01

Table 1: Statistics for the readability analysis of the smart devices.

In addition to the textual features extracted, further privacy-related information is detailed in Appendix Table 5. This part of the extraction focuses on aspects of the privacy policies that directly pertain to how user data is handled, such as the types of data collected, data usage policies, sharing practices, and user choices.

5.3 How Much Do the Policies Describe Data Management Practices?

We used sklearn’s CountVectorizer to analyze keyword frequencies in smart device policies, comparing those that explicitly mention the devices to those that do not. Our findings, illustrated in Figure 5, show that policies without device mentions tend to focus more

YYYY(X)




Figure 5: Keyword distribution for smart device policies - With and Without explicit mention of device

on general data collection than specifics related to device use. Both policy types consistently address data sharing and purpose. 'Access' and 'Security' keywords are moderately mentioned, indicating a universal emphasis on these aspects. Policies that explicitly mention devices use language related to data access slightly more than those that do not. This greater emphasis on access suggests that these policies are attempting to make the end user aware that the device(s) mentioned require resources that others may not need. However, 'Policy Change' and 'Choice' keywords are less common, suggesting infrequent updates or limited user options in data handling. Less frequent are the 'Do Not Track,' 'Opt-Out,' and 'Retention' keywords, highlighting a potential area for increased policy transparency. 'Legislation' keywords vary slightly, possibly reflecting different legal requirements. Policies mentioning devices specifically tend to more clearly address smart device data. This suggests that smart device privacy policies vary in their focus, with policies not mentioning devices following general data practices while policies not mentioning devices emphasize specific device usage.




Figure 6: Heatmap of cosine similarities of policy embeddings.

After observing the distribution of keywords between the two subsets of smart device policies, we found that keywords alone cannot fully describe the similarity of the policies. While they provide a baseline understanding, they do not capture the context. To address this, we employed text embeddings to transform the policy documents into numerical vectors, allowing for a more comprehensive and quantifiable comparison of the textual similarity. Cosine similarity, a measure that gauges the cosine of the angle between two vectors, served as our metric for this analysis. Interestingly, there was a striking similarity (94%) amongst most policies (see Figure 6). This suggests the existence of a standard template or common elements that many smart device manufacturers follow while drafting their policies. The remaining 6% of policies showed significant differences, indicating potential areas of innovation or divergence from common policy templates. However, the presence of some variance, as indicated by lighter shades, reflects the presence of distinctive elements within individual policies. This divergence could be attributed to unique operational practices, targeted user demographics, or specific legal requirements necessitating a departure from the norm. Overall, the high average cosine similarity score implies a cohesive body of privacy policies within the smart device space, albeit with room for individualized approaches.

5.4 How are the Policies Changing?

We analyze the evolution of smart device privacy policies based on their changes and their response to the GDPR.

We first analyzed how updated the smart device privacy policies are. Figure 7 shows the distribution of privacy policies based on the category of the smart device and their last update. We first observe that only 39.5% of the policies (324) disclosed their last update date, a concern considering how frequently smart devices receive hardware/software updates. When we separate policies based on whether there is an explicit mention of the smart device, we observe that policies with explicit mentions tend to be more updated for the same category. For instance, for the smart home device category, we note that six policies without explicit mention to the device had a last update before 2013. For nearly 93% of the policies with an explicit update, the update occurred after the GDPR [52] became effective in 2018 (63% were updated after CCPA [28] became effective in 2020). This suggests that manufacturers acknowledge and adopt the new requirements introduced by these regulations.




Figure 7: Distribution of privacy policies based on their last update.

Next, we analyze the changes that policies are experiencing in the last 5 years. The heatmap in Figure 8 shows the trends in content modification across different categories: Additions, Deletions, Unchanged, and Incremental Differences. There is a notable uptick in changes between 2018-2019 and 2022-2023. In the more recent timeframe, there is a pronounced spike in Additions and Deletions, averaging 65.80 and 51.92 sentences, respectively, pointing to a significant phase of content restructuring or updates. Conversely, the Unchanged category displays minimal fluctuation, with a relatively lower average of 62.81 sentences in 2023, suggesting that a portion of the content has consistently remained the same throughout the period. Incremental differences hit a high in 2023 with 12 instances, indicating a tendency towards more detailed and subtle editorial adjustments as time progresses.




Figure 8: Privacy policy updates by year.

5.5 How Did GDPR Impact Privacy Policies?

This analysis centers on evaluating the privacy policies of various manufacturers, focusing specifically on changes before and after the implementation of the GDPR in 2018. Out of the 819 extracted policies, we could only obtain archived versions for 312 of them. In the following, we compare the latest archived version before the enactment of GDPR with the oldest archived version after it.




Figure 9: Distribution of similarity scores.

Figure 9 shows the changes that policies experienced pre/post-GDPR. Note that 75 policies (24% of the dataset) did not experience

any changes and 73 additional policies experienced small modifications (considering a similarity score above 75%). On the other hand, 14 policies (4.5%) underwent substantial modifications (their similarity score was below 30%). This indicates that the majority of the policies were either already in compliance or required only minor adjustments to meet the new standards. Extending the analysis across different countries (see Figure 10) we observe that manufacturers from countries like Canada, Vietnam, Japan, and China significantly changed their policies post-GDPR. In contrast, manufacturers from countries like Germany, the United Kingdom, Poland, and Hong Kong adapted their policies to GDPR well in advance and hence did not require major changes at the time the regulation was enacted. The global average similarity score stands at 0.74 which indicates that most manufacturers did not require significant changes post GDPR.




Figure 10: Privacy policy similarity scores across countries.

As an example of further analysis supported by our dataset, we showcase how the privacy policies of two European manufacturers of smart devices (Miele and Schluter) changed in a 4 years period before the enactment of GDPR. Figure 11 shows the similarity of a specific year’s policy wrt the previous year’s policy. In both cases, we observe that policies presented changes during the first three years and, the case of Miele, during the fourth year too. Then, they became unchanged after the enactment of GDPR in 2018. This shows that different manufacturers adapted their policies in advance of the regulation.




Figure 11: Similarity across policies for two manufacturers 4 years before GDPR.

In conclusion, GDPR has been a significant catalyst for change in smart device privacy policies. The varying degrees and timelines

YYYY(X)

of policy adaptations underscore the regulation’s broad impact and the diverse strategies employed by organizations worldwide.

6 SMART DEVICE POLICIES VS. OTHER DOMAINS

In the following, we explore the similarity of smart device privacy policies vs. those of more consolidated domains of e-commerce and mobile applications. First, we analyze their purely textual similarity using cosine similarity.

Figure 12a displays a pairwise cosine similarity analysis of privacy policies, with darker shades indicating higher similarity. The diagonal, being the darkest, reflects perfect similarity as it compares each policy with itself. The off-diagonal elements, showing lighter shades, suggest that while policies share some similarities, there’s no complete uniformity. This variation highlights the customization of policies to suit specific data practices of each service. This is also consistent with the similarity analysis performed in Section 5. Figure 12b presents a histogram of cosine similarity scores, showing a moderate peak with most values between 0.2 and 0.6. This indicates a moderate level of textual similarity across policies. The range of scores suggests some standardization, likely due to legal and regulatory language, but also retains unique elements, possibly due to specific business practices and data-handling requirements of each service. Finally, we applied HDBSCAN, an efficient clustering algorithm, to group policies based on their text. Figure 13a reveals that most policies cluster together, with a few outliers. Notably, policies from smart devices with explicit mentions tend to cluster more closely, indicating more standardized language within this subcategory.

