

---

# Large Language Models are Few-shot Generators: Proposing Hybrid Prompt Algorithm To Generate Webshell Escape Samples

---

**Mingrui Ma\***

School of Cyber Science and Engineering  
Huazhong University of  
Science and Technology  
Wuhan, Hubei, China 430074  
m202271767@hust.edu.cn

**Lansheng Han**

School of Cyber Science and Engineering  
Huazhong University of  
Science and Technology  
Wuhan, Hubei, China 430074  
1998010309@hust.edu.cn

**Chunjie Zhou**

The Key Laboratory of Ministry of Education for Image Processing and Intelligent Control  
School of Artificial Intelligence and Automation  
Huazhong University of Science and Technology  
Wuhan, Hubei, China 430074  
cjiezhou@hust.edu.cn

## Abstract

The frequent occurrence of cyber-attacks has made webshell attacks and defense gradually become a research hotspot in the field of network security. However, the lack of publicly available benchmark datasets and the over-reliance on manually defined rules for webshell escape sample generation have slowed down the progress of research related to webshell escape sample generation and artificial intelligence (AI)-based webshell detection. To address the drawbacks of weak webshell sample escape capabilities, the lack of webshell datasets with complex malicious features, and to promote the development of webshell detection, we propose the Hybrid Prompt algorithm for webshell escape sample generation with the help of large language models. As a prompt algorithm specifically developed for webshell sample generation, the Hybrid Prompt algorithm not only combines various prompt ideas including Chain of Thought, Tree of Thought, but also incorporates various components such as webshell hierarchical module and few-shot example to facilitate the LLM in learning and reasoning webshell escape strategies. Experimental results show that the Hybrid Prompt algorithm can work with multiple LLMs with excellent code reasoning ability to generate high-quality webshell samples with high Escape Rate (88.61% with GPT-4 model on VirusTotal detection engine) and Survival Rate (54.98% with GPT-4 model).

## 1 Introduction

Webshell Starov et al. [2016], as a typical example of malicious scripts exploiting injection vulnerabilities, allows hackers to remotely access and invade web servers, posing serious threats to network security. Similar to the research on malware detection, webshell generation, and detection are non-stationary, adversarial problems Demetrio et al. [2021], which have been engaged in a constant game of cat and mouse, with an escalating spiral trend. From the attacker's perspective, mainstream

---

\*Personal Webpage: <https://jkpathfinder.github.io>

webshell detection tools and engines like VirusTotal Peng et al. [2019], WEBDIR+, and SHELLPUB are frequently updated and maintained, incorporating the rules and characteristics of new webshells within days or even shorter periods. This forces attackers to constantly develop new webshell generation methods to bypass the detection of such engines. On the detection side, research is still in its infancy Hannousse and Yahiouche [2021]. There is a lack of publicly available benchmark datasets and open-source baseline methods for webshell detection. Most models using neural networks or intelligent algorithms claim to have high accuracy and low false positives. However, the fact is that these models are tested on private datasets, which usually consist of only a few hundred or fewer samples, with obvious malicious features. In a real cyber-attack environment, the authenticity and generalization ability of such methods are difficult to guarantee.

In fact, Abdelhakim et al. Hannousse and Yahiouche [2021] argued that AI methods excel at extracting abstract features in webshell, which are advanced features that go beyond lexical, syntactical, and semantical features. These advanced features help reveal hidden aspects in webshells that cannot be detected through syntax and semantic analysis. However, unlike the research on malware adversarial sample generation Demetrio et al. [2021], Kolosnjaji et al. [2018], Song et al. [2022], Castro et al. [2019], research on webshell escape sample generation is still a blank field, which is due to the fact that the existing webshell bypass strategies are numerous and complicated, and there is no specific systematic method to follow. Therefore, it is an urgent and highly significant work to propose a webshell escape sample generation algorithm and construct a corresponding webshell benchmark dataset.

On the other hand, the blooming development of large language model (LLM) and artificial intelligence generated content (AIGC) technologies Chang et al. [2023] has already made an indelible impact in various domains such as chat and image generation Zhao et al. [2023b]. As the latest achievement in the field of natural language processing (NLP), LLM has taken a significant lead over earlier neural network structures (i.e. Long Short-Term Memory Staudemeyer and Morris [2019], Gate Recurrent Unit Dey and Salem [2017], etc.) in contextual reasoning and semantic understanding capabilities. The widespread application of LLM in various code-related tasks Liu et al. [2023a], Deng et al. [2023], Sun et al. [2023], Wei et al. [2023], Zhao et al. [2023a], Pearce et al. [2023] has fully showcased its excellent code reasoning abilities, making it possible to utilize LLM for generating webshell escape samples. Prompt engineering Shin et al. [2020] plays a crucial role in the vertical research application of LLM, which aims to explore better ways of human interaction with LLMs to fully leverage their performance potential. It is undeniable that many key techniques in prompt engineering, such as Chain of Thoughts (CoT) Wei et al. [2022], Tree of Thoughts (ToT) Yao et al. [2023], Zero-Shot CoT Kojima et al. [2022], etc., have improved the reasoning abilities of LLMs. Novel studies in prompt engineering, such as prompt finetuning, have been able to fine-tune the parameters in LLM, thus simplifying the traditional fine-tune process Li and Liang [2021].

Therefore, in this work, we explore the unexplored research area of AIGC-enabled webshell escape sample generation strategies. We propose Hybrid Prompt, a hierarchical and modular prompt generation algorithm, and apply it to different LLM models to generate multiple webshell samples with high escape capabilities. Experimental results demonstrate that the escape samples generated by the Hybrid Prompt algorithm + various LLM models can bypass mainstream detection engines with high Escape Rate ( $ER$ ) and Survival Rate ( $SR$ ).

The main contributions of this paper are three-folds: 1) We propose the Hybrid Prompt algorithm, which combines the advantages of multiple prompt schemes such as ToT Yao et al. [2023], few-shot prompting, CoT, etc. By synthesizing key features related to webshell escape and designing prompt strategies tailored to different sizes of webshells, the algorithm effectively enhances the code reasoning ability of LLM models and generates high-quality webshell escape samples; 2) We construct a webshell benchmark dataset generated by the Hybrid Prompt algorithm. This dataset achieves high  $ER$  and  $SR$  among mainstream detection engines and reflects the performance of rule-based detection engines more realistically and effectively; 3) We investigate and compare the quality of escape samples generated by different LLM models using the Hybrid Prompt algorithm. All these samples exhibit high  $ER$ , surpassing webshell samples generated by other intelligent algorithms (i.e. genetic algorithm Pang et al. [2023]). See App. A.1 for further detailed examples and preliminaries.

## 2 Algorithm design

### 2.1 Overall workflow

The overall flow from collecting multi-source webshell scripts to generating webshell escape samples is shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1: The overall workflow of webshell escape sample generation.

Specifically, we first collect 28,770 raw samples with obfuscated formats from mainstream data websites such as GitHub and Kaggle. Data filtering is then performed to obtain a clean Template webshell dataset with 6,639 samples. Through the Hybrid Prompt algorithm, LLM engages in self-inference based on the template webshell code and generates high-quality webshell escape samples.

