

BridgeShield: Enhancing Security for Cross-chain Bridge Applications via Heterogeneous Graph Mining

DAN LIN, School of Software Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, China

SHUNFENG LU, School of Software Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, China

ZIYAN LIU, School of Software Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, China

JIAJING WU*, Shenzhen Research Institute, Sun Yat-sen University, China

JUNYUAN FANG*, City University of Hong Kong, China

KAIXIN LIN, School of Computer Science and Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, China

BOWEN SONG, Ant Group, China

ZIBIN ZHENG, School of Software Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, China

Cross-chain bridges play a vital role in enabling blockchain interoperability. However, due to the inherent design flaws and the enormous value they hold, they have become prime targets for hacker attacks. Existing detection methods show progress yet remain limited, as they mainly address single-chain behaviors and fail to capture cross-chain semantics. To address this gap, we leverage heterogeneous graph attention networks, which are well-suited for modeling multi-typed entities and relations, to capture the complex execution semantics of cross-chain behaviors. We propose BridgeShield, a detection framework that jointly models the source chain, off-chain coordination, and destination chain within a unified heterogeneous graph representation. BridgeShield incorporates intra-meta-path attention to learn fine-grained dependencies within cross-chain paths and inter-meta-path attention to highlight discriminative cross-chain patterns, thereby enabling precise identification of attack behaviors. Extensive experiments on 51 real-world cross-chain attack events demonstrate that BridgeShield achieves an average F1-score of 92.58%, representing a 24.39% improvement over state-of-the-art baselines. These results validate the effectiveness of BridgeShield as a practical solution for securing cross-chain bridges and enhancing the resilience of multi-chain ecosystems.

CCS Concepts: • **Security and privacy** → **Web application security**; • **Applied computing** → **Electronic funds transfer**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Blockchain, decentralized applications, Cross-chain bridge, heterogeneous graph, attack detection

ACM Reference Format:

Dan Lin, Shunfeng Lu, Ziyang Liu, Jiajing Wu, Junyuan Fang, Kaixin Lin, Bowen Song, and Zibin Zheng. 2025. BridgeShield: Enhancing Security for Cross-chain Bridge Applications via Heterogeneous Graph Mining. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.* 1, 1 (August 2025), 22 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

*Corresponding authors.

Authors' Contact Information: Dan Lin, School of Software Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, Zhuhai, China; Shunfeng Lu, School of Software Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, Zhuhai, China; Ziyang Liu, School of Software Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, Zhuhai, China; Jiajing Wu, Shenzhen Research Institute, Sun Yat-sen University, Zhuhai, China; Junyuan Fang, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China; Kaixin Lin, School of Computer Science and Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China; Bowen Song, Ant Group, Huangzhou, China; Zibin Zheng, School of Software Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, Zhuhai, China.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

Manuscript submitted to ACM

1 Introduction

With the rapid development of blockchain technology, decentralized finance (DeFi) applications are gradually expanding from a single-chain mode and accelerating towards multi-chain parallel development [3, 21, 23]. Although the multi-chain architecture alleviates the problems of single-chain congestion and high Gas fees, it also brings new challenges: Data and assets on different blockchains cannot flow freely, forming the phenomenon of value silos and hindering the construction of the multi-chain ecosystem. Against this backdrop, cross-chain bridge decentralized applications (DApps) [10, 19] have emerged as solutions to connect these value silos and achieve interoperability between different blockchains.

As cross-chain bridges become a foundational component of decentralized applications, their security has attracted increasing attention from both academia and industry [12, 32]. Due to hidden design vulnerabilities and the substantial value at stake, these bridges have emerged as high-value targets for attackers. According to the Rekt database¹, three of the five most severe historical blockchain security incidents involved cross-chain bridges, accounting for a cumulative loss exceeding \$1.82 billion. The frequency and severity of such attacks underscore the urgent need to enhance the security of cross-chain bridges.

Existing studies on blockchain interoperability primarily focus on summarizing known cross-chain bridge vulnerabilities and attacks, while offering potential defense strategies [4, 8, 15, 33]. However, most of these efforts lack deployable detection frameworks. Rule-based tools such as XScope [31] and XChainWatcher [2] mitigate specific attack patterns to some extent, but their protocol-specific designs severely limit generalizability. More recently, BridgeGuard [28] introduces a graph mining-based detection approach with promising scalability. Nevertheless, it only analyzes transactions confined to a single chain and lacks the capacity to handle off-chain components involved in cross-chain attack execution.

Compared to single-chain DeFi systems, cross-chain bridge DApps introduce unique challenges due to their complex execution model spanning multiple heterogeneous chains and off-chain components. We highlight two key design challenges as follows:

- **Challenge 1: Structural heterogeneity.** Cross-chain behaviors involve diverse entities (e.g., users, contracts, relayers) and semantic interactions (e.g., token locks, message relay, event logs) across chains, forming heterogeneous graphs with varying node and edge types. Existing graph models based on homogeneous meta-paths struggle to capture such cross-chain business semantics.
- **Challenge 2: Fragmented execution traces.** Cross-chain behaviors typically span multiple transactions across different blockchains and smart contracts. As a result, the complete execution trace is fragmented and distributed across source-chain, off-chain, and destination-chain records, making it difficult to reconstruct coherent semantics for accurate attack detection.

To improve the security of cross-chain bridge DApps, we present *BridgeShield*, a detection framework designed to identify attack behaviors in cross-chain execution scenarios. **To address Challenge 1**, we model full-path cross-chain behaviors as a heterogeneous graph that unifies interactions across source chain, off-chain coordination, and destination chain. This graph captures the semantics of diverse entities and relations (e.g., users, contracts, relayers, token locks, relay messages). Such heterogeneous modeling enables fine-grained representation learning beyond the limitations of homogeneous meta-path approaches. **To address Challenge 2**, we design a unified data representation that links fragmented transaction traces across multiple chains and execution layers. This allows the reconstruction of end-to-end

¹<https://rekt.news/zh/leaderboard/>

behavior paths necessary for detecting attacks that only emerge at the global level. We further introduce hierarchical attention mechanisms to identify critical semantic patterns along these paths. We summarize the main contributions of this work as follows:

- **Detection Scope:** To the best of our knowledge, BridgeShield is the first framework that jointly models the source chain, off-chain coordination, and destination chain within a unified detection process, addressing the limitations of prior approaches that focus solely on single-chain behaviors.
- **Framework Design:** We design a novel heterogeneous graph attention architecture tailored to cross-chain execution modeling, enabling the identification of complex attack patterns through structured semantic aggregation.
- **Empirical Validation:** BridgeShield demonstrates superior detection performance, achieving an average F1-score improvement of 24.39% and a recall gain of 26.32% over existing state-of-the-art baselines on datasets covering source-chain, off-chain, and destination-chain behaviors.

The chapter arrangement of this paper is as follows. Section 2 introduces the related work. Section 3 presents the preliminaries and problem formulation. Section 4 elaborates on the implementation process and details of BridgeShield. Section 5 describes the experiments and result analysis. Section 6 discusses the work of this paper and prospects for future work. Section 7 concludes the paper.

2 Related Work

Cross-chain Bridge Security Analysis. Augusto *et al.* [1] revealed cross-chain vulnerabilities and privacy leaks based on multi-source information datasets, systematically classifying various interoperability solutions. Lee *et al.* [9] analyzed attack types targeting different cross-chain bridge components in detail by parsing their architectures and combining real-world attack cases. Notland *et al.* [18] linked design flaws in cross-chain bridge architectures to related vulnerability types and proposed corresponding preventive measures. However, these studies primarily focus on fundamental research of cross-chain bridge security and attack protection, without constructing systems to detect cross-chain bridge attack behaviors or safeguard cross-chain bridges from attacks. Facing this challenge, Zhang *et al.*[31] identified three categories of security vulnerabilities in cross-chain bridges and proposed Xscope, a detection tool based on security attributes and pattern rules. Augusto *et al.* [2] also proposed XChainWatcher, a cross-chain attack detection method based on predefined cross-chain rules and a Datalog engine, which meets real-time monitoring requirements in performance. Although predefined rule-based methods have made progress in cross-chain bridge attack detection, they typically rely heavily on specific protocol designs, and their generality and generalization capabilities still need further research and validation. Therefore, Wu *et al.*[28] investigated cross-chain transactions from a graph perspective and introduced BridgeGuard, a detection framework designed to integrate global and local graph mining. This method demonstrates strong flexibility and adapts to new attack patterns. However, BridgeGuard only focuses on graph feature analysis of single-chain transactions and lacks modeling of off-chain attack scenarios, which limits its comprehensive monitoring of cross-chain security risks to some extent.