After textual-based analysis revealed a moderate level of textual similarity in privacy policies across smart devices, mobile apps, and e-commerce websites, we used a readability-based analysis to understand the underlying factors contributing to this similarity. Specifically, we sought to understand if readability could account for the medium level of similarity previously identified. Table 2 shows the readability analysis results for both mobile apps and e-commerce website policies. When comparing the average mobile app and e-commerce policy with the average smart device policy (see Table 1), we observe as the main difference reading time: smart device privacy policies are, in general, longer than those of mobile applications but shorter than those of e-commerce websites.

Policy Features	Min Value	Median Value	Max Value
Coherence Score	0.10 / 0.18	0.31 / 0.30	0.76 / 0.92
Freq. of Imprecise Words	0.00 / 0.00	0.02 / 0.02	0.04 / 0.03
Freq. of Connective Words	0.00 / 0.00	0.04 / 0.04	0.07 / 0.07
Reading Complexity	6.44 / 7.02	12.92 / 12.37	23.09 / 26.68
Reading Time (Min)	1.00 / 1.00	8.00 / 22.00	185.00 / 205.00
Entropy	6.24 / 6.06	7.87 / 8.27	9.07 / 9.71
Freq. of Unique Words	0.07 / 0.07	0.28 / 0.19	0.60 / 0.54
Grammatical Errors	0.00 / 0.00	0.00 / 0.007	0.12 / 0.01


Table 2: Readability analysis statistics for privacy policies of mobile apps (first value before the '/') and e-commerce websites (second value).

Next, we analyzed the privacy policies based on extracted privacy features related to data management practices. Figure 15 shows


the keyword distribution across categories for e-commerce and mobile apps. Compared to the distribution for smart devices in the previous section (see Figure 5), we observe that mobile apps and smart devices with explicit device mentions have similar privacy policy distributions. This similarity could stem from the fact that mobile apps often use device sensors, akin to those in smart devices. Conversely, e-commerce websites’ privacy policies more closely resemble those of smart devices without explicit device mentions. This parallel might be because these policies typically focus on the data management practices of the manufacturer’s website rather than the device itself.

The comparative bubble chart (see Figure 15) clearly illustrates the trends in privacy policy attributes (see Table 5) for e-commerce websites, smart devices, and mobile apps, providing a percentage-based analysis of keyword coverage. It reveals a nearly equal focus on data collection policies between websites (52.17%) and Android apps (47.83%), while IoT policies less frequently mention devices. Data sharing is a significant concern in all areas, particularly in IoT policies without device mentions (56%), indicating a trend towards more data-sharing practices. Notably, 'Do Not Track' and 'Choice' are prominent in the general IoT category, suggesting a broader privacy approach. In contrast, specific IoT device policies seem to have a more focused privacy strategy. This, along with the varied representation of 'Access' and 'Choice', suggests a fragmented approach to user empowerment in managing their data. Android policies often clarify access purposes (60%), reflecting a commitment to transparency, while IoT device policies commonly detail policy changes (57.14%), indicating a move towards enhanced user control. 'Choice' is widely recognized, especially in the IoT (Device Not Mentioned) category (35.71%). Policy updates are frequently communicated in Android environments (57.14%), reflecting a proactive approach. However, 'Legislation' is less often addressed, with the highest mention in the general IoT category (25%), pointing to variations in legal compliance. The prevalence of 'Purpose' in almost all policies (33.33%) suggests it’s becoming an industry norm. Data retention is uniformly emphasized across domains (28.57%), but IoT-specific data concerns are minimally discussed, with the most in policies for specific IoT devices (2.86%), indicating a potential area for improvement in policy development.

Figure 14 complements this by illustrating the spread and central tendency of keyword mentions across different categories, providing insight on the emphasis placed on various aspects of privacy. For instance, keywords such as 'Collection' and 'Purpose' display a higher median in Android policies, suggesting a more frequent mention that may indicate a heightened focus on these areas within the platform. In contrast, 'Do Not Track' and 'Legislation' appear less frequently addressed across all datasets, as denoted by lower medians and many outliers, pointing to their sporadic mention and raising questions about the commitment to tracking transparency. In the case of IoT devices mentioning specific devices, there is a lower median frequency for most keywords, implying a more targeted or concise approach to their privacy policies. IoT devices that do not mention specific devices have a higher median frequency. Despite variations, there is a standardization level in the policies of three datasets, particularly those that mention the device, as evidenced by the tighter interquartile ranges. Finally, by integrating all




(a) Heatmap




(b) Similarity score distribution

Figure 12: Textual similarity across all privacy policies (i.e., smart devices, mobile apps, and e-commerce).



(a) Based on text.



(b) Based on text and features.

Figure 13: Policy cluster distributions.




Figure 14: Keyword distribution for e-commerce and mobile apps.




Figure 15: Distribution of keyword coverage.

the features from our textual and readability analyses into a multi-dimensional clustering approach, we observed intricate patterns of similarities and dissimilarities among the privacy policies.

The scatter plot (see Figure 13b) elucidates the grouping of policies based on readability and privacy-related features, along with policy text revealing clusters that vary in coherence, complexity, linguistic precision, etc. Cluster 0 presents a range of reading complexities, merging technical and user-friendly documents, highlighting variability in user understanding. These policies mainly focus on data collection, as evidenced by frequent "Collection" keyword usage. Cluster 1 is characterized by coherent, simpler policies, indicative of a user-friendly approach, and emphasizes "Collection",

YYYY(X)

"Purpose", and "Retention" keywords. Cluster 2, with the widest coherence and simplest readability, suggests clear, straightforward policies, likely enhancing user comprehension. This cluster frequently uses "Collection", "Sharing", "Purpose", and "Access" keywords. Cluster 3 comprises policies with long reading durations and higher complexity, pointing to comprehensive, yet possibly overwhelming content, showing low to moderate keyword usage across categories. Finally, Cluster 4 strikes a balance in detail and readability, though with variable reading times and grammatical precision, potentially affecting user experience, while exhibiting the highest average keyword usage across all categories.

Overall, the clustering analysis confirms that privacy policies exhibit moderate textual similarities but display diverse readability and privacy-related characteristics. This diversity reflects the balance between the necessity for standardized legal language to ensure compliance and specificity tailored to the unique requirements of different service types. The varied clustering underscores the challenges users face in navigating privacy policies, with some documents being more user-centric and others demanding higher levels of literacy and technical understanding.

7 DISCUSSION

We would like to highlight several important observations from our study.

Our analysis reveals the challenges that today's customers might face in accessing information about the data management practices of smart device products. This would make it difficult, and in some cases even impossible, to make an informed decision based on privacy at the time of purchasing certain smart devices.