### 2.2 Data filtering

To enhance LLM’s learning and understanding of the input webshell samples, we need to construct the Template webshell dataset, a clean and well-characterized webshell dataset with file names unified by *MD5* hash values. We perform triple data filtering process on multi-source webshell datasets, as shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Triple data filtering process.

In the first filtering step, we calculate the *MD5* hash value of all scripts to filter out webshell scripts with consistent content but confusing names. In the second filtering step, we convert the webshell scripts into Abstract Syntax Tree (AST) structures to filter out the scripts with the same syntax structure. For PHP scripts, we use "*php-ast*" to perform the translation (*ast\parse\_code*) and add the *name*, *kind* attribute to the nodes. The pseudocode for this step is shown in Algorithm 1.

---

#### Algorithm 1 Php-ast Runtime Flow

---

```
1: $ast = ast\parse_code($code, $version=70);  
2: $new_ast = add_attr($ast);  
3: $json = json_encode($new_ast, JSON_PRETTY_PRINT | JSON_UNESCAPED_UNICODE |  
JSON_OBJECT_AS_ARRAY);
```

---

In the third filtering step, the Vulcan Logic Disassembler (VLD) module in Zend engine is used to disassemble the scripts into opcode structures, aiming to filter out webshell scripts with consistent execution sequences. See details in App. A.2.

### 2.3 Hybrid Prompt

The ToT method has performance advantages over CoT, Self Consistency (SC) Wang et al. [2023] method in solving complex reasoning problems by searching for multiple solution paths, using strategies such as backtracking and pruning. However, this is not yet sufficient to address the

heuristic search task of generating webshell escape samples with a broader search space and stricter normalization constraints. Therefore, we propose the Hybrid Prompt algorithm, whose overall flow is shown in Figure 3.




Figure 3: The flowchart of Hybrid Prompt algorithm.

We begin with the normalized definition of relevant symbols. We use  $M$  to denote LLM,  $o$  to denote one of the candidates generated by each module of Hybrid Prompt,  $O$  to denote the set composed of candidates,  $x$  to denote the original input of Hybrid Prompt,  $F_e$  to denote the few-shot example,  $N$  to denote the tree depth of Hybrid Prompt and  $p$  to denote the number of candidates.

### 2.3.1 Module setting

To divide the task of generating webshell escape samples into several subtasks and enhance LLM’s single-step reasoning ability in the Hybrid Prompt algorithm, we introduce the concept of modules. A module represents a key escape idea, such as "Add Unrelated Comments", and some modules further have secondary and tertiary modules, see details in App. A.3. Each module contains an  $F_e$  chain consisting of several  $F_e$  nodes, which will be further elaborated in Section 2.3.2. Therefore, in Hybrid Prompt, LLM’s single-step search space contemplates the escape plan guided by a module for the current round of input webshell.

### 2.3.2 Compound input generator $G(M, o)$

To alleviate the issue of hallucination during LLM’s single-step reasoning, which may result in generating corrupted webshells, we apply the CoT method to generate multiple intermediate webshell samples at each reasoning step (each module) in the Hybrid Prompt algorithm, as illustrated in Figure 3. Considering that LLM may generate some low-value solutions with large deviations from the expectation, thus reducing the efficiency of subsequent votes, we design  $F_e$  chain structure for each module, see details in App. A.4. Therefore,  $G(M, o) = M(F_e, o)$ . When filtering the  $F_e$  chain, we adhere to the following principles: 1) The structure of the example webshell code should be as simple as possible; 2) Each node contains, as far as possible, only the processing methods corresponding to that module. The purpose is to reduce the difficulty of LLM in learning the corresponding method through an example that is as simple as possible and contains the core idea. The descriptive explanation further enhances the interpretability of the solutions. This idea is also in

line with the logical process of human learning and cognition, to help LLM better learn the features of the methods.

$F_e$  can essentially "modify" the LLM's thinking direction to a certain extent so that webshell can be generated in a Few-shot CoT mindset. In most cases, each  $F_e$  chain contains multiple  $F_e$  examples to provide more comprehensive coverage of different scenarios. In this case, multiple nodes are used as input prompt components for the current iteration round, to help LLM better learn multiple segmented strategies. Due to the large search space and sample diversity for each module, this Few-shot CoT method yields better results. Therefore, in each reasoning step of the Hybrid Prompt algorithm, the compound input consists of Pre-knowledge (optional),  $F_e$  chain, input webshell code, and extra key prompts, as shown in Figure 3.

Meanwhile, based on the input webshell size, we design 2 different generation approaches. For small webshells, we include  $p$  candidate webshell samples in a single conversation returned by the LLM. In this case, the average maximum length of each candidate webshell sample  $L(Avg\_Candidate_i)$  is calculated as  $L(Avg\_Candidate_i) = (L(MaxToken) - L(InputPrompt))/p$ . Where  $L(MaxToken)$  denotes the maximum context length that the current LLM model can handle, and  $L(InputPrompt)$  denotes the length of the input prompt in the current thought. Since small webshells are generally shorter, this approach can save the consumption of LLM's token resources, and enable LLM to generate more diverse samples in the returned message of a single conversation through specific "key prompts".

For large webshells, we enable the  $n$  parameter function to generate  $p$  candidate webshell samples by receiving multiple return messages from LLM. In this case, the maximum length of each candidate webshell sample  $L(Candidate_i)$  is calculated as  $L(Candidate_i) = L(MaxToken) - L(InputPrompt) - L(Description_i)$ . Where  $Description_i$  represents the brief description generated by LLM for the  $i^{th}$  candidate webshell sample, which is used to summarize the idea of candidate webshell generation and facilitate the subsequent voting process. This approach maximizes the length of the generated candidate webshell sample at the expense of consuming more token resources.

### 2.3.3 Candidate evaluator $V(M, O)$

The candidate evaluator is also designed to have 2 different voting methods for large and small webshells. For small webshells, Hybrid Prompt uses LLM to vote on multiple intermediate webshell samples and filter out the optimal ones. The reason for voting on multiple samples instead of voting on solutions is two-fold: 1) Since the compound input generator operates in a few-shot CoT mindset, webshell samples help LLM evaluate and assess the differences between generated examples more intuitively to make optimal judgments; 2) Voting directly on the samples can preserve all the original information of the candidate webshells. In this case,  $L(Generator(Input + Output)) \approx L(Evaluator(Input + Output)) < L(MaxToken)$ . Because both contain  $F_e$ s, the webshell contents of  $p$  candidates, and additional prompt information.

For large webshells, it is not feasible to directly input the webshell contents of  $p$  candidates into LLM because  $p \times (L(Candidate_i)) + L(F_echain) + L(AdditionalPrompt) > L(MaxToken)$ . Therefore, we use  $Description_i$  instead of  $Candidate_i$  as the input component of the voting procedure. This kind of information compression idea will inevitably lose the original code information. App. A.5 presents a specific example comparing 2 voting ideas.