Graph-based Methods for Blockchain Security Analysis. With the rapid development of deep learning, graph neural networks (GNNs) and their variants have become one of the most influential research methods in graph representation learning, owing to their excellent structural modeling capabilities and deep mining of topological dependencies and semantic correlations between nodes. In smart contract vulnerability detection, Zhuang *et al.* [34] represented smart contract functions by constructing contract graphs containing control flow and data flow, and achieved vulnerability detection by combining graph normalization with degree-free graph convolutional networks

and temporal message propagation networks. Building on this, Liu *et al.* [14] added a security pattern module to integrate expert knowledge with GNNs. Qin *et al.* [20] integrated multiple graph structures and first proposed a unified representation of Execution Property Graphs. In Ethereum account classification, Liu *et al.* [13] modeled Ethereum transaction records as graphs and achieved account classification through neighborhood filtering and feature-enhanced GNNs. Wang *et al.* [26] proposed a framework for identifying phishing accounts on Ethereum based on transaction subgraph networks. In cross-chain bridge security detection, to the best of our knowledge, BridgeGuard proposed by Wu *et al.* [28] is currently the first and only tool using graph modeling to address cross-chain bridge attack transaction detection. However, BridgeGuard lacks the ability to detect off-chain attacks.

3 Preliminaries and Problem Formulation

As shown in Fig. 1, the complete process of a cross-chain transaction can generally be divided into three stages: asset locking on the source chain, off-chain verification, and equivalent asset minting on the destination chain.

- Source chain stage: The user initiates a deposit request to the cross-chain bridge routing contract, which forwards the request to the token contract. The token contract locks the corresponding assets and generates a lock event. After validating this event, the routing contract records a deposit event.
- Off-chain stage: The relevant components verify the reliability of the source-chain information and then transmit the validated transaction data to the destination chain.
- Destination chain stage: The cross-chain bridge routing contract receives and forwards the verified request to the token contract. According to the cross-chain protocol, the token contract mints equivalent tokens and allocates them to the user, generating an unlock event. Upon detecting this event, the routing contract issues a withdrawal event, completing the cross-chain transaction.




Fig. 1. Illustration of the cross-chain transaction process, including key components such as source chain, destination chain, and off-chain validation.

Cross-chain bridge attacks have become increasingly sophisticated, manifesting in diverse forms across various execution stages. These attacks may occur at any point within the cross-chain transaction lifecycle, including the source

Table 1. Symbols and definitions

Symbols	Interpretation
G	Cross-chain behavior heterogeneous graph
V	Nodes of graph G
E	Edges of graph G
ϕ	Node type mapping function
φ	Edge type mapping function
T_v	Node type set
T_e	Edge type set
ψ	Meta-path set
$\text{fre}_{\psi_j}^{\mathcal{X}}$	Frequency of meta-path ψ_j in transactions with the transaction label \mathcal{X}
fre_diff_{ψ_j}	Absolute value of the frequency difference of meta-path ψ_j
$\text{count}_{\psi_j}^{\mathcal{X}}$	Number of occurrences of meta-path ψ_j in transactions with the transaction label \mathcal{X}
$I(G_i, \psi_j)$	Indicator function
$\alpha_{v_i v_j}^{\psi_k}$	Intra-attention weight within a cross-chain meta-path
β_{v_i}	Inter-attention weight between cross-chain meta-paths
$\text{Attention}_{\text{Intra-MP}}$	Intra-meta-path attention for cross-chain
$\text{Attention}_{\text{Inter-MP}}$	Inter-meta-path attention for cross-chain
Z_{v_i}	Final embedded representation of node v_i
Z_{global}	Global representation of the graph
\hat{y}	Multi-classification probability of the transaction sample
y_{pred}	Predicted category of the transaction sample

chain, off-chain coordination layer, or the destination chain. Prior studies [28] have shown that such attack transactions often exhibit anomalous patterns in local transaction topologies.

In practice, detailed records of cross-chain transactions can be collected by aggregating data from incident reports and third-party monitoring services. Each transaction record typically includes information such as the transaction hash, block number, timestamp, execution trace, emitted event logs, token transfers, and authorization activities.

Our research focuses on the problem of cross-chain bridge attack transaction detection. Given the detailed execution data of cross-chain transactions, we aim to identify abnormal behavior patterns and classify transactions into one of the following four categories: normal transactions, source-chain attack transactions, off-chain attack transactions, and destination-chain attack transactions.

Problem Statement (Cross-chain Attack Behavior Detection). Given a set of cross-chain transaction detail records as input, the task is to formally process and analyze their execution features in order to accurately classify each transaction into one of the four behavior categories:

- **Normal behavior** (\mathcal{N}) – legitimate cross-chain transactions;
- **Source-chain attacks** (\mathcal{A}_{src}) – malicious behavior occurring on the source chain (e.g., fake lock events);
- **Off-chain attacks** (\mathcal{A}_{off}) – manipulations in relayers, oracles, or validators;
- **Destination-chain attacks** (\mathcal{A}_{dst}) – malicious behavior occurring on the destination chain.

Table 1 summarizes the main symbols used throughout this paper.




Fig. 2. The overall framework of BridgeShield. BridgeShield constructs a cross-chain behavior heterogeneous graph (xBHG) from decoded transaction data, and extracts differential meta-paths to highlight attack-specific patterns. A heterogeneous graph attention network then learns semantic representations for transaction classification across source, off-chain, and destination layers.

4 Methodology

4.1 Overview of BridgeShield

In this paper, we propose BridgeShield, a cross-chain bridge attack behavior detection method based on a heterogeneous graph attention network. Our method integrates heterogeneous graph modeling with hierarchical attention over unified cross-chain traces, enabling fine-grained representation and global-context-aware detection of cross-chain attack behaviors. As illustrated in Fig. 2, the overall architecture of BridgeShield consists of the following key components:

(1) **Input data and feature alignment.** We collect cross-chain transaction records from bridge-related smart contracts, including execution traces, event logs, and token transfers. These raw records are decoded into structured entities and interaction types. To handle heterogeneous node attributes (e.g., user, contract, relay, log), we apply type-specific projection layers to embed them into a shared latent space, providing a consistent input foundation for subsequent graph modeling.

(2) **Heterogeneous graph modeling of cross-chain behaviors.** We construct a Cross-chain Behavior Heterogeneous Graph (xBHG), where nodes represent entities and logs, and edges represent multi-relational interactions such as calls, transfers, and cross-chain events. To reconstruct full-path behaviors, relay nodes are used to link semantically matched transactions across chains. This graph structure captures rich inter-chain semantics essential for cross-chain attack pattern learning.

(3) **Differential meta-path extractor guided by business logic.** To identify behavior patterns indicative of attacks, we perform meta-path enumeration over xBHG using depth-first search. By comparing frequency distributions between normal and attack transactions, we extract a set of differential meta-paths that highlight key cross-chain interaction sequences, serving as semantic priors for attention learning.

(4) **Heterogeneous graph attention network based on xBHG.** For each selected meta-path, we apply intra-meta-path attention to capture the relative importance of neighboring nodes, and inter-meta-path attention to fuse multiple semantic views. A pooling layer aggregates node-level features into a global graph representation, which is then passed to a fully connected detector to classify the transaction as normal or one of three types of cross-chain attacks.