- Notably, popular e-commerce platforms like Amazon and Walmart often do not provide direct links to the privacy policies of listed smart devices and/or information about their data management practices. Consequently, customers may need to search for their policies, typically on the manufacturers' websites. However, our analysis found that a significant portion of popular smart device manufacturers (1,167, 53% of the total) do not have websites beyond their Amazon store pages. This is particularly concerning since some of those manufacturers sell smart devices such as baby monitors and microphone-enabled speakers which handle sensitive information. To assess these manufacturers, we used the popular website *Fakespot* [53], which uses AI to detect fake reviews and potential scams. Of the 572 manufacturers analyzed by Fakespot, 52% received a 'C' grade or lower, suggesting that nearly half (the ones obtaining a higher grade) have real customers leaving honest reviews (see Figure 19 for more details). This situation underscores the need for e-commerce sites to require smart device manufacturers to include detailed information about their privacy policies alongside their products, enhancing transparency for consumers.
- Moreover, even when a customer locates a smart device manufacturer's privacy policy, many of these documents lack clarity regarding their applicability. Our analysis showed that only 49% of the analyzed policies explicitly state they

pertain to the smart device in question. This lack of specificity can lead to misconceptions, such as assuming a smart speaker does not record voice data or a smart camera does not capture video, simply because audio or video collection is not mentioned in the policy. Therefore, it is crucial for smart device manufacturers to enhance the transparency of their privacy policies.

- Although the average smart device privacy policy is relatively readable, there are instances where the complexity and required reading time render it impractical for most customers to fully grasp the content. This issue is not unique to smart devices; we observed similar challenges with mobile apps and e-commerce websites. However, the concern is more pronounced for smart devices due to the potentially sensitive data they collect via their equipped sensors, emphasizing the need for clearer and more accessible privacy policies in this sector.

Our study highlights the positive influence of data protection regulations like GDPR on the clarity of smart device privacy policies, a trend also seen in other domains. Post-GDPR, we noticed changes in these policies, leading to reduced ambiguity. Additionally, our comparison with more established domains reveals a notable uniformity in the structure and language of all privacy policies, including those of smart devices. This uniformity, while indicative of a 'template' approach, could be a double-edged sword. On one hand, it promotes standardization; on the other, it might lead to a lack of specific details tailored to different user needs and contexts. This generalized approach could result in users overlooking critical information about the sensitive data collected by smart devices.

8 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Smart devices, increasingly prevalent in daily life, pose significant privacy challenges due to their potentially intrusive sensors, which permeate personal spaces like homes. Our research presents, to our knowledge, the first comprehensive analysis of smart device privacy policies. Building on existing methodologies primarily used to analyze privacy policies of e-commerce websites and mobile apps, we developed a framework to discover, collect, and analyze the privacy policies of smart devices. Our framework addresses the challenge of locating these policies by searching e-commerce platforms for smart devices and identifying their manufacturers. It then seeks out the relevant privacy policies on the manufacturers' websites. The framework incorporates a suite of advanced machine learning and natural language processing techniques to derive insights from these policies. This includes evaluating readability, identifying privacy-related topics, and tracking their historical evolution. We have made both the tool and its source code publicly available, fostering further research in this area.

Our analysis encompassed over 4,000 smart devices, representing a significant portion of those sold on e-commerce websites, across 28 categories. It involved over 2,000 smart device manufacturers and examined 1,000 privacy policies. Additionally, we compared these privacy policies with those in the established domains of e-commerce and mobile applications. As a future work, we aim to enhance our tool to include user reviews that specifically mention privacy concerns related to smart devices. We also plan to integrate

data on cybersecurity incidents and data breaches. This expansion will enable more comprehensive studies on the topic, providing deeper insights into the privacy and security landscape of smart devices.