Regardless of the voting idea, for  $V(M, O)$ , where  $O = \{o_1, o_2, \dots, o_p\}$ ,  $V(M, o_i) = 1$  is considered a good state, when  $o_i \sim M^{vote}(o_i|O)$ . For Hybrid Prompt, the evaluation of a good state is to synthesize both the confusion level of the intermediate results generated by LLM for a module and the distance between them and the  $F_e$ s, as shown in Figure 3. By allowing LLM to pursue local optimal solutions at each step of sample generation, this "greedy" idea makes it easier for the LLM to approximate the global optimal solution for the heuristic problem of escape sample generation.

### 2.3.4 Search algorithm

For the Hybrid Prompt method, the depth of the tree  $N$  depends on the number of the modules selected. The DFS strategy leads to an excessive state space of LLM during the backtracking and pruning stages, which reduces the efficiency of the algorithm operation. Therefore, we consider using the BFS search algorithm. The pseudocode of the corresponding Hybrid Prompt-BFS algorithm is

shown in Algorithm 2. The final output of the webshell escape sample is the candidate that wins in the vote process at the  $N^{th}$  layer.

---

**Algorithm 2** Hybrid Prompt-BFS Algorithm

---

**Require:** Input  $x$ , Compound Input Generator  $G(M, o)$ , Candidate Evaluator  $V(M, O)$ , Tree Depth  $N$ , Candidate num  $p$ , Step Output  $O_i(O \leq i \leq N)$

- 1:  $O_0 = x$
- 2: **for**  $n = 1$  to  $N$  **do**
- 3:    $O'_n = \{[o, z] | o \in O_{n-1}, z_n \in G(M, o)\}$
- 4:    $V_n = V(M, O'_n)$
- 5:    $O_n = \text{sort}(V_n, p)$
- 6: **end for**
- 7: Return  $O_n$

---

**2.3.5 Additional explanation**

Since LLM has a limited range of contextual memory, we cannot let LLM memorize the entire Hybrid Prompt context but should set its local memory range. For this reason, our approach is to set the contextual memory range for the Hybrid Prompt, as shown in Figure 3. For the webshell escape sample generation task, an important guiding principle is to ensure the validity of generated samples. This means that the escaped samples should not lose the attack behavior and malicious features of the original samples and can be executed correctly without any syntax or lexical errors. To achieve this, Hybrid Prompt introduces Safeguard Prompt to constrain sample generation and improve  $SR$ . In addition, common techniques in prompt engineering, such as “” delimiter, are also applied in the Hybrid Prompt algorithm to normalize the output of LLMs. The order of modules also has a significant impact on the Hybrid Prompt algorithm. Therefore, when running the Hybrid Prompt algorithm, it is important to consider the relative position between specific modules and establish corresponding rules to avoid such situations from occurring. See more explanations in App. A.6.

**3 Experiments**

In the experimental section, our main objective is to answer the following questions:

**RQ1: Effectiveness analysis.** Can Hybrid Prompt effectively generate escape samples? **RQ2: Ablation study.** Are the individual parts of the Hybrid Prompt algorithm effectively designed? **RQ3: Sensitivity analysis.** Does the number of candidates  $p$  affect the performance of the Hybrid Prompt algorithm? What is the impact on the performance of the Hybrid Prompt algorithm if the tree depth  $N$  is reduced by half? **RQ4: Defensive study.** Is there a method available to detect the escape samples generated by the Hybrid Prompt algorithm?

**3.1 Setup**

**Experimental settings.** We use the Hybrid Prompt algorithm with the tree depth  $N = 10$  to generate a total of 3,273 escape samples from 6,639 samples in the Template webshell dataset, with 1,091 samples generated by GPT-3.5, GPT-4, and Code-llama-34B each. We implement Hybrid Prompt using Python 3.10 and PyTorch 1.8.1. We run all our experiments on a Windows server configured with a 2.9GHz Intel Xeon 6326R CPU,  $2 \times 80G$  NVIDIA TESLA A100 GPU, and 64GB memory. We further build a Virtual Attack Environment for verifying the validity of the escape samples generated by the Hybrid Prompt algorithm.

**Evaluation metrics & Comparative methods.** To better compare the quality of samples generated by different LLM models using the Hybrid Prompt algorithm, we choose 3 evaluation metrics:  $ER$ ,  $SR$  and Modification Ratio ( $MR$ ), where  $ER = 1 - DR$ ,  $DR = N_{Detected\_samples} / N_{Total\_samples}$ ,  $SR = N_{Malicious\_samples} / N_{Total\_samples}$ .  $DR$  represents the detection accuracy,  $N_{Total\_samples}$  is the total number of samples generated by LLM under the Hybrid Prompt algorithm, and  $N_{Malicious\_samples}$  is the number of samples generated by LLM under the Hybrid Prompt algorithm that still retain malicious functionality.  $MR = N_{Escape\_samp\_size} / N_{Ori\_samp\_size}$ ,  $N_{Escape\_samp\_size}$  represents the total file size of  $N$  escape samples generated,  $N_{Ori\_samp\_size}$

represents the total file size of  $N$  original samples generated. Due to the lack of relevant research, we also include a comparison with the dataset from CWSOGG Pang et al. [2023], an obfuscated webshell dataset generated using the genetic algorithm.

**Models & Detection engines.** We test the  $ER$ ,  $SR$ , and  $MR$  of samples generated by Hybrid Prompt under 4 detection engines: Web Shell Detector, WEBDIR+, SHELLPUB and VirusTotal respectively. In addition, we cross-check the performance of several LLM models, including GPT-3.5, GPT-4, and Code-llama-34B, which demonstrate excellent performance in code generation and semantic understanding tasks. For VirusTotal, we set the Label Aggregation threshold to 13 following the tuning recommendation of Zhu et al. [2020] and apply redundant votes to certain vulnerable detection engines (such as Comodo).

For further details on the Experimental setup, see App. A.7. Codes available at <https://github.com/HybridPrompt/Hybrid-Prompt-demo>

### 3.2 Comparative experiment

To answer **RQ1**, the comparative results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Comparative experiment results

Anti-Virus Engine	<i>Web Shell Detector</i>	<i>WEBDIR+</i>	<i>VirusTotal</i>	<i>SHELLPUB</i>	$SR$	$MR$
Model	$ER$					
GPT-3.5 Turbo + Hybrid Prompt	0.9342	0.8874	0.7465	0.8023	0.4093	1.38
GPT-4 + Hybrid Prompt	0.9727	0.9287	0.8861	0.9024	0.5498	1.43
Code-llama-34B + Hybrid Prompt	0.9015	0.8549	0.6358	0.7625	0.3021	2.95
Original Template Dataset	0.3415	0.2054	0.1232	0.1684	1	N/A
CWSOGG Dataset	0.4052	0.3151	0.2327	0.2748	1	N/A