4.2 Heterogeneous Graph Modeling for Cross-Chain Behaviors

Compared with homogeneous graphs, heterogeneous graphs can more accurately represent the interaction relationships between different types of entities [7, 27, 30], enabling the model to have stronger expressive ability when analyzing the characteristics of cross-chain transactions. Therefore, to more comprehensively capture the complexity of cross-chain behaviors, this section will construct a heterogeneous cross-chain behavior graph and perform the initialization of node features.

4.2.1 Definition of Cross-chain Behavior Graph. As shown in Fig. 3, the Cross-chain Behavior Heterogeneous Graph (xBHG) is a heterogeneous graph, which can be expressed as $G = (V, E, \phi, \varphi)$, where V and E denote the sets of nodes and edges, respectively. The mapping function ϕ specifies node types, while φ specifies edge types. The node type set T_v contains six categories of nodes, and the edge type set T_e contains six types of edges.

Table 2 summarizes the definitions and functions of these six categories of nodes in the cross-chain behavior graph. To better support the detection of cross-chain attacks, user nodes are further distinguished according to their roles on the source chain and the destination chain: on the source chain, a user initiates a cross-chain request by interacting with the bridge contract, whereas on the destination chain, a user serves as the receiver of transferred funds. Table 3 shows the definitions and functions of the six types of edges in the cross-chain behavior graph. We establish edges in the cross-chain behavior graph in the following ways: establish a transaction edge between the “from” address and the “to” address of a transaction; establish a function call edge between the caller address and the callee address; establish a log record edge between the address that issues a log and the log node; establish a transfer edge between the “from” address and the “to” address of an asset transfer; establish a token authorization edge between the authorized address




Fig. 3. Heterogeneous graph scheme of cross-chain transaction behavior, including multiple entity nodes (detailed in Table 2) and diverse interaction edges (defined in Table 3)

Table 2. Node type definitions of cross-chain behavior heterogeneous graph

Symbols	Node Type	Function
U	User	Accounts who initiates cross-chain operations
R	Router Contract	Bridge contract who handles cross-chain transactions
T	Token Contract	Contract who executes token-related operations (e.g., token transfer)
O	Other Account	Unmarked accounts not in the above categories
L	Log	Records events during transactions
D	Relay	Off-chain component linking source and destination chains

Table 3. Edge type definitions of cross-chain behavior heterogeneous graph

Symbols	Edge Type	Function
E_t	Transaction	Relationship between users and router contracts
E_c	Function Call	Invocation from caller to callee
E_e	Log Record	Link between contracts and emitted logs
E_x	Transfer	Token or asset transfer relation
E_a	Token Authorization	Authorization relation between accounts
E_d	Cross-chain Interaction	Interaction of data or assets between on-chain and off-chain

and the authorizing address; establish a cross-chain interaction edge between the source chain router contract and the relay node, as well as between the relay node and the destination chain router contract.

4.2.2 Feature Initialization. In the node feature initialization stage, we add the out-degree and in-degree of each node as initial features. These two metrics capture the connectivity and interactivity of a node within the graph. A node with a high out-degree is usually linked to many others, suggesting greater influence or participation. Conversely, a node with a high in-degree is pointed to by many others, indicating that it may serve as a key entity or an important receiver in the network. Such information helps reveal the role and position of nodes in the graph. In particular, within cross-chain bridge scenarios, out-degree and in-degree reflect the activity level and dependency of nodes, which assists the model in understanding their roles and interaction patterns.

In addition, nodes that are called carry function list information, while log nodes record the specific function name and parameter list that triggered the log. These textual attributes contain rich semantic information. CodeBERT [6] is a pre-trained model designed by Microsoft for programming languages, which can be used to efficiently generate reliable vector representations of code. Thus, we choose to use the pre-trained CodeBERT² model to convert the function text attributes of log nodes into 512-dimensional vector representations. Such vector representations can preserve the syntactic and semantic features of function texts, helping the model better understand the roles and relationships of nodes in the cross-chain behavior graph. Additionally, using pre-trained models can make full use of the training results of existing large-scale language corpora, improving the quality and accuracy of text representation, thereby avoiding the high computational overhead caused by training models from scratch.

Since node features vary in dimensionality across different node types, feature alignment is required to ensure effective model training. Specifically, assume that a certain node type $t \in T_v$ has N_t corresponding elements in the cross-chain behavior graph, and each element has feature data of d_t dimensions. To convert these features into a new

²<https://huggingface.co/microsoft/codebert-base>




Fig. 4. A heterogeneous graph instance constructed from matched source-chain transactions on the Ethereum network and destination-chain transactions on the Binance Smart Chain.

dimension d , we use a linear layer $h_t = W_t x_t + b_t$ to unify the dimensions of the features, where h_t represents the projected feature matrix, with a size of $d \times N_t$, that is, the new dimension and the number of elements; W_t is a learnable type conversion matrix, with a size of $d \times d_t$, and is used to map the original features of the elements belonging to type t from d_t dimensions to the new d dimensions; x_t represents the feature matrix of type t , with a size of $d_t \times N_t$; b_t is the bias term, with a size of $d \times 1$.

An example of the final obtained graph is shown in Fig. 4, modeling the matched source chain transactions³ on the Ethereum network and destination chain transactions⁴ on the Binance Smart Chain. The red user node in the source chain initiates a cross-chain transaction request to the cyan router contract node. The router contract then calls the blue token contract to lock assets and generate a log event. Subsequently, it interacts with the destination chain through the purple relay node to realize the transfer of cross-chain assets.

4.3 Differential Meta-path Extractor

The cross-chain behavior heterogeneous graph can describe in detail the complex relationships between different types of nodes and edges in cross-chain behaviors. As a high-order structure, meta-paths have been widely applied in the research of many heterogeneous graphs [5, 11, 24]. Their core advantage lies in being able to capture the complex relationships between different types of nodes and edges.

³Ethereum Transaction Hash: 0xf9f957ecca80188d271f10c263078417cace8e184125150de8bedea81a69225

⁴Binance Smart Chain Transaction Hash: 0xbc7fafc4fc6335f044c4d74749acf34403201983b476447e9f3329187b64f1cc

Algorithm 1: Meta-path generation on cross-chain behavior graph

Input: Maximum path length l_{max} , node type list T_n
Output: Set of all possible meta-paths M

```

1 Initialize an empty set  $M \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
2 function RECURSIVE_GENERATE( $current\_path$ ):
3   if  $len(current\_path) > l_{max}$  then
4     | return ; // Stop the search for the current path
5   end
6   if  $len(current\_path) = l_{max}$  then
7     |  $M \leftarrow M \cup \{current\_path\}$ ; // Add complete path to result set
8   end
9   for each node type  $t \in T_n$  do
10    | RECURSIVE_GENERATE( $current\_path + [t]$ ); // Continue the search for the current path
11  end
12 end
13 RECURSIVE_GENERATE( $[\ ]$ ); // Start the search process
14 return  $M$ ;
```

The frequency of meta-paths reflects the commonness of the interaction patterns between various types of nodes in the graph. Meta-paths with higher frequencies often represent more universal and prominent interaction relationships in the graph. Therefore, to comprehensively capture these interaction relationships, we set a threshold θ . When the frequency $fre_diff_{\psi_j}$ of a meta-path $\psi_j \in \psi$ is greater than the set threshold θ , the meta-paths ψ_j with differentiated characteristics in attack transactions and normal transactions are selected to capture the features of the graph. The calculation process of $fre_diff_{\psi_j}$ is as follows:

$$fre_diff_{\psi_j} = \left| fre_{\psi_j}^{\mathcal{A}} - fre_{\psi_j}^{\mathcal{N}} \right|, \quad (1)$$

where $fre_{\psi_j}^{\mathcal{N}}$ is the occurrence frequency of the meta-path ψ_j under the normal transaction label \mathcal{N} , and $fre_{\psi_j}^{\mathcal{A}}$ is the occurrence frequency of the meta-path ψ_j under the attack transaction label \mathcal{A} . Their calculation formulas are as follows:

$$fre_{\psi_j}^{\mathcal{A}} = \frac{count_{\psi_j}^{\mathcal{A}}}{n_{\mathcal{A}}}, \quad (2)$$

$$count_{\psi_j}^{\mathcal{A}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\mathcal{A}}} I(G_i, \psi_j), \quad (3)$$

where $count_{\psi_j}^{\mathcal{A}}$ represents the number of occurrences of the meta-path ψ_j under the attack label \mathcal{A} , and n is the total number of graphs in the dataset. $I(G_i, \psi_j)$ is an indicator function, which takes a value of 1 when the meta-path ψ_j appears in graph G_i , and 0 otherwise. Similarly, the meta-path count $count_{\psi_j}^{\mathcal{N}}$ under the normal label \mathcal{N} can be obtained.