REFERENCES

- [1] Anil Alter, Michele M Tugade, and Barbara L Fredrickson. Smartness as a continuous variable: identifying dimensions of intelligent environments. *Frontiers in psychology*, 7, 2016.
- [2] Oberlo. Smart home statistics. <https://www.oberlo.com/statistics/smart-home-statistics#:~:text=Smart%20home%20statistics%20show%20that%20in%202018%2C%2029.5,the%20coming%20years%2C%20reaching%2064.1%20million%20by%202025.,2018>. Accessed: May 24, 2023.
- [3] Noah Aporthe, Dillon Reisman, and Nick Feamster. Always on (even when we're off the grid): Privacy risks and conservation benefits associated with the internet of things. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, 2017.
- [4] Rolf H Weber. *Internet of Things*. Springer, 2010.
- [5] Jayavardhana Gubbi, Rajkumar Buyya, Slaven Marusic, and Marimuthu Palaniswami. Internet of things (iot): A vision, architectural elements, and future directions. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 29(7), 2013.
- [6] Paul Biocco, Mahsa Keshavarz, Patrick Hines, and Mohd Anwar. A study of privacy policies across smart home companies. In *An Interactive Workshop on the Human Aspects of Smarthome Security and Privacy (WSSP 2018), Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS)*, 2018.
- [7] Luigi Atzori, Antonio Iera, and Giacomo Morabito. The internet of things: A survey. *Computer Networks*, 54(15), 2010.
- [8] Alessandro Acquisti. Privacy and data protection in the age of big data: A time for big decisions. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 31(6), 2015.
- [9] Benjamin Fabian, Tatiana Ermakova, and Tino Lentz. Large-scale readability analysis of privacy policies. In *International Conference on Web Intelligence*, 2017.
- [10] Christina L Madden and Douglas B McDonald. The scoring of digital rights: a preliminary analysis. *International Journal of Law and Information Technology*, 17(2), 2009.
- [11] Barbara Krumay and Jennifer Klar. Readability of privacy policies. In *Data and Applications Security and Privacy XXXIV: 34th Annual IFIP WG 11.3 Conference*, pages 388–399. Springer, 2020.
- [12] Mozilla Foundation. Privacy not included. <https://foundation.mozilla.org/en/privacynotincluded/>, 2021. Accessed: 29th April 2023.
- [13] Internet Archive. Wayback machine. <https://archive.org/web/>, 1996.
- [14] Mikhail Kuznetsov, Evgenia Novikova, Igor Kotenko, and Elena Doynikova. Privacy policies of iot devices: Collection and analysis. *Sensors*, 22(5), 2022.
- [15] Esma Aimeur, Oluwa Lawani, and Kimiz Dalkir. When changing the look of privacy policies affects user trust: An experimental study. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 58:368–379, 2016.
- [16] Jaspreet Bhatia and Travis D. Breaux. A data purpose case study of privacy policies. In *2017 IEEE 25th International Requirements Engineering Conference (RE)*, pages 394–399, 2017.
- [17] Ali Sunyaev, Tobias Dehling, Patrick L Taylor, and Kenneth D Mandl. Availability and quality of mobile health app privacy policies. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 22(e1):e28–e33, 2015.
- [18] Duc Viet Bui, Kang G. Shin, Jong-Min Choi, and Junbum Shin. Automated extraction and presentation of data practices in privacy policies. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, 2021, 2021.
- [19] Norman M. Sadeh, Alessandro Acquisti, Travis D. Breaux, Lorrie Faith Cranor, Aleecia M. McDonald, Joel R. Reidenberg, Noah A. Smith, Fei Liu, N. Cameron Russell, Florian Schaub, Shomir Wilson, Jim Graves, Pedro Giovanni Leon, Rohan Ramanath, and Ashwini Rao. Towards usable privacy policies: Semi-automatically extracting data practices from websites' privacy policies. In *Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS 2014)*, 2014.
- [20] Shomir Liu, Yang Liu, Yuan Li, Shuqin Li, and Fei Niu. Polisis: Automated analysis and presentation of privacy policies using deep learning. *USENIX Security Symposium*, 27(3), 2018.
- [21] Duha Ibdah, Nada Lachtar, Satya Meenakshi Raparathi, and Anys Bacha. "why should i read the privacy policy, i just need the service": A study on attitudes and perceptions toward privacy policies. *IEEE access*, 9:166465–166487, 2021.
- [22] Michael Gebauer, Faraz Mashhur, Nicola Leschke, Elias Grünewald, and Frank Pallas. A human-in-the-loop approach for information extraction from privacy policies under data scarcity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15006*, 2023.
- [23] Hao Cui, Rahmadi Trimanananda, Athina Markopoulou, and Scott Jordan. Poli-Graph: Automated privacy policy analysis using knowledge graphs. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*, pages 1037–1054. Anaheim, CA, August 2023. USENIX Association.
- [24] Sebastian Zimmeck, Peter Story, Daniel Smullen, Abhilasha Ravichander, Ziqi Wang, Joel R. Reidenberg, N. Cameron Russell, and Norman M. Sadeh. Maps: Scaling privacy compliance analysis to a million apps. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, 2019:66 – 86, 2019.
- [25] John W Ratcliff and David E Metzener. Pattern-matching-the gestalt approach. *Dr Dobbs Journal*, 13(7):46, 1988.
- [26] Henry Hosseini, Martin Degeling, Christine Utz, and Thomas Hu. Unifying privacy policy detection. In *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, volume 2021, 06 2021.
- [27] Peter Voigt and Arndt von dem Bussche. The eu general data protection regulation (gdpr): A practical guide. *Springer*, 2017.
- [28] California consumer privacy act (ccpa) of 2018, 2018.
- [29] Shomir Wilson, Florian Schaub, Aswath Abhilash Dara, Frederick Liu, Sushain Cherivirala, Pedro Giovanni Leon, Mads Schaarup Andersen, Sebastian Zimmeck, Kanthashree Mysore Sathyendra, N Cameron Russell, et al. The creation and analysis of a website privacy policy corpus. In *54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2016.
- [30] Niharika Guntamukkala, Rozita Dara, and Gary Grewal. A machine-learning based approach for measuring the completeness of online privacy policies. In *14th international conference on machine learning and applications*, pages 289–294. IEEE, 12 2015.
- [31] Weijia He, Valerie Zhao, Olivia Morkved, Sabeeka Siddiqui, Earlene Fernandes, Josiah Hester, and Blase Ur. Sok: Context sensing for access control in the adversarial home iot. In *IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 37–53, 2021.
- [32] Leland McInnes and John Healy. Umap: Uniform manifold approximation and projection for dimension reduction. *ArXiv*, abs/1802.03426, 2018.
- [33] Leland McInnes, John Healy, and S. Astels. hdbscan: Hierarchical density based clustering. *J. Open Source Softw.*, 2:205, 2017.
- [34] David Banisar. National comprehensive data protection/privacy laws and bills 2023. *Privacy Laws and Bills*, 2023.
- [35] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Tamar Solorio, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the ACL*, pages 4171–4186. ACL, June 2019.
- [36] Daniel Cer, Mona Diab, Eneko Agirre, Iñaki Lopez-Gazpio, and Lucia Specia. Semeval-2017 task 1: Semantic textual similarity-multilingual and cross-lingual focused evaluation. In *11th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2017)*, 2017.
- [37] Claude E Shannon. Prediction and entropy of printed english. *Bell system technical journal*, 30(1), 1951.
- [38] Aleecia M McDonald and Lorrie Faith Cranor. The cost of reading privacy policies. *Isjlp*, 4:543, 2008.
- [39] Marc Brysbaert. How many words do we read per minute? a review and meta-analysis of reading rate. *PsyArXiv Preprints*, 2019.
- [40] Elfrida H Hiebert. Unique words require unique instruction. *TextMatters*, 2012.
- [41] Adam Geitgey. Natural language processing is fun! *Medium*, July, 18, 2018.
- [42] Matthew Honnibal and Ines Montani. spaCy 2: Natural language understanding with Bloom embeddings, convolutional neural networks and incremental parsing. <https://spacy.io/>, 2017.
- [43] Shaheen Syed and Marco Spruit. Full-text or abstract? examining topic coherence scores using latent dirichlet allocation. In *IEEE International conference on data science and advanced analytics (DSAA)*, 2017.
- [44] Hua Yu and Jie Yang. A direct lda algorithm for high-dimensional data—with application to face recognition. *Pattern recognition*, 34(10), 2001.
- [45] Daniel Naber. *A rule-based style and grammar checker*. PhD thesis, University of Bielefeld, 2003.
- [46] Julien B Kouame. Using readability tests to improve the accuracy of evaluation documents intended for low-literate participants. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*, 6(14), 2010.
- [47] Rudolf Flesch. Flesch-kincaid readability test. *Retrieved October*, 26(3), 2007.
- [48] Joel R Reidenberg. Privacy policies as decision-making tools: An evaluation of ayres &&# x2010; braithwaite, irobot, and norton. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*, 13(4), 2016.
- [49] Anantaa Kotal, Anupam Joshi, and Karuna Pande Joshi. The effect of text ambiguity on creating policy knowledge graphs. In *2021 IEEE Intl Conf on Parallel & Distributed Processing with Applications, Big Data & Cloud Computing, Sustainable Computing & Communications, Social Computing & Networking (ISPA/BDCloud/SocialCom/SustainCom)*, 2021.
- [50] Leo Breiman. Random forests. *Machine learning*, 45(1), 2001.
- [51] Corinna Cortes and Vladimir Vapnik. Support-vector networks. *Machine learning*, 20(3):273–297, 1995.
- [52] Regulation (eu) 2016/679 of the european parliament and of the council of 27 april 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing directive 95/46/ec (general data protection regulation), 2016.
- [53] Fakespot. <https://www.fakespot.com/>.
- [54] Matthew E Peters, Mark Neumann, Mohit Iyyer, Matt Gardner, Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Deep contextualized word representations. In *Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational*

Aamir Hamid^{1,*}, Hemanth Reddy Samidi¹, Tim Finin¹, Primal Pappachan^{2,†}, Roberto Yus¹
¹University of Maryland, Baltimore County, ²Portland State University
{ahamid2, finin, hsamidi1, ryus}@umbc.edu, primal@pdx.edu

YYYY(X)

Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers), 2018.