In Table 1, the GPT-4 + Hybrid Prompt algorithm has the best comprehensive performance, leading to both  $ER$  and  $SR$ . This is because GPT-4 is more capable of following complex instructions carefully, while Hybrid Prompt contains multiple detailed instructions with normalized constraints. GPT-3.5, on the other hand, could partially follow complex instructions, resulting in a higher probability of generating escape samples that prioritize either  $ER$  or  $SR$ , making it difficult to balance both. It is encouraging to note that the comprehensive performance of the open-source LLM Code-llama-34B, is very close to that of the GPT-3.5 model, confirming the performance potential of the open-source models. Meanwhile, the  $ER$  of webshell samples generated by the 3 LLM models + Hybrid Prompt algorithm have far exceeded those of the Original template dataset and the CWSOGG dataset, which fully demonstrate the performance superiority and dominance of the LLM models over rule-based artificial escape strategies and the traditional intelligent algorithms (i.e., genetic algorithm). However, when considering the  $MR$  metric, the open-source LLM Code-llama-34B still lags behind GPT-3.5 and GPT-4, indicating the need to generate more obfuscated content to evade detection. As for the detection engines, VirusTotal, due to its integration of many different detection engines, has a higher overall  $DR$  compared to Web Shell Detector, SHELLPUB and WEBDIR+. However, even VirusTotal struggles with the creativity of LLMs and the uncertainty of the generated escape samples, which illustrates the limitations and drawbacks of these types of specific rule-based detection engines.

### 3.3 Ablation analysis

To validate the effectiveness of the algorithm and address **RQ2**, we test the performance of samples generated by removing different components of the algorithm (i.e. removing Safeguard Prompt, removing  $F_e$  chain, removing voting strategy, removing the entire Hybrid Prompt algorithm) under  $ER$  and  $SR$  evaluation metrics in the GPT-3.5 model. The experimental results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2 illustrates that "W/o Hybrid Prompt" has poor performance and a high probability of hallucination due to the absence of any additional prompt. Both "W/o  $F_e$ " and "W/o Voting" produce different degrees of performance degradation. For "W/o  $F_e$ ", LLM loses reference examples, leading to a higher probability of generating corrupted samples. "W/o  $F_e$ " also indirectly reflects that the current LLM's code reasoning ability still relies on  $F_e$  chains to achieve better task performance. For "W/o Voting", LLM is unable to explore multiple reasoning paths, so the generation space and diversity of samples are limited, which leads to a lower  $ER$ . "W/o Safeguard Prompt" has the least

Table 2: The comparative results of ablation analysis

Anti-Virus Engine	<i>Web Shell Detector</i>	<i>WEBDIR+</i>	<i>VirusTotal</i>	<i>SHELLPUB</i>	<i>SR</i>
Strategy	<i>ER</i>				
Hybrid Prompt	0.9342	0.8874	0.7465	0.8023	0.4093
W/o Safeguard Prompt	0.9221	0.8653	0.7114	0.7721	0.3398
W/o $F_e$	0.7315	0.6819	0.5042	0.6911	0.2310
W/o Voting	0.8213	0.7998	0.6524	0.7039	0.3067
W/o Hybrid Prompt	0.5021	0.4267	0.3120	0.3863	0.1513

impact on the quality of generated escape samples. Although the probability of generating corrupted samples increases and the  $SR$  decreases due to the loss of Safeguard Prompt’s normalization measures, the impact on the  $ER$  is not significant. However, all ablation models produce varying degrees of performance degradation compared to the complete Hybrid Prompt algorithm, fully demonstrating the effectiveness of various components in the Hybrid Prompt algorithm.

### 3.4 Sensitivity analysis

We investigate the impact of the candidate number,  $p$ , and the tree depth,  $N$ , on the  $SR$  and  $ER$  evaluation metrics of generated samples in the GPT-3.5 model. The experimental results of **RQ3** are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: The comparative results of sensitivity analysis

Anti-Virus Engine	<i>Web Shell Detector</i>	<i>WEBDIR+</i>	<i>VirusTotal</i>	<i>SHELLPUB</i>	<i>SR</i>
Candidate num $p$	<i>ER</i>				
1	0.8213	0.7998	0.6524	0.7039	0.3067
2	0.8749	0.8567	0.7031	0.7687	0.3648
3	0.9342	0.8874	0.7465	0.8023	0.4093
4	0.9489	0.8968	0.7621	0.8095	0.4163
5	0.9522	0.9014	0.7708	0.8193	0.4266
Anti-Virus Engine	<i>Web Shell Detector</i>	<i>WEBDIR+</i>	<i>VirusTotal</i>	<i>SHELLPUB</i>	<i>SR</i>
Tree depth $N$	<i>ER</i>				
5	0.8957	0.8210	0.5982	0.6724	0.4102
10	0.9342	0.8874	0.7465	0.8023	0.4093

From Table 3, it can be observed that a larger number of candidates can increase the search space of LLM, which in turn enriches the diversity of generated samples, enables better selection of the optimal solution, and improves the sample  $ER$  and  $SR$ . However, the increase of  $p$  will also result in a higher token consumption and, in the case of small webshells, further reduces the  $L(Avg\_Candidate_i)$  for each sample. Table 3 also shows the "marginal effect" that occurs as  $p$  increases. When  $p$  exceeds 3, the performance improvement of  $ER$  and  $SR$  metrics is not obvious, which can be attributed to the fact that the search space of LLM’s self-inference is approaching the local upper limit. However, it is noteworthy that the consumption of tokens exhibits an almost linear relationship with the increase in  $p$ , despite the limited performance gains in  $ER$  and  $SR$  metrics. Therefore, the pros and cons between evaluation metrics and resource consumption should be weighed in practical applications. When the tree depth  $N = 5$ , the  $ER$  of the Hybrid Prompt algorithm shows a significant decrease. From this, it is not difficult to analyze that Hybrid Prompt progressively enhances the level of obfuscation in candidate samples through the step-by-step inference in each module, aiming to reach the goal of high  $ER$ . However, there is only a slight difference in  $SR$  between  $N = 5$  and  $N = 10$ , indicating that a series of normalization measures of Hybrid Prompt algorithm effectively guarantees the validity of the generated samples. See App. A.8 for visualization results of the experiments.