The calculation of the meta-path set ψ is implemented by Algorithm 1. All possible meta-paths are calculated by setting the maximum path length l_{max} and the node type list T_n . In Algorithm 1, first, a set is initialized to store the generated paths, and all possible node types are determined. Then, starting from an empty path, the path is expanded step by step. At each step, a node type is selected and added to the current path, and the search continues. When the path length reaches the set maximum value, the path is stored in the set; otherwise, the expansion and search continue.

Based on the 6 types of node types in the cross-chain behavior graph, the search process forms a fully expanded recursive tree. In addition, the value of the length in the algorithm should start from 2 because only at least two nodes can form an edge, thereby forming an effective meta-path. According to Algorithm 1 and the definition of heterogeneous graph nodes in this paper, it can be calculated that there are 36 meta-paths with a length of 2, 216 meta-paths with a length of 3, 1296 meta-paths with a length of 4, and 7,776 meta-paths with a length of 5.

When the length of the meta-path increases to 5, the number of its possible combinations rises sharply, leading to a significant increase in computational complexity. It not only requires more computing resources and time for path enumeration and feature extraction but may also bring additional storage overhead. At the same time, longer meta-paths often involve more intermediate nodes, making the frequency of paths satisfying a specific structure in the graph relatively low and showing obvious information sparsity. This sparsity will reduce the model’s ability to learn key patterns and even introduce noise, affecting detection performance. Based on the above considerations, we select meta-paths with lengths of 2, 3, and 4. This is aimed at ensuring the expressive ability of cross-chain business logic while balancing computational efficiency and the stability of training effects.

4.4 Meta-path Based Heterogeneous Graph Attention Networks

Based on the xBHG, we propose BridgeShield, a meta-path-based heterogeneous graph attention network detection method. BridgeShield consists of four components: intra-meta-path attention layer, inter-meta-path attention layer, a global graph aggregation layer, and a cross-chain DApp attack detector.

4.4.1 Intra-meta-path Attention Layer for Cross-chain. In the heterogeneous graph of cross-chain behaviors, a specific cross-chain node v_i in the meta-path ψ_k is often connected to multiple cross-chain-related neighbor nodes. However, the influence of these neighboring nodes on v_i is not uniform: some may contain key information about abnormal behaviors, while others may introduce irrelevant noise. For example, under normal circumstances, a cross-chain transaction typically follows the meta-path:

$$\psi_1 = \left(U \xrightarrow{E_c} R \xrightarrow{E_c} T \right). \quad (4)$$

Along this path, the neighbors of a user node include the router contract and the token contract. The router contract, as the core component of the cross-chain bridge, is responsible for routing requests and ensuring token exchange across chains. Its behavioral patterns are often more indicative of potential cross-chain attack features, and thus exert greater influence on the user node. In contrast, the token contract primarily executes transfers according to pre-defined rules and has limited capability in characterizing abnormal behaviors. Consequently, when modeling the heterogeneous graph to extract potential attack patterns, the router contract should be assigned a higher weight.

To this end, we introduce an intra-meta-path attention mechanism for cross-chain scenarios, which automatically learns the relative importance of different neighbors along a given meta-path. Specifically, for each pair of cross-chain transaction nodes (v_i, v_j) , the attention weight under the meta-path ψ_k is computed as

$$e_{v_i v_j}^{\psi_k} = \text{Attention}_{\text{Intra-MP}}(h_{v_i}, h_{v_j}, \psi_k), \quad (5)$$

where h_{v_i} and h_{v_j} denote the feature representations of nodes v_i and v_j , respectively, and $\text{Attention}_{\text{Intra-MP}}$ is the intra-meta-path attention function for cross-chain modeling, which calculates interaction weights based on node features.

To ensure that the computed weights accurately reflect the relative importance of node associations in cross-chain transactions, we normalize them using the softmax function:

$$\alpha_{v_i v_j}^{\psi_k} = \text{softmax}_{v_j} (e_{v_i v_j}^{\psi_k}) = \frac{\exp(\sigma(a_{\psi_k}^T \cdot [h_{v_i} \parallel h_{v_j}]))}{\sum_{v_l \in \mathcal{N}_{v_i}^{\psi_k}} \exp(\sigma(a_{\psi_k}^T \cdot [h_{v_i} \parallel h_{v_l}]))}, \quad (6)$$

where $a_{\psi_k}^T$ is a learnable attention vector, σ is an activation function, \parallel represents vector concatenation, and $\mathcal{N}_{v_i}^{\psi_k}$ is the neighbor set of node v_i under the meta-path ψ_k .

Next, the calculated attention weights are applied to perform a weighted aggregation of neighbor features, forming the representation of node v_i under the meta-path ψ_k :

$$z_{v_i}^{\psi_k} = \sigma \left(\sum_{v_j \in \mathcal{N}_{v_i}^{\psi_k}} \alpha_{v_i v_j}^{\psi_k} \cdot h_{v_j} \right), \quad (7)$$

where σ denotes a nonlinear activation function, and $z_{v_i}^{\psi_k}$ represents the feature vector of node v_i after attention-weighted aggregation, which integrates information from its neighbors along meta-path ψ_k . Through this process, the model adaptively emphasizes informative neighbors while suppressing irrelevant or redundant features, thereby improving the ability to identify cross-chain attack patterns.

When modeling cross-chain interactions, a single meta-path may not fully capture the diversity of transaction modes. For instance, in the basic case represented by ψ_1 (Equ. 4), assets are transferred directly through the router contract, forming a straightforward interaction pattern. However, cross-chain behaviors may also exhibit more complex modes, such as

$$\psi_2 = \left(\text{U} \xrightarrow{E_a} \text{U} \xrightarrow{E_c} \text{T} \right), \quad (8)$$

where the assets are first routed through an intermediate user account before reaching the router contract. These two paths may reflect distinct semantics: ψ_1 often corresponds to normal cross-chain transactions, while ψ_2 (Equ. 8) may indicate covert attack strategies.

If only a single-head attention mechanism is used, the model may over-focus on a specific type of cross-chain interaction pattern, such as the conventional path of cross-chain asset transfers, while overlooking potential risks in other cross-chain patterns. Therefore, we extend to a multi-head attention mechanism. Different attention heads can focus on different types of neighbor relationships, thereby capturing complex information in cross-chain transactions more comprehensively. In multi-head attention, each attention head m uses different parameters $W^{(m)}$ for transformation. Then, the attention weight $e_{v_i v_j}^{\psi_k, m}$ of each pair of nodes (v_i, v_j) under the meta-path ψ_k is expressed as:

$$e_{v_i v_j}^{\psi_k, m} = \text{Attention}_{\text{Intra-MP}}^{(m)} (W_{v_i}^{(m)} h_{v_i}, W_{v_j}^{(m)} h_{v_j}, \psi_k), \quad (9)$$

where different $W^{(m)}$ enable each attention head to learn different feature transformations, thus focusing on different transaction modes or relationships. Next, the results of multiple attention heads are concatenated to obtain a node representation with more expressive power:

$$z_{v_i}^{\psi_k} = \parallel_{m=1}^M \sigma \left(\sum_{v_j \in \mathcal{N}_{v_i}^{\psi_k}} \alpha_{v_i v_j}^{\psi_k} \cdot h_{v_j} \right). \quad (10)$$

Finally, the node embeddings $\{z_{v_0}^{\psi_k}, z_{v_1}^{\psi_k}, \dots, z_{v_x}^{\psi_k}\}$ learned by multiple attention heads are used as input and passed to subsequent modules to support cross-chain attack detection and abnormal behavior recognition.

