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Abstract:- The most common electronic payment method is a credit card, which is more susceptible to fraud due to the volume of daily electronic transactions that are taking place. Card fraud has cost credit card firms a lot of money. At the moment, the most frequent problem is the detection of credit card fraud. Companies that issue credit cards are searching for the best systems and technology to reduce and detect credit card fraud. This study has surveyed, highlighted, and compared a number of approaches using recognizing credit card fraud, weighing each method’s benefits and drawbacks.
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I. INTRODUCTION

As non-cash electronic transactions have grown rapidly, online payment solutions have become popular. Electronic payments include credit cards. Credit cards are thin rectangles of plastic or metal supplied by banks or financial services companies to consumers (cardholders) to pay merchants for products and services. Consumers promise the card issuer. The card issuer (typically a bank) opens a revolving account and gives the customer credit. This allows payment. 51% of transactions are card-based. With new technologies, credit card fraud is rising despite the benefits of electronic payment. Scammers use skimming and phishing to steal data. Sometimes victims enter passwords, user names, and credit card information on a fake website. Bait emails from the con artist lead victims to fake websites. Emails from PayPal banks, AOL, and eBay invite victims to log their personal information to remedy issues. The fraudster can profit by taking victims’ identities and money. Card fraud cost a lot. As chip card security has improved, thieves are targeting CNP transactions, according to 2017 US Payments Forum research.

2018 credit card fraud losses were $24.26 million. PR Newswire Association LLC estimates global fraud losses of US$27 billion by 2019. By 2020, it may exceed $30 billion. Activation processes have reduced fraud. Merchants are implementing credit card fraud prevention procedures. Fraud prevention requires more care. Machine Learning systems that can scan big data sets and detect fraudulent transactions can reduce credit card fraud. This document has seven sections. Section II reviews brief studies. Section III describes how elementary studies were selected. Section IV covers prominent credit card fraud detection methods. Section V compared fraud detection methods. Section VI discusses results. Section VII concluded.

II. CREDIT CARD FRAUD & CREDIT CARD FRAUD DETECTION

Fraud is any purposeful or deliberate act of depriving someone of ownership or money through wiliness, fraud, or other unfair means, according to the Association of Certified. CCF refers to unlawful CC or data theft. Two fraud gangs use different CCF tricks. Name the groups. App fraudsters ask for a new bank card or give it to companies using fraudulent information. A user can file many applications with the same description (duplicate fraud), or another user with similar descriptions (named identity fraud). Instead, there are basically four sorts of behavioral fraud: stolen/lost cards, mail theft, phoney cards, and current cardholder does not exist fraud.

Fraudsters steal or lose credit cards. Mail theft occurs when a fraudster acquires personal information from a bank before a credit card or original card holder.

Cardholders & Fakes No credit card or fraud descriptions. Remote card-based communications were possible by mail, phone, or internet. Second, fraudulent cards are made from card data”.

Services make electronic payments more comfortable, seamless, adequate, and easy to use, but we must not disregard electronic commerce losses.

They offer strong security to banks and organizations. To overcome these challenges, but fraudsters’ clever strategies evolve. Thus, it is essential to increasing detection and prevention. To fight fraud, you must grasp its mechanisms. Fraud method determines credit card fraud detection device.

Give the transaction details to the verification module, which will determine fraud or non-fraud. It will be rejected if fraudulent.

Transaction is accepted otherwise. Statistics and AI can identify the two. AI data mining can classify, group, and segment millions of transactions to uncover patterns and detect fraud.

Machine learning automatically detects fraud. Fraud can be prevented and detected. Fraud detection and XXX-X-XXXX-XXXX-X/XX/$XX.00 ©20XX IEEE prevention's main purpose is to identify and stop fraudulent transactions. Historical data is used to assess a transaction’s legitimacy. Fraud detection takes over when the system fails. Unsupervised fraud detection methods identify outliers as future fraudulent transactions, while supervised fraud detection systems classify new transactions as fraudulent or
genuine based on misleading and legitimate activities. Supervised and unsupervised machine learning can be compared point-by-point. Several card fraud detection technologies have been studied. ANN, K-means Clustering, DT, etc.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

Prajal Save et al.[18]’s tree-based model uses Luhn’s and Hunt’s methods. Luhn’s algorithm detects fraudulent transactions. The supplied credit card number validates it. Address Mismatch and Degree of Outlierness measure each transaction's divergence from the cardholder’s profile. In the final stage, Bayes Theorem strengthens or weakens the general belief, then an advanced combination heuristic combines the computed probability with the initial fraud belief.

J et al. Three machine-learning algorithms detected fraudulent transactions. Vector Machines, Random Forests, and Decision Trees are used to evaluate classifiers and predictions. Prevalence-dependent or prevalence-independent.

These algorithms have also been compared for credit card fraud detection. Popat-Chaudhary[20] supervised algorithms were presented. Deep learning, Logistic Regression, Nave Bayesian, Support Vector Machine (SVM), Neural Network, Artificial Immune System, K Nearest Neighbor, Data Mining, Decision Tree, Fuzzy logic-based System, and Genetic Algorithm are employed. Credit card fraud detection algorithms identify high-risk transactions.