### 3.5 Defensive study

As mentioned in Section 1, we aim to facilitate research on AI-based webshell detection algorithms rather than promote malicious activities. Considering the lack of available open-source solutions for AI-based webshell detection methods Ma et al. [2024] and to inspire **RQ4**, we design a comparative AI-webshell detection engine based on the BERT Devlin et al. [2019] model. In short, we use 2 BERT models with the identical structure (named Model 1 and Model 2). During the fine-tuning



stage, Model 2 additionally introduces escape samples generated by the Hybrid Prompt algorithm. Both Model 1 and Model 2 are tested on the same dataset using  $Acc$  and  $F1$  as evaluation metrics where  $Acc = (TP + TN)/(TP + FP + TN + FN)$ ,  $F1 = (2 \times Pre \times Rec)/(Pre + Rec)$ ,  $Pre = TP/(TP + FP)$ ,  $Rec = TP/(TP + FN)$ . For specific methodology and experimental settings, please refer to App. A.9. The test results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Defensive study results

Model 1		Model 2	
Acc	F1	Acc	F1
0.6917	0.8059	0.9939	0.9958

We can observe that the adversarial fine-tuned Model 2 outperforms the baseline fine-tuned Model 1 in both evaluation metrics, with 30.22% and 18.99% improvement in  $Acc$  and  $F1$  metrics, respectively. This is because the adversarial fine-tuned Model 2 effectively learns the abstract features of escape samples, which results in high-precision recognition of escape strategies during the testing phase. It is worth noting that the experimental results in Table 4 are obtained with an imbalanced data distribution. If the number of benign samples is close to the number of malicious samples, the performance gap between Model 2 and Model 1 will be further amplified. Table 4 also demonstrates that the webshell escape samples generated under the guidance of the Hybrid Prompt algorithm are valuable for enhancing the robustness and generalization ability of the AI-based webshell detection engines, and can effectively achieve the goal of promoting defense by attack.

## 4 Related work

**Prompt engineering algorithm.** As one of the most classic prompt algorithms, CoT Wei et al. [2022] aims to assist LLMs in achieving complex reasoning abilities through intermediate inference steps. Zero-shot CoT Kojima et al. [2022], as a follow-up to CoT, enables LLM to perform self-reasoning through twice generation, involving 2 separate prompting processes. SC Wang et al. [2023] serves as another complement to the CoT algorithm by sampling a diverse set of reasoning paths and marginalizing out reasoning paths to aggregate final answers. Least to Most Prompting (LtM) Zhou et al. [2023], also an advancement of the CoT algorithm, decomposes a problem into a set of subproblems built upon each other and inputs the solutions of the previous sub-problem into the prompt of the next sub-problem to gradually solve each sub-problem. Generated Knowledge Approach (GKA) Liu et al. [2022] enables LLM to generate potentially useful information related to a given question before generating the response through 2 intermediate steps: knowledge generation and knowledge integration. Diverse Verifier on Reasoning Steps (DiVeRSe) Li et al. [2023], on the other hand, improves the reliability of LLM answers by generating multiple reasoning paths.

**The application of LLM in code-related tasks.** Zhang et al. Zhang et al. [2023a] utilized ChatGPT to generate vulnerability exploitation code. Liu et al. Liu et al. [2023b] applied GPT to the task of vulnerability description mapping and evaluation tasks. They provided certain prompts to ChatGPT and extracted the required information from its responses using regular expressions. Zhang et al. Zhang et al. [2023b] proposed STEAM, a framework for bug fixing using LLM to simulate programmers’ behaviors. Kang et al. introduced the LIBRO Kang et al. [2023] model for exploring bug reproduction tasks. The aforementioned researches demonstrate that with appropriate algorithmic design, LLM is capable of handling various specific tasks in the field of code analysis.

**Researches on webshell detection techniques.** We categorize the research in the field of webshell detection into 3 stages: Start Stage, Initial Development Stage, and In-depth Development Stage. In the Start Stage, research methods are simple and have numerous flaws and deficiencies, such as limited private datasets, unreasonable feature extraction methods Tian et al. [2017], Zhang et al. [2018], etc. In the Initial Development Stage, relevant studies explore and make progress in various aspects of the detection process. However, theoretical innovations remain relatively scarce Wu et al. [2019], Lu et al. [2020], Zhang et al. [2020], Le et al. [2023], Zhou et al. [2021], etc. In the In-depth Development Stage, simple individual classifiers or machine learning algorithms become less common, and related research has penetrated into the theoretical process level of modeling methods An et al. [2022], Cheng et al. [2022]. However, from an overall point of view, research related to webshell detection techniques is still in its early stages, largely due to the slow progress of

the attacker’s research, and the lack of advanced webshell escape sample generation algorithms in the field.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose Hybrid Prompt, a webshell escape sample generation prompt algorithm that combines various prompt strategies such as ToT, CoT, etc. Hybrid Prompt combines structured webshell module and  $F_e$  chain, utilizes auxiliary methods to inspire LLMs to perform self-assessment and optimization, and demonstrates excellent performance on LLMs with strong code reasoning capabilities (GPT-3.5, GPT-4, Code-llama-34B), enabling the generation of high-quality webshell escape samples. Hybrid Prompt algorithm also exhibits strong scalability and generalization capability, allowing for the addition of more modules and corresponding  $F_e$  chains to update escape strategies and expand to more webshell languages.

**Limitations and future work.** The Hybrid Prompt algorithm currently supports a limited number of webshell languages, and there is a need to expand it to support more webshell languages in the future. Hybrid Prompt algorithm does not fine-tune LLMs. Fine-tuning can further reduce the probability of LLM hallucination and improve the quality of generated escape samples. For the voting strategy in the case of large webshells, the description-based strategy used in the Hybrid Prompt algorithm results in the loss of original information from candidate code, which in turn affects the vote effect of LLM. While information compression strategies are acceptable for NLP tasks such as contextual dialogs, there is room for further improvement for tasks such as code generation, which require precise raw sample information.

Therefore, our further work includes combining LLM fine-tuning techniques with the Hybrid Prompt algorithm to further enhance the code generation capability of LLM and designing more advanced information compression algorithms to improve the quality of sample generation.

## References

- Tongjian An, Xuefei Shui, and Hongkui Gao. Deep learning based webshell detection coping with long text and lexical ambiguity. In Cristina Alcaraz, Liqun Chen, Shujun Li, and Pierangela Samarati, editors, *Information and Communications Security - 24th International Conference, ICICS 2022, Canterbury, UK, September 5-8, 2022, Proceedings*, volume 13407 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 438–457. Springer, 2022. doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-15777-6\_24. URL [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-15777-6\\_24](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-15777-6_24).
- Raphael Labaca Castro, Battista Biggio, and Gabi Dreo Rodosek. Poster: Attacking malware classifiers by crafting gradient-attacks that preserve functionality. In Lorenzo Cavallaro, Johannes Kinder, XiaoFeng Wang, and Jonathan Katz, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS 2019, London, UK, November 11-15, 2019*, pages 2565–2567. ACM, 2019. doi: 10.1145/3319535.3363257. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3319535.3363257>.
- Yupeng Chang, Xu Wang, Jindong Wang, Yuan Wu, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, Linyi Yang, Xiaoyuan Yi, Cunxiang Wang, Yidong Wang, Wei Ye, Yue Zhang, Yi Chang, Philip S. Yu, Qiang Yang, and Xing Xie. A survey on evaluation of large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2307.03109, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2307.03109. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.03109>.
- Baijun Cheng, Yanhui Guo, Yan Ren, Gang Yang, and Guosheng Xu. Msdetector: A static PHP webshell detection system based on deep-learning. In Yamine Aït Ameer and Florin Craciun, editors, *Theoretical Aspects of Software Engineering - 16th International Symposium, TASE 2022, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, July 8-10, 2022, Proceedings*, volume 13299 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 155–172. Springer, 2022. doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-10363-6\_11. URL [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-10363-6\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-10363-6_11).
- Luca Demetrio, Battista Biggio, Giovanni Lagorio, Fabio Roli, and Alessandro Armando. Functionality-preserving black-box optimization of adversarial windows malware. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Secur.*, 16:3469–3478, 2021. doi: 10.1109/TIFS.2021.3082330. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIFS.2021.3082330>.