4.4.2 Inter-meta-path Attention Layer for Cross-chain. Cross-chain bridge attacks involve multi-chain interactions, requiring a mechanism to aggregate semantics across different meta-paths. Traditional node embedding methods often rely on a single semantic perspective, making it difficult to represent multi-level semantics in cross-chain transactions. To address this limitation, we design an inter-meta-path attention mechanism that adaptively learns the relative weights of different meta-paths and aggregates their information, thereby improving the detection of abnormal cross-chain behaviors.

Formally, given a set of node embeddings $(Z_{\psi_0}, Z_{\psi_1}, \dots, Z_{\psi_x})$ obtained from intra-meta-path attention, we compute the weights of different meta-paths $(\beta_{\psi_0}, \beta_{\psi_1}, \dots, \beta_{\psi_x})$ using an inter-meta-path attention function:

$$(\beta_{\psi_0}, \beta_{\psi_1}, \dots, \beta_{\psi_x}) = \text{Attention}_{\text{Inter-MP}}(Z_{\psi_0}, Z_{\psi_1}, \dots, Z_{\psi_x}), \quad (11)$$

where $\text{Attention}_{\text{Inter-MP}}$ is a neural network module that first applies a nonlinear transformation to adapt each embedding to different transaction patterns. The importance of each business logic path is then measured as

$$w_{\psi_i} = \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{i \in V} q^T \cdot \tanh(W \cdot z_{\psi_i} + b), \quad (12)$$

where W is the weight matrix, b is the bias vector, and q is the inter-meta-path attention vector for cross-chain. All parameters are shared across meta-paths to ensure comparability. The final normalized weights are obtained using softmax

$$\beta_{\psi_i} = \frac{\exp(w_{\psi_i})}{\sum_{i=1}^P \exp(w_{\psi_i})}. \quad (13)$$

A larger value of β_{ψ_i} indicates that the corresponding meta-path contributes more to cross-chain attack detection. Since different attack types rely on different transaction logics, the weight distribution will dynamically adjust according to the task.

Finally, the learned weights β_{ψ_i} are used as coefficients to adaptively aggregate meta-paths with different cross-chain business logic features, performing a weighted summation to obtain the final node embedding representation $Z_{v_i} = \sum_{i=1}^x \beta_{\psi_i} \cdot Z_{\psi_i}$. This inter-meta-path attention layer enables the model to capture multi-level semantics of cross-chain behaviors, balancing the contributions of different transaction patterns to enhance attack detection accuracy.

4.4.3 Global Graph Aggregation Layer for Cross-chain. Inspired by Liu *et al.* [13] who transformed the Ethereum account classification problem into a node classification problem, the detection of cross-chain attack transactions can be converted into a graph-level classification task. Therefore, it is necessary to fuse global graph information through pooling operations to obtain the overall representation of the graph.

Different pooling operations have their own advantages in graph representation learning. Average pooling retains the overall feature distribution of all nodes in the graph by aggregating the mean values of the features of different types of nodes. It can effectively capture the common patterns of cross-chain interactions, reduce the interference of abnormal fluctuations, and provide a stable graph-level representation. Max pooling focuses on the prominent features of key nodes, can sharply capture local abnormal signals, and enhance the ability to capture abnormal behavior patterns related to attacks. Self-attention pooling dynamically learns the weights of nodes, can adaptively distinguish the importance differences among different nodes, and effectively model complex dependency relationships. Therefore, we mainly select these three pooling methods to obtain the global representation of the graph and explore the impact

of different pooling methods on the results. The calculation methods of these three pooling methods are as follows:

$$Z_{\text{global,mean}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_{v_i}, \quad (14)$$

$$Z_{\text{global,max}} = \max_{i \in [1, N]} Z_{v_i}, \quad (15)$$

$$Z_{\text{global,att}} = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_{v_i} \cdot Z_{v_i}. \quad (16)$$

where Z_{v_i} is the embedding representation of node v_i , and α_{v_i} is the attention weight of node v_i , which is calculated by a trainable attention network $\alpha_{v_i} = \sigma(w^T Z_{v_i})$, where w is a trainable attention parameter, and σ is a Sigmoid activation function, which is used to normalize the attention score ranging from 0 to 1. Finally, the global graph representation is obtained through the pooling operation.

4.4.4 Cross-Chain DApp Attack Detector. We use a multi-layer perceptron (MLP) with softmax to transform the obtained global graph representation Z_{global} into the probability distribution over multiple classes:

$$\hat{y} = \text{softmax}(WZ_{\text{global}} + b), \quad (17)$$

where W and b are the trainable weight matrix and bias vector, respectively. To effectively alleviate the problem of class imbalance, we use a cross-entropy loss function with class weights:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^C w_{y_i} y_{ij} \log(\hat{y}_{i,j}), \quad (18)$$

where N is the total number of samples, C is the total number of classes, w_j is the weight of class j , y_{ij} is the value of sample i belonging to class j in the true labels, and $\hat{y}_{i,j} \in [0, 1]$ represents the predicted probability that the model thinks sample i belongs to class j . Finally, the predicted class label is then determined as:

$$y_{\text{pred}} = \arg \max(\hat{y}). \quad (19)$$

This design enables effective multi-class classification of cross-chain DApp transactions, providing a robust basis for distinguishing normal and malicious behaviors across different execution stages.

5 Experiments and Results

To evaluate the effectiveness and robustness of *BridgeShield*⁵, we formulate the following research questions:

- **RQ1:** How do key configuration choices, such as the meta-path filtering threshold (θ) and pooling strategies, affect the detection performance of *BridgeShield*?
- **RQ2:** How does *BridgeShield* compare with existing graph representation learning methods and existing tools for detecting business-logic attacks on cross-chain bridges?
- **RQ3:** To what extent do the differential meta-path extraction module and the hierarchical attention mechanism contribute to the overall detection performance of *BridgeShield*?

⁵The implementation is publicly available at <https://github.com/Connector-Tool/BridgeShield>.

5.1 Settings

Dataset. We construct a comprehensive dataset of cross-chain bridge attack transactions by extending real-world incidents. In addition to 49 well-documented attacks previously reported in the literature, we incorporate two new cases that occurred until December 2024. As summarized in Table 4, these cases illustrate distinct attack mechanisms: GemPad exploited a malicious token to repeatedly trigger the collectFees callback, enabling unauthorized LP withdrawals through reentrancy; FEGtoken, in contrast, exploited a vulnerability in relay validation during cross-chain message transmission, allowing forged messages to be accepted as legitimate.

The final dataset thus contains 51 representative events collected from June 2021 to December 2024. It includes 21,105 heterogeneous graphs of normal cross-chain transactions, along with 85, 45, and 30 heterogeneous graphs of attack transactions on the source chain, off-chain, and destination chain, respectively. By consolidating multi-source evidence and extending with new incidents, this dataset provides the most complete benchmark to date for evaluating cross-chain attack detection methods.

Table 4. Detailed information of additional events. Table header fields are inspired by BridgeGuard [28].

Incidents	Attack Date	Incident Loss (\$)	Information Source	Attack Stage of Cross-chain	Reason
GemPad	2024/12/17	1,900,000	Rekt News	Destination Chain	Reentrancy
FEGtoken	2024/12/29	900,000	BlockSec Phalcon	Off-chain	Fake Deposit Event

Evaluation Settings. To ensure reliability, each experiment is repeated five times. For each run, 80% of the data is used for training and 20% for testing, with different random seeds applied. Detailed logs of all runs are preserved. Baseline comparison methods are configured as follows: feature engineering approaches employ MLPClassifier from Scikit-learn, while graph neural network approaches use node degree as input features with a learning rate of 0.01 and cross-entropy loss for optimization.