Appendices

A PRIVACY POLICY ANALYSIS DETAILS

Table 3 contains the taxonomy of imprecise words and Table 4 contains the taxonomy of connective words (both extracted from [49]) that PrivacyLens uses in its analysis of an IoT device privacy policy.

Imprecise Words	
Modal Words	may,might,likely,can could,would
Usable Words	easy,adaptable familiar,extensible
Probable Words	probably,possibly,optionally
Numeric Words	anyone, certain everyone, numerous some,most,few much,many,various including but not limited to
Condition Words	depending,necessary inappropriate,appropriate as needed,as applicable otherwise reasonably from time to time
Generalization Words	generally,mostly,widely commonly,usually,general Normally,typically,largely often,primarily among other things

Table 3: Taxonomy of imprecise words extracted from [49].

Connective Words	
Copulative Words	and, both, as well as, not only, but also
Control Flow Words	if, then, while
Anaphorical Words	it, this, those

Table 4: Taxonomy of connective words extracted from [49].

B SEED KEYWORDS

Table 5 contains the seed keywords for evaluating data practices in privacy policies. We evaluated privacy policy sections based on established best practices in the field. These sections include Collection, which details the types and methods of user data collection; Sharing, explaining how and with whom user data is shared; Choice, presenting users' privacy options such as opting in or out; Access, outlining how users can access and verify their data; Data Retention, which describes the reasons and duration for storing user data; Data Security, focusing on the measures taken to protect user data; Policy Change, explaining the procedure for notifying users about changes in privacy practices; Do Not Track, which concentrates on online tracking technologies like cookies; and Purpose, clarifying

the intended use of collected data and ensuring it is not used for unapproved purposes. Each section is crucial for understanding how user data is managed and protected

C FRAMEWORK EVALUATION

In this section, we assess the effectiveness and performance of PrivacyLens by conducting an evaluation of both its policy collection and analysis capabilities.

C.1 Evaluating Policy Collection

Current Privacy Policy Extraction. We evaluated the accuracy of our Amazon web-scraped data against verified "truth" values for the top 30 products across ten smart device categories, totaling 300 devices. Our assessment primarily focused on extracting manufacturers' names and their websites, using three key metrics: F1 score, recall, and precision. The results, detailed in Table 6, show a high overall F1 score (0.98), recall (0.96), and precision (0.99) for manufacturer data. Similarly, for website URL collection, the system also achieved impressive scores: an F1 score of 0.95, recall of 0.91, and precision of 0.99. These findings demonstrate the system's effectiveness in accurately extracting essential information about IoT device manufacturers and their websites, a critical step in locating their privacy policies.

To evaluate the accuracy of our method in distinguishing IoT products from a broader product range, we randomly selected 100 products from our total dataset and manually verified each to determine if it was an IoT device, establishing a baseline of true identifications. We then applied our method to these same products to classify them as IoT or non-IoT, generating a set of predictions. By comparing these predictions with the manual identifications, we assessed the effectiveness of our method, primarily using the F1 score as our metric. Our approach achieved an F1 score of 0.88, indicating a high level of accuracy in correctly identifying IoT products and effectively minimizing misclassification of non-IoT products as IoT. This result demonstrates the robustness of our method in accurately filtering and identifying IoT products.

To assess the efficacy of PrivacyLens in collecting privacy policies, we randomly chose 100 manufacturer websites from our dataset and manually identified the privacy policy URL on each site. We then compared these URLs with those automatically extracted by PrivacyLens. The system demonstrated strong performance, achieving an F1 score of 0.94 in identifying privacy policy URLs and a 0.76 F1 score in extracting policy text. This indicates PrivacyLens's high precision and accuracy in extraction tasks. However, PrivacyLens faced challenges when privacy policies were embedded in dynamic website components or required downloading, highlighting a need for specialized parsers for certain sites. Overall, these results suggest that PrivacyLens's web parsing technique is effective for collecting privacy policies.

Past Privacy Policy Extraction. In our study, we randomly selected another 100 manufacturers, ensuring they existed as of 2020, and their corresponding websites from our dataset. We then chose a random date between 2020 and 2022 for each and used PrivacyLens to retrieve the archived website version from that date, if available. PrivacyLens successfully retrieved archived websites for 64% of these manufacturers. However, upon manual review, we found that

YYYY(X)

Privacy Attribute	Definition	Keywords
Collection	The methods and purposes used by a service provider to get user data.	Collect, personal, identifiable, telephone, number, phone, telephone number, IP address, phone number, IP, mobile, email, address, name, date of birth, birthday, age, account, credit card, location, username, password, contact, zip code, postal code, mailing address, phone
Sharing	The methods third parties use to share or acquire user information.	Party, share, sell, disclose, company, advertiser, provider, partner, public, analytics, companies, organizations, businesses, contractors, divulge, sell, law, legal, regulation, third party, transfer, service providers, marketing partners, subsidiaries, disclosure, safe harbor
Purpose	The objectives and reasons behind collecting and using user data.	Ads, use, services, verifying, purpose, fraud, prevention, improve products, identification, promotions, personalize, advertising, analytics
Access	If users may access, edit, or remove their information, and how.	Delete, profile, correct, account, change, update, section, access, removal, request, modify, edit, settings, preferences, accurate
Security	How user data is safeguarded.	Secure, security, safeguard, protect, compromise, encrypt, advertiser set, unauthorized, access, SSL, socket, socket layer, encryption, restrict, fraud
Policy Change	Whether and how users will be informed of privacy policy changes.	Change, change privacy, policy time, current, policy agreement, update privacy, update, notice
Do Not Track	Whether and how internet tracking and advertising using Do Not Track signals are handled.	Signal, track, track request, browser, disable, track setting, cookies, web beacons, IP address
Legislation	The legal frameworks that empower individuals to control the collection, usage, and distribution of their personal information by businesses and organizations.	GDPR, CCPA, General Data Protection Regulation
Choice	User's right to make decisions about how their personal data is collected, used, and shared by a service or platform.	Opt, unsubscribe, disable, choose, choice, consent, setting, option, wish, agree, opt-in, opt-out, subscribe, do not track
Retention	The policies and practices related to the storage, archiving, and deletion of user data	Retain, store, delete, deletion, database, participate, promotion, send friend, record, remove, retention, keep, data, backup,
Smart Device Data	Information collected from IoT devices and related services.	sensor data, device data, environmental data, operational data, health metrics, location data, Bluetooth, Wi-Fi, NFC, Capacitive NFC, LTE, device communication, connected devices, smart devices, user commands, voice control, device settings, interaction logs, health data, fitness tracking, biometric identifiers, heart rate, proximity data, ambient conditions, temperature, lighting, microphone, Barometer, cross-device tracking, RFID, Vibration sensor, Radar sensor, Pressure sensors, Ultrasonic sensors, Infrared sensors, RF sensor

Table 5: Privacy attributes extracted from a privacy policy based on seed keywords.