- Gelei Deng, Yi Liu, Victor Mayoral Vilches, Peng Liu, Yuekang Li, Yuan Xu, Tianwei Zhang, Yang Liu, Martin Pinzger, and Stefan Rass. Pentestgpt: An llm-empowered automatic penetration testing tool. *CoRR*, abs/2308.06782, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2308.06782. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2308.06782>.
- 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 Thamar Solorio, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2019, Minneapolis, MN, USA, June 2-7, 2019, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2019. doi: 10.18653/V1/N19-1423. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/n19-1423>.
- Rahul Dey and Fathi M. Salem. Gate-variants of gated recurrent unit (GRU) neural networks. In *IEEE 60th International Midwest Symposium on Circuits and Systems, MWSCAS 2017, Boston, MA, USA, August 6-9, 2017*, pages 1597–1600. IEEE, 2017. doi: 10.1109/MWSCAS.2017.8053243. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/MWSCAS.2017.8053243>.
- Abdelhakim Hannousse and Salima Yahiouche. Handling webshell attacks: A systematic mapping and survey. *Comput. Secur.*, 108:102366, 2021. doi: 10.1016/J.COSE.2021.102366. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2021.102366>.
- Sungmin Kang, Juyeon Yoon, and Shin Yoo. Large language models are few-shot testers: Exploring llm-based general bug reproduction. In *45th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2023, Melbourne, Australia, May 14-20, 2023*, pages 2312–2323. IEEE, 2023. doi: 10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00194. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00194>.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. In Sanmi Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*, 2022. URL [http://papers.nips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2022/hash/8bb0d291acd4acf06ef112099c16f326-Abstract-Conference.html](http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/8bb0d291acd4acf06ef112099c16f326-Abstract-Conference.html).
- Bojan Kolosnjaji, Ambra Demontis, Battista Biggio, Davide Maiorca, Giorgio Giacinto, Claudia Eckert, and Fabio Roli. Adversarial malware binaries: Evading deep learning for malware detection in executables. In *26th European Signal Processing Conference, EUSIPCO 2018, Roma, Italy, September 3-7, 2018*, pages 533–537. IEEE, 2018. doi: 10.23919/EUSIPCO.2018.8553214. URL <https://doi.org/10.23919/EUSIPCO.2018.8553214>.
- Ha Viet Le, Tu N. Nguyen, Hoa Ngoc Nguyen, and Linh Le. An efficient hybrid webshell detection method for webserver of marine transportation systems. *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, 24(2): 2630–2642, 2023. doi: 10.1109/TITS.2021.3122979. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2021.3122979>.
- Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation. In Chengqing Zong, Fei Xia, Wenjie Li, and Roberto Navigli, editors, *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, ACL/IJCNLP 2021, (Volume 1: Long Papers), Virtual Event, August 1-6, 2021*, pages 4582–4597. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021. doi: 10.18653/V1/2021.ACL-LONG.353. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.353>.
- Yifei Li, Zeqi Lin, Shizhuo Zhang, Qiang Fu, Bei Chen, Jian-Guang Lou, and Weizhu Chen. Making language models better reasoners with step-aware verifier. In Anna Rogers, Jordan L. Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki, editors, *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023*, pages 5315–5333. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023. doi: 10.18653/V1/2023.ACL-LONG.291. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.291>.
- Chao Liu, Xuanlin Bao, Hongyu Zhang, Neng Zhang, Haibo Hu, Xiaohong Zhang, and Meng Yan. Improving chatgpt prompt for code generation. *CoRR*, abs/2305.08360, 2023a. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2305.08360. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.08360>.
- Jiacheng Liu, Alisa Liu, Ximing Lu, Sean Welleck, Peter West, Ronan Le Bras, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Generated knowledge prompting for commonsense reasoning. In Smaranda

- Muresan, Preslav Nakov, and Aline Villavicencio, editors, *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, ACL 2022, Dublin, Ireland, May 22-27, 2022, pages 3154–3169. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2022. doi: 10.18653/V1/2022.ACL-LONG.225. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.225>.
- Xin Liu, Yuan Tan, Zhenghang Xiao, Jianwei Zhuge, and Rui Zhou. Not the end of story: An evaluation of chatgpt-driven vulnerability description mappings. In Anna Rogers, Jordan L. Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023*, pages 3724–3731. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023b. doi: 10.18653/V1/2023.FINDINGS-ACL.229. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.229>.
- Jinping Lu, Zhi Tang, Jian Mao, Zhiling Gu, and Jiemin Zhang. Mixed-models method based on machine learning in detecting webshell attack. In *CIPAE 2020: 2020 International Conference on Computers, Information Processing and Advanced Education, Ottawa, ON, Canada, October 16-18, 2020*, pages 251–259. ACM, 2020. doi: 10.1145/3419635.3419716. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3419635.3419716>.
- Mingrui Ma, Lansheng Han, and Chunjie Zhou. Research and application of artificial intelligence based webshell detection model: A literature review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.00066*, 2024. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2405.00066. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2405.00066>.
- Bo Pang, Gang Liang, Jin Yang, Yijing Chen, Xinyi Wang, and Wenbo He. CWSOGG: catching web shell obfuscation based on genetic algorithm and generative adversarial network. *Comput. J.*, 66(5):1295–1309, 2023. doi: 10.1093/COMJNL/BXAC040. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/comjnl/bxac040>.
- Hammond Pearce, Benjamin Tan, Baleegh Ahmad, Ramesh Karri, and Brendan Dolan-Gavitt. Examining zero-shot vulnerability repair with large language models. In *44th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2023, San Francisco, CA, USA, May 21-25, 2023*, pages 2339–2356. IEEE, 2023. doi: 10.1109/SP46215.2023.10179324. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP46215.2023.10179324>.
- Peng Peng, Limin Yang, Linhai Song, and Gang Wang. Opening the blackbox of virustotal: Analyzing online phishing scan engines. In *Proceedings of the Internet Measurement Conference, IMC 2019, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 21-23, 2019*, pages 478–485. ACM, 2019. doi: 10.1145/3355369.3355585. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3355369.3355585>.
- Taylor Shin, Yasaman Razeghi, Robert L. Logan IV, Eric Wallace, and Sameer Singh. Autoprompt: Eliciting knowledge from language models with automatically generated prompts. In Bonnie Webber, Trevor Cohn, Yulan He, and Yang Liu, editors, *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2020, Online, November 16-20, 2020*, pages 4222–4235. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2020. doi: 10.18653/V1/2020.EMNLP-MAIN.346. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.346>.
- Wei Song, Xuezixiang Li, Sadia Afroz, Deepali Garg, Dmitry Kuznetsov, and Heng Yin. Malmalware: A reinforcement learning framework for blackbox generation of adversarial malware. In Yuji Suga, Kouichi Sakurai, Xuhua Ding, and Kazue Sako, editors, *ASIA CCS '22: ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security, Nagasaki, Japan, 30 May 2022 - 3 June 2022*, pages 990–1003. ACM, 2022. doi: 10.1145/3488932.3497768. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3488932.3497768>.
- Oleksii Starov, Johannes Dahse, Syed Sharique Ahmad, Thorsten Holz, and Nick Nikiforakis. No honor among thieves: A large-scale analysis of malicious web shells. In Jacqueline Bourdeau, Jim Hendler, Roger Nkambou, Ian Horrocks, and Ben Y. Zhao, editors, *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW 2016, Montreal, Canada, April 11 - 15, 2016*, pages 1021–1032. ACM, 2016. doi: 10.1145/2872427.2882992. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2872427.2882992>.
- Ralf C. Staudemeyer and Eric Rothstein Morris. Understanding LSTM - a tutorial into long short-term memory recurrent neural networks. *CoRR*, abs/1909.09586, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1909.09586>.
- Yuqiang Sun, Daoyuan Wu, Yue Xue, Han Liu, Haijun Wang, Zhengzi Xu, Xiaofei Xie, and Yang Liu. When GPT meets program analysis: Towards intelligent detection of smart contract logic