Evaluation Metrics. We measure performance using True Positives (TP), False Negatives (FN), and False Positives (FP). Precision, recall, and F1-score are then computed to provide a comprehensive evaluation of detection effectiveness.

Baselines. The proposed method is compared with homogeneous graph representation methods, heterogeneous graph representation methods, and the cross-chain bridge business logic attack detection method.

- Homogeneous graph representation methods include the Graph Attention Network (GAT) [25] and Graph2vec [17]. GAT learns the neighbor information of central nodes through attention mechanisms, suitable for node classification and representation learning of graph data. Graph2vec is a method that embeds the entire graph into a vector space, capturing structural features through unsupervised learning and suitable for graph classification tasks.
- Heterogeneous graph representation methods include three types: the Relational Graph Convolutional Network (RGCN) [22] that models relationships between different types of nodes and edges through relation-aware convolution operations, the Heterogeneous Graph Transformer (HGT) [29] that integrates self-attention to model different types of nodes and edges, and Heterogeneous Edge-enhanced Graph Attention Network (HEAT) [16] that further considers edge information on the basis of HGT.
- The cross-chain bridge business logic attack detection methods include Xscope [31] and BridgeGuard [28]. Xscope is a rule-based cross-chain bridge attack detection method that identifies attacks through key variables in cross-chain behaviors. BridgeGuard [28] models and detects cross-chain transactions from a graph perspective, and identifies attack patterns in cross-chain transactions through global graph mining and local graph mining.




Fig. 5. The impact of thresholds on BridgeShield, and the frequency of meta-paths under normal and attack labels when $\theta = 1$

5.2 RQ1: Configuration Analysis

To evaluate the impact of configuration choices on model performance, we first analyze the effect of the threshold θ , which controls the selection of meta-paths with discriminative properties across different transaction categories. This parameter directly influences the model’s ability to capture potential attack behavior patterns.

As shown in Fig. 5(a), setting θ implies that all meta-paths are included as features. In this case, the recall rate is relatively high, while the precision is comparatively low. The reason is that including more meta-paths covers cross-chain behavior patterns more comprehensively, thereby improving recall. However, this also enlarges the feature space and introduces additional noise. As θ increases, the features selected by the model become more refined, the noise decreases, and the precision rate is greatly improved. Nevertheless, when $\theta > 1$, due to the filtering of some key features, the recall rate starts to decline, which means that the model may miss some complex or hidden cross-chain attack behaviors. From the experimental data, when $\theta = 1$, the F1-score of the model is the highest, indicating that the model achieves a balance between precision rate and recall rate at this time.

In addition, as shown in Fig. 5(b), we further analyze the meta-paths selected when $\theta = 1$, as well as their frequencies under the normal label and the attack label. It can be found that meta-paths such as OOOO, OOOL and OROO appear more frequently in the graphs with the attack label. Here, O represents a node without any mark. This indicates that attackers will more often call some untrustworthy contracts to achieve their attack purposes. And other regular business logic paths, such as RTL and URL, appear more frequently in the graphs with the normal label. Among them, RTL reflects that the cross-chain bridge account calls the token contract account, and then the token contract account emits an event. And URL indicates that a user calls the cross-chain bridge account, and then the cross-chain bridge account emits an event.

Overall, the meta-paths selected after filtering by the threshold θ can reflect the business logic of the cross-chain bridge and effectively reveal abnormal call situations in the cross-chain behavior graph. Based on the optimal threshold $\theta = 1$ obtained from the experiments, we further explore the impacts of different pooling operations on the global graph representation and the detection of cross-chain attack transactions. As shown in Table 5, the three pooling methods all demonstrate excellent performance in normal transaction detection. Therefore, we focus on the performance of different pooling methods on the three classes of attack transactions, and uses boldface to indicate the optimal results among the three types of attack transactions. In terms of attack transaction detection, overall, global average pooling and max

Table 5. Experimental results of different pooling methods. \mathcal{N} denotes normal transaction behavior, \mathcal{A}_{src} , \mathcal{A}_{off} , and \mathcal{A}_{dst} represent the source chain, off-chain, and destination chain attack behaviors, respectively.

Pooling Method	Category	Precision	Recall	F1-score
Self-attention Pooling	\mathcal{N}	99.97% \pm 0.02%	99.86% \pm 0.12%	99.91% \pm 0.06%
	\mathcal{A}_{src}	74.02% \pm 18.97%	93.57% \pm 4.26%	81.66% \pm 12.50%
	\mathcal{A}_{off}	73.67% \pm 28.29%	80.50% \pm 19.40%	71.50% \pm 14.40%
	\mathcal{A}_{dst}	87.36% \pm 11.80%	81.90% \pm 26.17%	80.92% \pm 12.32%
Average Pooling	\mathcal{N}	99.99% \pm 0.01%	99.94% \pm 0.10%	99.96% \pm 0.05%
	\mathcal{A}_{src}	90.30% \pm 12.42%	97.03% \pm 4.07%	93.04% \pm 6.71%
	\mathcal{A}_{off}	81.67% \pm 32.49%	87.67% \pm 11.64%	79.59% \pm 23.03%
	\mathcal{A}_{dst}	90.14% \pm 10.53%	93.14% \pm 9.60%	91.01% \pm 6.23%
Max Pooling	\mathcal{N}	99.98% \pm 0.02%	99.97% \pm 0.06%	99.98% \pm 0.03%
	\mathcal{A}_{src}	94.36% \pm 7.93%	93.03% \pm 10.35%	93.53% \pm 8.17%
	\mathcal{A}_{off}	89.09% \pm 24.39%	94.17% \pm 8.12%	90.43% \pm 17.90%
	\mathcal{A}_{dst}	95.00% \pm 11.18%	93.14% \pm 9.60%	93.78% \pm 9.08%

Table 6. Average experimental results of attack transaction detection in pooling method comparison

Pooling Method	Average Precision	Average Recall	Average F1-score
Self-attention Pooling	78.35% \pm 19.69%	85.32% \pm 16.61%	78.03% \pm 13.07%
Average Pooling	87.37% \pm 18.48%	92.61% \pm 8.44%	87.88% \pm 11.99%
Max Pooling	92.82% \pm 14.50%	93.45% \pm 9.36%	92.58% \pm 11.72%

pooling show good performance in detecting source-chain attacks \mathcal{A}_{src} , off-chain attacks \mathcal{A}_{off} , and destination-chain attacks \mathcal{A}_{dst} . In contrast, self-attention pooling performs relatively poorly. The average values of different evaluation metrics for the three pooling methods in attack transaction detection are shown in Table 6. The average F1-scores of average pooling and max pooling in attack transaction detection reach 87.88% and 92.58% respectively. In comparison, the average F1-score of self-attention pooling is only 78.03%.

Average pooling and max pooling outperform self-attention pooling when dealing with cross-chain bridge attack transactions. On one hand, it may be because the imbalance in the number of transaction categories amplifies the parameter sensitivity of self-attention pooling. Its complex structure requires sufficient training data to support the reliable learning of weights between nodes. However, a small number of attack transaction samples are difficult to meet the learning requirements of the attention weight matrix, causing the model to be dominated by normal transactions and making it hard to capture attack features. On the other hand, cross-chain bridge attack transactions often manifest as local topological anomalies. Max pooling can directly capture anomalies by extracting extreme feature values, and average pooling can aggregate the mean values of global features to amplify statistical subtle differences. In contrast, when there is insufficient data, the dynamic weights of self-attention pooling tend to converge to common behavior patterns that occur frequently but have little effect on attack detection, rather blurring key attack features. In addition, the high-order parameters introduced by the self-attention mechanism are prone to overfitting the features of normal transactions with limited samples. In contrast, parameter-free average pooling and max pooling can more reliably retain key information for distinguishing between normal and attack transactions in imbalanced data, avoiding the risk of overfitting.