Geetha S. The Sliding-Window approach grouped transactions and extracted attributes to identify cardholder behavioral trends. Maximum, minimum, average, and elapsed time are available. et al. Popular supervised and unsupervised machine learning techniques were used to assess the issues. Classical and modern supervised learning algorithms were studied. Tree-based algorithms, classical and deep neural networks, hybrid algorithms, and Bayesian techniques. Machine-learning algorithms are tested for credit card fraud detection. Popular supervised, ensemble, and unsupervised methods were evaluated on several measures. Unsupervised algorithms perform better across all measures and handle dataset skewness better.

Deepakila Fraud detection algorithms included Anomaly Detection Algorithm, K-Nearest Neighbor, Random Forest, K-Means, and Decision Tree. Using a scenario, presented many methods and predicted the optimal algorithm to detect deceptive transactions. The system calculated the fraud score for that transaction using multiple criteria and algorithms to forecast the fraud result. Xiaohan Yu et al[23], devised a deep network fraud detection technique. The paper described a deep neural network credit card fraud system. It described neural network algorithms and deep neural network applications. Preprocessing and focus loss to fix data skew. Siddhant.

Bagga et al[24], developed numerous methods for identifying fraudulent transactions. Evaluated and contrasted logistic regression, KNN, RF, quadrant discriminative analysis, naive Bayes, multilayer perceptron, ada boost, ensemble learning, and pipelining on credit card fraud data using different parameters and metrics. ADASYN balances datasets.

Accuracy, recall, F1 score, Balanced Classification Rate, and Matthews' correlation coefficient evaluate classifier performance. Based on measurements, this determines the optimal method to fix the problem.

Urban-Carrasco Deep neural networks have been tested for false positive detection by processing fraud detectionsystem alerts.

Ten neural network topologies evaluated FDS alerts as either genuine (actual fraud incidents) or wrong (false positives). The ideal setup reduced alerts by 35.16 percent when collecting 91.79 percent of fraud cases and 41.47 percent when catching 87.75 percent. Grid search a deep learning approach. The model’s performance is compared to logistic regression (LR) and support vector machine (SVM) (SVM). Logistic regression and support vector machine models are compared to the created model on credit card data. Borse, Sujash, Dhotre[27], Machine learning’s Naive Bayes classifier predicted common or fraudulent transactions. Naive Bayes classifier accuracy, recall, precision, F1, and AUC scores are calculated. Asha R B et al. offer a deep learning-based credit card fraud detection approach. Predicting fraud via support vector machine, k-nearest neighbour, and artificial neural network techniques identify fraudulent transactions faster and cheaper. Logistic Regression, Decision Trees, Random Forest, AI, K-Nearest Neighbors, and K-means clustering are compared. A scenario-based algorithm can select the optimum scenario for a scenario as all situations are different. This survey article discusses fraud detection methods with pros and cons. Researchers utilize performance indicators and algorithms to identify fraudulent transactions. To find the right weight for cost, tested accuracy, and detection accuracy, studies are urged to improve fraud detection. Such surveys will help researchers create the most accurate hybrid technique for detecting fraudulent credit card transactions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Techniques</th>
<th>Strong Advantage</th>
<th>Weakness disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision Tree</td>
<td>It’s easy to use. It helps solve decision-action difficulties. Adaptability helps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consider all problem solutions. Cleanup is minimal.</td>
<td>This procedure is complex. The RF algorithm can fix overfitting. DR math complexity may rise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Forest[31]</td>
<td>RF may classify and regress. It handles big, high-dimensional datasets. It ensures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>model accuracy and prevents overfitting.</td>
<td>Despite its versatility, RF is not more suited for Regression problems than classification ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistic Regression</td>
<td>Much easier to learn and implement, with a lower learning curve. There are no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>presumptions made about how classes are distributed in the featurespace.</td>
<td>Since logistic regression uses a linear decision surface, it is unable to address the underlying non-linear problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial Neural Networks</td>
<td>The act of putting data into storage on the global systemic infrastructure. Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to deal with partial information.</td>
<td>What cannot be explained in a manner in which the network operates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K -Nearest Neighbors[37]</td>
<td>It holds up well against the erratic coaching data. It's easy to put into action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detection times are satisfactory. It could be more effective if the training data is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>massive.</td>
<td>There is a constant requirement to provide a definition of K, which can be difficult in some circumstances. This is because computing the distance between all the training samples’ data points is computationally expensive. Expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-means Clustering</td>
<td>Effective as well as rapid. Technique that is repeated. Performs work on data stored</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in digital categories.</td>
<td>A significant number of repetitions You will need to choose a k value for yourself. Must have a solid understanding of the context of your data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Credit Card Fraud Detection Techniques And Their Comparison

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We have come to the conclusion that despite the fact that every technology has its own set of benefits, each also has drawbacks that reduce its efficiency and its capacity to recognize and report fraudulent financial dealings. The disproportionate nature of the fraudulent activity (the proportion of fraudulent transactions to the total number of transactions).

V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE SCOPE

Credit card fraud worries the world. Fraud causes massive financial losses. Credit card firms have invested in fraud detection and prevention methods. This study aims to establish algorithms that credit card issuers can use to
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