- vulnerabilities in gptscan. *CoRR*, abs/2308.03314, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2308.03314. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2308.03314>.
- Yifan Tian, Jiabao Wang, Zhenji Zhou, and Shengli Zhou. Cnn-webshell: Malicious web shell detection with convolutional neural network. In *Proceedings of the VI International Conference on Network, Communication and Computing, ICNCC 2017, Kunming, China, December 8-10, 2017*, pages 75–79. ACM, 2017. doi: 10.1145/3171592.3171593. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3171592.3171593>.
- Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V. Le, Ed H. Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/pdf?id=1PL1NIMMrw>.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V. Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In Sanmi Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*, 2022. URL [http://papers.nips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2022/hash/9d5609613524ecf4f15af0f7b31abca4-Abstract-Conference.html](http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/9d5609613524ecf4f15af0f7b31abca4-Abstract-Conference.html).
- Yuxiang Wei, Chunqiu Steven Xia, and Lingming Zhang. Copiloting the copilots: Fusing large language models with completion engines for automated program repair. In Satish Chandra, Kelly Blincoe, and Paolo Tonella, editors, *Proceedings of the 31st ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/FSE 2023, San Francisco, CA, USA, December 3-9, 2023*, pages 172–184. ACM, 2023. doi: 10.1145/3611643.3616271. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3611643.3616271>.
- Yixin Wu, Yuqiang Sun, Cheng Huang, Peng Jia, and Luping Liu. Session-based webshell detection using machine learning in web logs. *Secur. Commun. Networks*, 2019:3093809:1–3093809:11, 2019. doi: 10.1155/2019/3093809. URL <https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/3093809>.
- Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Thomas L. Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2305.10601, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2305.10601. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.10601>.
- Han Zhang, Ming Liu, Zihan Yue, Zhi Xue, Yong Shi, and Xiangjian He. A PHP and JSP web shell detection system with text processing based on machine learning. In Guojun Wang, Ryan K. L. Ko, Md. Zakirul Alam Bhuiyan, and Yi Pan, editors, *19th IEEE International Conference on Trust, Security and Privacy in Computing and Communications, TrustCom 2020, Guangzhou, China, December 29, 2020 - January 1, 2021*, pages 1584–1591. IEEE, 2020. doi: 10.1109/TRUSTCOM50675.2020.00219. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TrustCom50675.2020.00219>.
- Ying Zhang, Wenjia Song, Zhengjie Ji, Danfeng Yao, and Na Meng. How well does LLM generate security tests? *CoRR*, abs/2310.00710, 2023a. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2310.00710. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2310.00710>.
- Yuwei Zhang, Zhi Jin, Ying Xing, and Ge Li. STEAM: simulating the interactive behavior of programmers for automatic bug fixing. *CoRR*, abs/2308.14460, 2023b. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2308.14460. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2308.14460>.
- Zijian Zhang, Meng Li, Liehuang Zhu, and Xinyi Li. Smartdetect: A smart detection scheme for malicious web shell codes via ensemble learning. In Meikang Qiu, editor, *Smart Computing and Communication - Third International Conference, SmartCom 2018, Tokyo, Japan, December 10-12, 2018, Proceedings*, volume 11344 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 196–205. Springer, 2018. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-05755-8\_20. URL [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-05755-8\\_20](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-05755-8_20).
- Jianyu Zhao, Yuyang Rong, Yiwen Guo, Yifeng He, and Hao Chen. Understanding programs by exploiting (fuzzing) test cases. In Anna Rogers, Jordan L. Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023*, pages 10667–10679. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023a.

doi: 10.18653/V1/2023.FINDINGS-ACL.678. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.678>.

Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, Yifan Du, Chen Yang, Yushuo Chen, Zhipeng Chen, Jinhao Jiang, Ruiyang Ren, Yifan Li, Xinyu Tang, Zikang Liu, Peiyu Liu, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. A survey of large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2303.18223, 2023b. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2303.18223. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.18223>.

Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Claire Cui, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc V. Le, and Ed H. Chi. Least-to-most prompting enables complex reasoning in large language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/pdf?id=WZH7099tgfM>.

Ziheng Zhou, Lin Li, and Xu Zhao. Webshell detection technology based on deep learning. In *7th IEEE International Conference on Big Data Security on Cloud, IEEE International Conference on High Performance and Smart Computing, and IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Data and Security, BigDataSecurity/HPSC/IDS 2021, New York City, NY, USA, May 15-17, 2021*, pages 52–56. IEEE, 2021. doi: 10.1109/BIGDATASECURITYHPSCIDS52275.2021.00020. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/BigDataSecurityHPSCIDS52275.2021.00020>.

Shuofei Zhu, Jianjun Shi, Limin Yang, Boqin Qin, Ziyi Zhang, Linhai Song, and Gang Wang. Measuring and modeling the label dynamics of online Anti-Malware engines. In *29th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 20)*, pages 2361–2378. USENIX Association, August 2020. ISBN 978-1-939133-17-5. URL <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity20/presentation/zhu>.

## A Appendix

### A.1 Preliminary and examples

**VirusTotal achieves high-precision detection of open-access webshell repositories.** For a limited number of publicly available webshell repositories on the internet, detection engines can also achieve high-precision detection, and the superiority of AI-based methods is not fully demonstrated. We apply the VirusTotal detection engine to various open-access webshell repositories on GitHub, achieving high-precision detection of different webshells. Figure 4 gives a specific example of VirusTotal detecting the "tennc/webshell"<sup>2</sup> repository.




Figure 4: VirusTotal achieves high precision detection.

**LLM generates new webshells.** By providing a simple prompt and giving a rough idea of webshell escape techniques, LLM can generate a 0-day webshell (Figure 5). However, in such a situation, the lack of strict prompt constraints and complete thought flows can lead LLM to generate a potentially corrupted webshell.