Table 7. Experimental results compared with other methods

Method	Category	Precision	Recall	F1-score	
Homogeneous Graph Representation Learning	GAT	\mathcal{N}	99.62% \pm 0.40%	100.00% \pm 0.00%	99.81% \pm 0.20%
		\mathcal{A}_{src}	45.72% \pm 42.24%	48.11% \pm 45.24%	46.16% \pm 42.27%
		\mathcal{A}_{off}	20.00% \pm 44.72%	7.50% \pm 16.77%	10.91% \pm 24.39%
		\mathcal{A}_{dst}	31.52% \pm 44.00%	32.53% \pm 44.65%	31.67% \pm 43.46%
	Graph2vec	\mathcal{N}	99.45% \pm 0.08%	99.95% \pm 0.02%	99.70% \pm 0.04%
		\mathcal{A}_{src}	40.00% \pm 25.28%	7.26% \pm 5.03%	12.09% \pm 8.08%
		\mathcal{A}_{off}	62.00% \pm 21.68%	27.83% \pm 16.28%	35.46% \pm 14.12%
		\mathcal{A}_{dst}	56.67% \pm 33.50%	32.92% \pm 13.82%	40.76% \pm 18.69%
Heterogeneous Graph Representation Learning	RGCN	\mathcal{N}	99.93% \pm 0.06%	99.26% \pm 1.53%	99.59% \pm 0.76%
		\mathcal{A}_{src}	81.96% \pm 40.33%	98.00% \pm 4.47%	82.52% \pm 36.21%
		\mathcal{A}_{off}	45.14% \pm 31.92%	54.88% \pm 40.64%	48.42% \pm 34.63%
		\mathcal{A}_{dst}	91.85% \pm 13.36%	84.99% \pm 11.45%	87.98% \pm 10.75%
	HGT	\mathcal{N}	99.98% \pm 0.01%	99.97% \pm 0.03%	99.97% \pm 0.02%
		\mathcal{A}_{src}	91.68% \pm 6.93%	95.75% \pm 4.29%	93.56% \pm 4.55%
		\mathcal{A}_{off}	54.29% \pm 50.91%	41.79% \pm 40.40%	46.29% \pm 43.43%
		\mathcal{A}_{dst}	66.99% \pm 15.66%	84.94% \pm 9.90%	74.18% \pm 12.10%
	HEAT	\mathcal{N}	99.90% \pm 0.17%	99.97% \pm 0.05%	99.94% \pm 0.08%
		\mathcal{A}_{src}	60.28% \pm 38.77%	70.75% \pm 40.04%	63.69% \pm 37.36%
		\mathcal{A}_{off}	53.23% \pm 47.60%	44.05% \pm 33.50%	46.71% \pm 36.80%
		\mathcal{A}_{dst}	51.92% \pm 22.54%	61.71% \pm 38.11%	50.40% \pm 28.82%
Cross-chain Bridge Attack Detection	Xscope	\mathcal{N}	99.63% \pm 0.00%	99.17% \pm 0.00%	99.40% \pm 0.00%
		\mathcal{A}_{src}	53.85% \pm 0.00%	100.00% \pm 0.00%	70.00% \pm 0.00%
		\mathcal{A}_{off}	100.00% \pm 0.00%	48.70% \pm 0.00%	65.50% \pm 0.00%
		\mathcal{A}_{dst}	100.00% \pm 0.00%	52.70% \pm 0.00%	69.06% \pm 0.00%
	BridgeGuard	\mathcal{N}	99.94% \pm 0.07%	99.98% \pm 0.03%	99.96% \pm 0.04%
		\mathcal{A}_{src}	88.14% \pm 3.76%	87.11% \pm 3.81%	87.23% \pm 3.59%
		\mathcal{A}_{off}	0.00% \pm 0.00%	0.00% \pm 0.00%	0.00% \pm 0.00%
		\mathcal{A}_{dst}	94.56% \pm 3.09%	85.14% \pm 4.33%	90.16% \pm 3.44%
Our Method	BridgeShield	\mathcal{N}	99.98% \pm 0.02%	99.97% \pm 0.06%	99.98% \pm 0.03%
		\mathcal{A}_{src}	94.36% \pm 7.93%	93.03% \pm 10.35%	<u>93.53% \pm 8.17%</u>
		\mathcal{A}_{off}	<u>89.09% \pm 24.39%</u>	94.17% \pm 8.12%	90.43% \pm 17.90%
		\mathcal{A}_{dst}	<u>95.00% \pm 11.18%</u>	93.14% \pm 9.60%	93.78% \pm 9.08%

5.3 RQ2: Comparison Methods

To answer RQ2, we evaluate the average precision, recall, and F1-score of BridgeShield, other graph representation learning methods, and cross-chain bridge attack detection methods. The results of the comparison experiments, as well as the averages of different evaluation metrics for the detection of source-chain attacks \mathcal{A}_{src} , off-chain attacks \mathcal{A}_{off} , and destination-chain attacks \mathcal{A}_{dst} , are shown in Tables 7 and Table 8 respectively. Similarly, we focus on the detection results of different methods on the three types of attack transactions, use boldface and underlines to represent the optimal and sub-optimal detection results for the three types of attack transaction detections.

Table 8. Average experimental results of attack transaction detection in comparison methods

Method	Average Precision	Average Recall	Average F1-score
GAT	32.41% ± 43.65%	29.38% ± 35.55%	29.58% ± 36.71%
Graph2vec	52.89% ± 26.82%	22.67% ± 11.71%	29.44% ± 13.63%
RGCN	72.98% ± 28.54%	<u>79.29% ± 18.85%</u>	<u>72.97% ± 27.20%</u>
HGT	70.99% ± 24.50%	74.16% ± 18.20%	71.34% ± 20.03%
HEAT	55.14% ± 36.30%	58.84% ± 37.22%	53.60% ± 34.33%
Xscope	<u>84.62% ± 0.00%</u>	67.13% ± 0.00%	68.19% ± 0.00%
BridgeGuard	60.90% ± 2.28%	57.42% ± 2.71%	59.13% ± 2.34%
BridgeShield	92.82% ± 14.50%	93.45% ± 9.36%	92.58% ± 11.72%

(1) In terms of homogeneous graph representation learning, GAT is mainly suitable for feature learning of homogeneous graphs and lacks the ability to model heterogeneous nodes and heterogeneous edges. Therefore, it is difficult to extract complex transaction patterns and features in the cross-chain behavior heterogeneous graph, which makes GAT’s ability to detect attack transactions poor, especially its ability to recognize \mathcal{A}_{off} is very limited. This shows that the feature aggregation of a single type of nodes and edges in a homogeneous graph cannot effectively model the behavior patterns and potential clues in cross-chain transactions. Graph2vec also performs poorly. As a homogeneous graph representation learning method, it also ignores the heterogeneity of nodes and edges, cannot accurately depict the diverse semantic relationships in cross-chain transactions, and lacks a mechanism for processing heterogeneous information. Moreover, cross-chain attack transactions usually manifest as local abnormal behavior patterns, while the global embedding of Graph2vec is difficult to capture the structural features of such fine granularity, which further leads to insufficient understanding of transaction patterns and excavation of potential risk clues.

(2) In terms of heterogeneous graph representation learning, RGCN assigns independent weight matrices to different relationship types for information transmission, thus improving the ability to recognize cross-chain attack transactions. However, the aggregation method of RGCN is based on the mean value or weighted sum, and it is easily interfered by noise. As a result, RGCN still has certain limitations when capturing complex cross-chain behaviors, and its ability to detect \mathcal{A}_{off} is also restricted. HGT adaptively adjusts the weights of information propagation among different types of transaction entities and operations through a meta-path-based attention mechanism, thus capturing the features of attack transactions more accurately. Especially in the detection of \mathcal{A}_{src} , HGT can effectively identify abnormal deposit transactions. However, HGT still has certain limitations in the detection of \mathcal{A}_{off} and \mathcal{A}_{dst} . It may be because these attacks involve more complex call chains and state changes, and it is difficult to model comprehensively only relying on the relationship attention mechanism. Although HEAT introduces edge features for aggregation, the edge features in this study are randomly initialized, which may introduce some noise to HEAT.