Category	Manufacturer Collection			Website Collection		
	Recall	Prec.	F1	Recall	Prec.	F1
Sensor	0.90	1.00	0.95	0.95	1.00	0.98
Projector	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.94	0.94	0.94
Bulb	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Speaker	0.97	1.00	0.98	0.97	1.00	0.98
Alarm	0.97	1.00	0.98	0.89	1.00	0.94
Camera	0.97	1.00	0.98	0.85	1.00	0.92
Scale	0.90	1.00	0.95	0.92	1.00	0.96
Watch	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Lock	0.97	1.00	0.98	0.88	1.00	0.93
Tracking	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.74	1.00	0.85
Overall	0.96	0.99	0.98	0.91	0.99	0.95

Table 6: Evaluation of the extraction of manufacturers (Manufacturer Collection) and their websites (Website Collection) for IoT devices.

8% of these retrieved sites led to empty homepages, likely due to incomplete captures by the Wayback Machine. Further analysis revealed that PrivacyLens located the archived privacy policy on the websites of 30 out of the 64 manufacturers (47%). The failure to find privacy policies for the remaining 44% was primarily due to missing privacy links in the snapshots. Additionally, the average time difference between the requested and actual snapshot dates was 87 days.

C.2 Evaluating Policy Analysis

Privacy Document	Value (Our Approach)
Minimum Correct Grammar	0.00
Minimum Imprecise Words	0.00
Minimum Connective Words	0.02
Maximum Correct Grammar	0.95
Maximum Imprecise Words	0.04
Maximum Connective Words	0.06

Table 7: Approach

Privacy Document	Value (Ground Truth)
Minimum Correct Grammar	0.06
Minimum Imprecise Words	0.09
Minimum Connective Words	0.025
Maximum Correct Grammar	0.23
Maximum Imprecise Words	0.09
Maximum Connective Words	0.076

Table 8: Ground Truth

To evaluate the insights extracted from each privacy policy, we leveraged existing ground truth datasets from the literature. As

there does not exist a human-annotated dataset of privacy policies for IoT devices, we chose datasets of privacy policies of websites that include annotations. The dataset in [49], which is based on the OPP-115 dataset [54], contains annotations on grammatical errors, frequency of imprecise words, and connectivity words. Then, for the remaining features of PrivacyLens’s readability analysis, we annotate 10 policies of the OPP-115 using popular and free web-based resources: *Readable*¹⁷ for readability, *Planetcalc*¹⁸ for entropy, and *The Read Time*¹⁹ for reading time. We show the results next for each of the features.

W.r.t. **grammatical errors**, we adhered to the methodology of the benchmark study [49] for our comparative analysis (see Tables 7 and 8). Despite the benchmark’s varied results, we effectively compared our specific scores. Our results for the policy with the fewest grammatical errors closely matched their lowest range, with a minor deviation of -0.06. However, in the policy with the most errors, we noted a significant variance, surpassing their range by approximately +0.7. This suggests that our grammatical error detection tool, *language_tool_python*, adopts a more rigorous approach to grammatical correctness.

For **connective words**, we aligned our findings with the general ranges provided in the study [49]. The policy with the fewest connective words showed a negligible deviation of 0.005, closely matching their lower range. In contrast, the policy with the most connective words had our figures slightly exceeding theirs by 0.016, yet still demonstrating consistency with the reported study.

Regarding **imprecise words**, our analysis of the usage in policies compared to the ranges from the study [49] revealed that our results were slightly higher in the policy with the most imprecise words, by a difference of 0.05. Conversely, for the policy with the fewest imprecise words, our findings were marginally lower, with a difference of 0.09. This discrepancy still underscores the alignment of our method with the findings of the cited study.

Our Flesch-Kincaid **readability** scores closely aligned with those from Readable, indicating methodological agreement. For example, for RedOrbit’s privacy policy, our score was 10.26 compared to Readable’s 10.4, and for Sci-News, our score was 9.4 against Readable’s 8.9. Similar trends were observed for Uptodate and Earthkam, where our scores were 12.9 and 14.6, respectively, in comparison to Readable’s 12.9 and 15.5. Overall, the consistency with scores from readable.com validates the reliability of our approach.

PrivacyLens’s **entropy** measurements, ranging between 4.1-4.2, showed high consistency with Planetcalc’s range of 4.1-4.3. Specifically, RedOrbit’s privacy policy scored 4.1 with our method, versus 4.2 with Planetcalc. For Earthkam, Uptodate, and Amazon, both our method and Planetcalc reported an entropy score of 4.2, except for Amazon, where Planetcalc noted a slightly higher score of 4.3. This close alignment reinforces the accuracy and reliability of our method.

In evaluating ten policies, our method estimated a total **reading time** of 120 minutes and 5 seconds, closely paralleling The Read Time’s calculation of 120 minutes and 40 seconds. The minor difference of 35 seconds between the two methods highlights the

precision of our evaluation technique. The **unique words**, **keyword usage**, and **last update** features, which rely on searching specific keywords in the document, leverage a well-tested Python search library.

Finally, we evaluated the classifier’s performance trained to predict a human analyst’s **overall assessment** of 172 privacy policies. These policies correspond to devices analyzed by the Mozilla PNI initiative, along with their respective human analyst assessments. We employed cross-validation to ensure a reliable estimate of the model’s effectiveness. The results, as shown in Table 9, indicate that PrivacyLens accurately predicts human analyst assessments with a high F1-Score (0.91). Notably, PrivacyLens shows better performance for the "acceptable" label compared to the "unacceptable" one. This discrepancy arises from the limited number of "unacceptable" instances in the dataset, leading to lower prediction accuracy due to model bias and challenges in identifying this minority class, despite implementing random oversampling.

Figure 16 illustrates the significance of analyzing various features used in training the model. A positive feature importance coefficient implies an increase in the model’s prediction accuracy with the feature value, while a negative coefficient suggests a decrease in accuracy, assuming other features remain constant. The findings reveal that features related to privacy analysis generally have a more substantial impact on prediction accuracy than those related to readability. However, features such as reading level, unique words, and reading time are also marked as highly important, hinting that an analyst’s assessment may be influenced by the effort required to comprehend the policy. Additionally, it’s noteworthy that PrivacyLens, mirroring the manual analysis of Mozilla PNI which took thousands of hours, demonstrates its efficiency in analyzing IoT device privacy policies.

Class	Precision	Recall	F1-score
acceptable	0.96	0.96	0.96
unacceptable	0.67	0.67	0.67
Weighted Avg	0.92	0.90	0.91

Table 9: Performance of the "overall assessment" model.




Figure 16: Feature Importance of the "overall assessment" model.