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/tennc/webshell>




Figure 5: Generating webshells using simple prompts on LLM.

**Preliminary.** With the development of AIGC and LLM technologies, there are numerous LLM models in different subfields with different focuses. For example, GLM and GLM2 models tend to prioritize open-source and lightweight to meet the deployment needs of personal terminals. DALLE focuses on AI image generation, while FATE-LLM is biased toward application scenarios under the federal learning paradigm. Hybrid Prompt performs exceptionally well on LLM models with strong code reasoning abilities. We have done some toy tests with basic prompts on Chatglm-6B<sup>3</sup>, Chatglm2-6B<sup>4</sup>, Chatglm-13B, and Chatglm2-13B models, but the performance is unsatisfactory, as shown in Figure 6.

Even when adjusting key parameters such as *Temperature*, *Top\_p*, *Top\_k*, etc., or even fine-tuning such models, the results still yield little effect. The fundamental reasons are two-fold. Firstly, Chatglm and other LLM models focusing on interactive dialogs have weak reasoning ability, while the webshell escape sample generation task requires strong inference ability. (The model should effectively understand each specific escape strategy in the prompts and modify the given examples for bypassing without destroying the original functionality and syntactic structure of the webshell.) Secondly, prompt engineering itself tends to have more significant effects on LLMs with more than 30B parameters. Therefore, this strategy is more suitable for LLM models with a large number of parameters and strong code reasoning abilities, such as GPT-3.5 and GPT-4.

## A.2 Examples in the triple data filtering process

When using the "php-ast" tool, we process the child nodes belonging to the array and AST separately. Figure 7 gives a specific example of the AST structure generated for a small webshell. Each information node in the tree contains "name" and "kind" attributes. Figure 8 illustrates an example of php opcodes generated using the VLD tool.

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/THUDM/ChatGLM-6B>

<sup>4</sup><https://github.com/THUDM/ChatGLM2-6B>




Figure 6: Chatglm and Chatglm2 models perform poorly on the task of webshell generation.




Figure 7: An example of webshell AST structure.




Figure 8: A typical example of generating opcodes through VLD disassembler.



### A.3 Hierarchical module structure

This hierarchical structure of modules in Figure 9 constitutes a forest structure, in which each primary module is the root node of the tree in the forest. This modular design concept has strong scalability, allowing for the real-time addition of modules to increase the number of escape methods for the Hybrid Prompt algorithm.




Figure 9: Hierarchical module structure in Hybrid Prompt.

### A.4 $F_e$ chain structure

Figure 10 provides a specific example of the  $F_e$  chain in the "Array methods" module. This chain structure helps LLM to rapidly grasp the core escape ideas within the corresponding module. Each node in the  $F_e$  chain includes the original webshell sample, as well as the webshell sample processed by the corresponding module, and a brief description explaining the processing method and core ideas of the module.




Figure 10: The structure of  $F_e$  chain for each module.

### A.5 Example of 2 different voting strategies

Figure 11 presents a concrete example of 2 different voting strategies. Left: Small webshell's voting strategy, where all raw webshell information is contained in a single contextual dialog; Right: Large webshell's voting strategy, where information is compressed for every candidate generated by LLM. The voting strategy for large webshell maximizes candidate generation length at the expense of sacrificing raw sample information.

### A.6 Further elaboration on the design of the Hybrid Prompt algorithm

For Hybrid Prompt itself, it is impossible to compress the history information like many NLP tasks (e.g. contextual conversations, etc.) because it will result in a significant loss of raw webshell




Figure 11: Comparison of 2 different vote ideas.

information. Hence, Contextual memory range refers to the scope of each iteration in the Hybrid Prompt algorithm. At this stage, the only contextual information required for the next iteration round is the candidate output selected by the winning voting strategy in the previous iteration. Therefore, defining the Contextual memory range ensures the continuity of information memory throughout the complete Hybrid Prompt algorithm. Correspondingly,  $O'_n, V_n$  within the body of the "for" loop in the Algorithm 2 are the local contextual contents that LLM needs to memorize.

To illustrate the potential threat posed by the module order for the Hybrid Prompt algorithm, we provide an intuitive example. In Figure 12, if the "String XOR Encryption" module is placed in front of the "Symbol Interference" module, the encrypted webshell sample is no longer "text-readable", resulting in a high probability of hallucination when LLM executes to the "Symbol Interference" module, and triggering a series of subsequent generation errors. Therefore, during the implementation of Hybrid Prompt algorithm, we strictly constrain the relative positions between different modules.

## A.7 Experimental setup details

We believe that the  $ER$  and  $SR$  metrics of the generated escape samples are more important than the number of samples. This is because the number of samples in the Template webshell dataset can be dynamically expanded, and due to the uncertainty of LLM output, the same Hybrid Prompt algorithm process applied to the same template webshell file may produce different escape samples. Except for Section 3.4, in the remaining experiments, we set the number of candidates  $p$  to 3. Due to the frequent updating and maintenance of detection engines, the actual test results may differ slightly from the results presented in this paper. However, the experimental results can still effectively reflect the performance differences and data trends among different methods.






Figure 14: Performance comparison of different LLM models on Hybrid Prompt algorithm.




Figure 15: Visualization of ablation analysis results for Hybrid Prompt algorithm.




Figure 16: Visualization of the "marginal effect" with increasing  $p$ .

the learning ability and fine-tuning effectiveness, we introduce the stratified K-fold algorithm, and differential learning rates, and enable FP16 mixed precision training for the BERT model. Firstly, we transform the 3,273 escape samples generated by the Hybrid Prompt algorithm into AST structures using the "*php-ast*" tool described in Section 2.2, and randomly divide 2,300 samples for model fine-tuning and 973 samples for testing. Subsequently, we collect 10,000 normal web scripts (benign samples) from open-source data platforms and servers such as *Apache*. We divide 7,360 samples for model fine-tuning and 2,640 samples for testing.

Model 1 is fine-tuned with 6,639 original webshell samples from the Template webshell dataset + 7,360 normal samples. Model 2, in addition to the 6,639 original webshell samples + 7,360 normal samples, appends 2,300 escape samples for adversarial fine-tuning. After fine-tuning, both Model 1 and Model 2 are tested on 973 webshell escape samples + 2,640 normal samples. The experimental process is illustrated in Figure 17.




Figure 17: The workflow of the defensive study.

### A.10 Societal impacts and safeguards

The original intention behind designing the Hybrid Prompt algorithm is to achieve the goal of promoting defense against attacks, which we also verified in Section 3.5. All experiments in this paper (Section 3) are conducted under the built Virtual Attack Environment, thus posing no harm to the real internet environment. Additionally, the algorithms and data included in this work are intended to contribute to the development and transformation of webshell detection techniques, solely for academic research reference, and are strictly prohibited for any real-world cyber-attack activities. Furthermore, we emphasize that all researchers who need access to the escape samples generated by the Hybrid Prompt algorithm must sign an agreement with us.