C.3 Feature Values Across Clusters

D SUMMARY OF POLICY FEATURE ANALYSIS

The analysis of policy features across different clusters revealed diverse characteristics in privacy policies. These are summarized based on the data presented in Tables 17a to 17:

¹⁷<https://readable.com>

¹⁸<https://planetcalc.com>

¹⁹<https://thereadtime.com/>

YYYY(X)

- **Cluster 1 (Table 17a):** Policies typically have moderate coherence scores (0.30-0.36), low frequency of imprecise (0.01-0.03) and connective words (0.03-0.05), and intermediate reading complexity (10.06-19.39). Reading times range from 3 to 8 minutes, with entropy values of 7.10-8.38 and unique word frequencies between 0.30 and 0.37. Grammatical errors vary from minimal to moderate (0.00-0.95).
- **Cluster 0 (Table 17b):** This cluster features lower coherence scores (0.25-0.31), very low imprecise (0.00-0.02) and connective word frequencies (0.02-0.08), and higher reading complexities (12.10-26.99). Reading times are significantly longer (13-59 minutes), with high entropy (7.89-9.72) and unique word frequencies ranging from 0.14 to 0.34. Grammatical errors are minimal to moderate (0.00-0.92).
- **Cluster 2 (Table 17c):** Policies have slightly higher coherence (0.26-0.34), imprecise word (0.01-0.03), and connective word frequencies (0.03-0.06) compared to Cluster 0. Reading complexities vary (7.66-19.19), with reading times ranging widely (7-48 minutes). Entropy values are 7.45-8.62, with unique word frequencies of 0.10-0.30. Grammatical errors range from none to high (0.00-0.98).
- **Cluster 3 (Table 17d):** This cluster has the widest range in coherence scores (0.10-0.92), imprecise word (0.00-0.04), and connective word frequencies (0.00-0.09). Reading complexities are highly varied (4.70-86.68), as are reading times (0-39 minutes). Entropy values range from 5.23 to 9.71, and unique word frequencies vary significantly (0.10-0.77). Grammatical errors range from none to the maximum (0.00-1.00).
- **Cluster 4 (Table 17):** Policies in this cluster show moderate variability in coherence scores (0.25-0.64), imprecise word (0.00-0.03), and connective word frequencies (0.01-0.06). Reading complexities (9.34-27.44) and times (10-185 minutes) suggest varied policy lengths. Entropy is high (7.53-10.13), with unique word frequencies (0.07-0.29) and grammatical errors (0.00-0.96) being moderately varied.

Policy Features	Min Value	Median Value	Max Value
Coherence Score	0.30	0.35	0.36
Freq. of Imprecise Words	0.01	0.02	0.03
Freq. of Connective Words	0.03	0.04	0.05
Reading Complexity	10.06	14.44	19.39
Reading Time (Min)	3.00	4.00	8.00
Entropy	7.10	7.41	8.38
Freq. of Unique Words	0.30	0.33	0.37
Grammatical Errors	0.00	0.82	0.95

(a) Cluster 1

Policy Features	Min Value	Median Value	Max Value
Coherence Score	0.25	0.30	0.31
Freq. of Imprecise Words	0.00	0.01	0.02
Freq. of Connective Words	0.02	0.03	0.08
Reading Complexity	12.10	14.11	26.99
Reading Time (Min)	13.00	15.50	59.00
Entropy	7.89	8.12	9.72
Freq. of Unique Words	0.14	0.24	0.34
Grammatical Errors	0.00	0.82	0.92

(b) Cluster 0

Policy Features	Min Value	Median Value	Max Value
Coherence Score	0.26	0.31	0.34
Freq. of Imprecise Words	0.01	0.02	0.03
Freq. of Connective Words	0.03	0.04	0.06
Reading Complexity	7.66	12.65	19.19
Reading Time (Min)	7.00	17.00	48.00
Entropy	7.45	8.12	8.62
Freq. of Unique Words	0.10	0.22	0.30
Grammatical Errors	0.00	0.69	0.98

(c) Cluster 2

Policy Features	Min Value	Median Value	Max Value
Coherence Score	0.10	0.31	0.92
Freq. of Imprecise Words	0.00	0.02	0.04
Freq. of Connective Words	0.00	0.04	0.09
Reading Complexity	4.70	12.09	86.68
Reading Time (Min)	0.00	6.00	39.00
Entropy	5.23	7.72	9.71
Freq. of Unique Words	0.10	0.33	0.77
Grammatical Errors	0.00	0.50	1.00

(d) Cluster 3

Policy Features	Min Value	Median Value	Max Value
Coherence Score	0.25	0.31	0.64
Freq. of Imprecise Words	0.00	0.02	0.03
Freq. of Connective Words	0.01	0.04	0.06
Reading Complexity	9.34	13.24	27.44
Reading Time (Min)	10.00	21.00	185.00
Entropy	7.53	8.28	10.13
Freq. of Unique Words	0.07	0.20	0.29
Grammatical Errors	0.00	0.69	0.96

(e) Cluster 4

Figure 17: Feature values across clusters

YYYY(X)

E COUNTRY DISTRIBUTION

Figure 18 describes a comparative stacked bar chart of smart device type prevalence across multiple countries, plotted on a logarithmic scale to accommodate the wide variance in counts. Each bar represents a country, with color-coded segments indicating the count of each device type within that country. The chart highlights the heterogeneity in smart device distribution, reflecting varying degrees of market penetration and consumer adoption across the regions. This analysis provides valuable insights into the global distribution of smart devices and the differences in their adoption across different countries.

F FAKESPOT

Charts in Figure 19 provides a clear overview of the data collected from Fakespot. These figures illustrate various aspects of the analysis, such as the distribution of unreliable reviews, comparison of Amazon Ratings, and the overall Fakespot Company Review Grades for all 572 manufacturers that did not have a privacy policy.




Figure 19: Fakespot Company Review Grade Distribution.

G POLICY AMBIGUITY LEVELS BY YEARS

Table10 provides the percentage of policy ambiguity levels for each year. The "Not Amb (%)", "Somew. Amb (%)", and "Very Amb (%)" columns represent the percentage of policies that are not ambiguous, somewhat ambiguous, and very ambiguous, respectively. The "Total" column indicates the total number of policies analyzed for each year. The data shows that the percentage of policies that are not ambiguous has fluctuated over the years, ranging from a low of 47.22% in 2020 to a high of 71.43% in 2018. The percentage of somewhat ambiguous policies has also varied, with a low of 5.56% in 2017 and a high of 29.17% in 2020. Similarly, the percentage of very ambiguous policies has ranged from 11.90% in 2018 to 23.61% in 2020. This analysis provides valuable insights into the levels of policy ambiguity over the years, highlighting the fluctuating nature of policy clarity and the need for ongoing monitoring and analysis of policy implementation

Year	Not Amb (%)	Somew. Amb (%)	Very Amb (%)	Total
2017	66.67	5.56	27.78	18
2018	71.43	16.67	11.90	42
2019	62.16	21.62	16.22	37
2020	47.22	29.17	23.61	72
2021	65.38	15.38	17.31	52
2022	54.17	26.39	18.06	72
2023	70.00	10.00	20.00	10

Table 10: Policy Ambiguity Levels by Year

IoT Keyword	Weight
smart	0.9
wifi	0.9
bluetooth	0.9
voice-controlled	0.9
app-controlled	0.9
chromecast	0.9
hub	0.7
connected	0.7
wireless	0.65
internet	0.6
remote	0.65
automation	0.7
sensor	0.7
network	0.65
cloud	0.6
synchronization	0.6
compatibility	0.55
sync	0.55
interface	0.5
dashboard	0.6
real-time	0.6
monitoring	0.65
security	0.65
audio	0.55
microphone	0.55
speaker	0.55
touch	0.55
gesture	0.6
light	0.5
api	0.6
sdk	0.6
protocol	0.6
ethernet	0.6
gateway	0.7
mesh	0.7
router	0.6
digital	0.55
interconnected	0.65

Table 11: IoT Keywords Weights

H ABIGUITY ANALYSIS

Table 14 shows the results in terms of ambiguity along with the accuracy of the classifiers used. For policies deemed 'Somewhat




Figure 18: Distribution of Country for each Device Type

High Confidence Terms
iot
apple home kit
alexa
google assistant
android

Table 12: High Confidence Terms

Ambiguous,' the F1 scores for the Random Forest Classifier and SVC improved to 0.89 and 0.94, respectively, an increase from the scores for 'Not Ambiguous' policies (0.78 and 0.85). However, this pattern shifted with 'Very Ambiguous' policies, where the F1 scores marginally decreased to 0.88 and 0.90. These findings suggest that while a moderate level of ambiguity may unexpectedly aid classification accuracy, high ambiguity poses significant challenges, indicating the need for more sophisticated algorithms capable of handling diverse ambiguity levels in policy texts

I KEYWORD USAGE ACROSS CLUSTERS

The analysis of keyword usage across different clusters revealed diverse characteristics in privacy policies. These are summarized based on the data presented in Tables 15 to 19:

- **Cluster 1 (Table 15):** This cluster shows moderate to high usage across all keyword categories, with the highest average usage in the "Collection," "Purpose," and "Retention" keyword categories. This suggests a consistent and relatively high level of usage across a wide range of keywords in this cluster.
- **Cluster 0 (Table 16):** In this cluster, the usage of all keyword categories is generally lower compared to Cluster 1. The "Collection" keyword category still has the highest average usage, but the usage of other categories is notably lower. This cluster represents a lower overall usage of keywords across all categories.
- **Cluster 2 (Table 17):** Cluster 3 exhibits the highest usage across all keyword categories, with the "Collection," "Sharing," "Purpose," and "Access" categories showing particularly high average usage. This cluster represents a high overall usage of keywords, especially in the specified categories.
- **Cluster 3 (Table 18):** This cluster shows low to moderate usage across all keyword categories, with the "Collection" category having the highest average usage. The usage of other categories is relatively low. This cluster represents a lower overall usage of keywords, similar to Cluster 2.
- **Cluster 4 (Table 19):** Cluster 5 demonstrates the highest usage across all keyword categories, with the "Collection,"

YYYY(X)

Category	Frequency
Smart Speaker	603
Smart Thermostat	579
Smart Camera	532
Miscellaneous	526
Smart Lock	447
Smart Fitness Tracker	430
Smart Light	366
Smart Doorbell	344
Smart Alarm System	343
Smart TV	275
Smart Scale	214
Smart Home Device	112
Smart Air Purifier	43
Smart Sensor	30
Smart Watch	30
Smart Monitor	24
Smart Security	21
Smart Health Tracker	19
Smart Refrigerator	19
Smart Location Tracker	16
Smart Entertainment Device	9
Smart Connected Vehicle	9
Smart Networking	8
Smart Fitness Equipment	3
Smart Mount	2
Smart Projector	2
Smart Body Scanners	1
Smart Gaming	1

Table 13: Count of Smart Devices for Each Category

Ambiguity Class	Number of Policies	Random Forest Classifier	SVC
Not Ambiguous	471	0.78	0.85
Somewhat Ambiguous	186	0.89	0.94
Very Ambiguous	162	0.88	0.90

Table 14: F1-score of ambiguity determination models.

"Sharing," and "Purpose" categories showing particularly high average usage. This cluster represents the highest overall usage of keywords, especially in the specified categories.

In summary, the cluster analysis reveals distinct patterns of keyword usage across different clusters, with some clusters showing higher overall usage of keywords across all categories, while others exhibit lower usage. These findings provide valuable insights into the distribution and usage patterns of the specified keyword categories within the dataset.

Table 15: Cluster 0

Keyword Categories	Min Usage	Median Usage	Max Usage
Collection Keywords	44.00	46.00	186.00
Sharing Keywords	42.00	51.00	222.00
Purpose Keywords	53.00	64.50	158.00
Access Keywords	45.00	81.00	114.00
Security Keywords	16.00	16.50	64.00
Policy Change Keywords	23.00	41.00	90.00
Legislation Keywords	0.00	0.00	0.00
Choice Keywords	22.00	32.50	169.00
Retention Keywords	9.00	12.50	104.00
IoT Data Keywords	0.00	0.00	9.00

Table 16: Cluster 1

Keyword Categories	Min Usage	Median Usage	Max Usage
Collection Keywords	34.00	45.00	65.00
Sharing Keywords	6.00	14.00	25.00
Purpose Keywords	13.00	33.00	46.00
Access Keywords	8.00	11.00	20.00
Security Keywords	3.00	4.00	11.00
Policy Change Keywords	6.00	8.00	17.00
Legislation Keywords	0.00	0.00	0.00
Choice Keywords	4.00	11.00	23.00
Retention Keywords	4.00	10.00	16.00
IoT Data Keywords	0.00	0.00	4.00

Table 17: Cluster 2

Keyword Categories	Min Usage	Median Usage	Max Usage
Collection Keywords	63.00	143.00	385.00
Sharing Keywords	22.00	74.50	225.00
Purpose Keywords	24.00	90.00	245.00
Access Keywords	22.00	53.00	210.00
Security Keywords	6.00	38.50	110.00
Policy Change Keywords	8.00	29.00	111.00
Legislation Keywords	0.00	0.00	0.00
Choice Keywords	3.00	33.50	125.00
Retention Keywords	50.00	108.50	447.00
IoT Data Keywords	0.00	0.00	21.00

Table 18: Cluster 3

Keyword Categories	Min Usage	Median Usage	Max Usage
Collection Keywords	0.00	50.00	138.00
Sharing Keywords	0.00	24.00	103.00
Purpose Keywords	0.00	32.00	175.00
Access Keywords	0.00	18.00	82.00
Security Keywords	0.00	13.00	77.00
Policy Change Keywords	0.00	14.00	141.00
Legislation Keywords	0.00	0.00	0.00
Choice Keywords	0.00	9.00	82.00
Retention Keywords	0.00	12.00	63.00
IoT Data Keywords	0.00	0.00	12.00

Table 19: Cluster 4

Keyword Categories	Min Usage	Median Usage	Max Usage
Collection Keywords	83.00	201.00	1,145.00
Sharing Keywords	29.00	110.00	815.00
Purpose Keywords	49.00	134.00	786.00
Access Keywords	27.00	84.00	673.00
Security Keywords	15.00	42.00	254.00
Policy Change Keywords	11.00	46.00	310.00
Legislation Keywords	0.00	0.00	0.00
Choice Keywords	12.00	45.00	375.00
Retention Keywords	8.00	52.00	758.00
IoT Data Keywords	0.00	1.00	58.00