(3) In terms of cross-chain bridge attack detection, Xscope, as a rule-based method, performs outstandingly in the \mathcal{A}_{src} category, with a recall rate reaching 100%, and can fully cover the attack behaviors of this category. However, in the \mathcal{A}_{dst} and \mathcal{A}_{off} categories, its recall rate is relatively low, resulting in a low overall F1-score. This is because the detection of Xscope relies on log events. However, transactions not executed on EVM-compatible chains do not have log events. The method proposed in this paper does not rely only on the parsing of log events, so it can avoid such problems to a certain extent. The cross-chain transaction execution graph-based method BridgeGuard performs relatively well on \mathcal{A}_{src} and \mathcal{A}_{dst} . However, it only analyzes transactions within a single chain and lacks the capability to detect off-chain attacks, which limits its ability to provide comprehensive monitoring of cross-chain security risks.

5.4 RQ3: Ablation Study

To fully explore the complex interaction relationships among nodes in the cross-chain behavior heterogeneous graph, BridgeShield designs a differentiated meta-path extraction (DME) module. Meanwhile, to integrate the global interaction information among cross-type entities, BridgeShield also introduces a hierarchical attention mechanism (HAM), which is used to update node representations and generate a global graph representation. To verify the roles of these two modules in detecting cross-chain attack behaviors, we design two ablation experiments. The variant models corresponding to these two ablation experiments are as follows:

- BridgeShield (w/o DME): Remove the differentiated meta-path extraction module, that is, rely on the original meta-paths in the graph, and perform pooling on the node features updated through the HAM.
- BridgeShield (w/o HAM): Remove the hierarchical attention mechanism, and directly perform pooling on the node features in the extracted meta-paths.




Fig. 6. Ablation experiments for BridgeShield

Fig. 6 shows the average results of the variant models on the cross-chain bridge business logic attack detection task. When the differentiated meta-path extraction module is removed (w/o DME), the model performance drops significantly. This indicates that although the global graph representation can provide certain information, the lack of differential meta-paths makes it difficult for the model to recognize some key high-order structural features, thus affecting the classification results. After removing the hierarchical attention mechanism (w/o HAM), the overall performance of the model also drops significantly. This shows that this mechanism plays an important role in aggregating the features of intra-cross-chain meta-paths and inter-cross-chain meta-paths and improving the model's detection ability.

6 Discussion

Generalizability. Although attackers' behavioral patterns are diverse and dynamic, their ultimate goal is to illegally obtain cross-chain bridge assets by violating the normal cross-chain business logic. As a result, the transaction networks generated by attackers will inevitably exhibit features distinct from normal transactions. Therefore, through heterogeneous graph modeling and GNN-based detection, BridgeShield can adapt to more types of attack behaviors, demonstrating strong generality and scalability. By constructing a heterogeneous graph of cross-chain bridge transaction

behaviors, BridgeShield captures dynamic interactions between smart contracts and log information generated during transactions. This means our method is applicable not only to known attack patterns but also to evolving ones. Additionally, as a GNN-based detection approach, BridgeShield can be retrained as new attack data expands, enhancing the model's ability to recognize novel attack patterns. By continuously collecting new cross-chain attack data and feeding it back into the training process, the system can gradually adapt to emerging attack modes.

Future Work. In future work, we aim to extend BridgeShield to non-EVM compatible blockchains like Solana, achieving more comprehensive cross-chain security monitoring across multi-chain heterogeneous environments. Meanwhile, we plan to explore the application of large language models in cross-chain security to build an intelligent security analysis engine, improving the identification and defense against complex attack patterns.

7 Conclusion

This work presents BridgeShield, a framework for detecting cross-chain bridge attack behaviors. BridgeShield is the first framework that jointly models the source chain, off-chain coordination, and destination chain within a unified detection process, overcoming the limitations of prior methods restricted to single-chain behaviors. Through extensive evaluation on 51 real-world attack events and tens of thousands of cross-chain transaction graphs, BridgeShield achieves an average F1-score of 92.58%, which is 24.39% higher than the existing tool Xscope. These results highlight its ability to accurately identify attack behaviors across the full execution path, including the source chain, off-chain relays, and destination chain. Overall, BridgeShield provides an effective and practical solution for securing cross-chain bridges and multi-chain ecosystems. By enabling end-to-end detection of malicious behaviors, it contributes to strengthening the reliability of decentralized infrastructures and offers a foundation for future research on secure cross-chain interoperability.

Acknowledgments

The work described in this paper is supported by the National Key Research and Development Program of China (2023YFB2704700), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (62332004, 62372485 and 623B2102), the Natural Science Foundation of Guangdong Province (2023A1515011314), the Ant Group.

References

- [1] André Augusto, Rafael Belchior, Miguel Correia, André Vasconcelos, Luyao Zhang, and Thomas Hardjono. 2024. Sok: Security and privacy of blockchain interoperability. In *2024 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 3840–3865.
- [2] André Augusto, Rafael Belchior, Jonas Pfannschmidt, André Vasconcelos, and Miguel Correia. 2024. XChainWatcher: Monitoring and Identifying Attacks in Cross-Chain Bridges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.02029* (2024).
- [3] Rafael Belchior, André Vasconcelos, Sérgio Guerreiro, and Miguel Correia. 2021. A survey on blockchain interoperability: Past, present, and future trends. *Acm Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 54, 8 (2021), 1–41.
- [4] Li Duan, Yangyang Sun, Wei Ni, Weiping Ding, Jiqiang Liu, and Wei Wang. 2023. Attacks against cross-chain systems and defense approaches: A contemporary survey. *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica* 10, 8 (2023), 1647–1667.
- [5] Shaohua Fan, Junxiong Zhu, Xiaotian Han, Chuan Shi, Linmei Hu, Biyu Ma, and Yongliang Li. 2019. Metapath-guided heterogeneous graph neural network for intent recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 2478–2486.
- [6] Zhangyin Feng, Daya Guo, Duyu Tang, Nan Duan, Xiaocheng Feng, Ming Gong, Linjun Shou, Bing Qin, Ting Liu, Daxin Jiang, et al. 2020. Codebert: A pre-trained model for programming and natural languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08155* (2020).
- [7] Xinyu Fu, Jiani Zhang, Ziqiao Meng, and Irwin King. 2020. Magnn: Metapath aggregated graph neural network for heterogeneous graph embedding. In *Proceedings of the web conference 2020*. 2331–2341.
- [8] Terje Haugum, Bjørnar Hoff, Mohammed Alsadi, and Jingyue Li. 2022. Security and privacy challenges in blockchain interoperability—a multivocal literature review. In *Proceedings of the 26th international conference on evaluation and assessment in software engineering*. 347–356.
- [9] Sung-Shine Lee, Alexandr Murashkin, Martin Derka, and Jan Gorzny. 2023. Sok: Not quite water under the bridge: Review of cross-chain bridge hacks. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Blockchain and Cryptocurrency (ICBC)*. IEEE, 1–14.

- [10] Li Li, Jiahao Wu, and Wei Cui. 2023. A review of blockchain cross-chain technology. *IET Blockchain* 3, 3 (2023), 149–158.
- [11] Mei Li, Xiangrui Cai, Sihan Xu, and Hua Ji. 2023. Metapath-aggregated heterogeneous graph neural network for drug–target interaction prediction. *Briefings in bioinformatics* 24, 1 (2023), bbac578.
- [12] Ningran Li, Minfeng Qi, Zhiyu Xu, Xiaogang Zhu, Wei Zhou, Sheng Wen, and Yang Xiang. 2025. Blockchain Cross-Chain Bridge Security: Challenges, Solutions, and Future Outlook. *Distributed Ledger Technologies: Research and Practice* 4, 1 (2025), 1–34.
- [13] Jieli Liu, Jiatao Zheng, Jiajing Wu, and Zibin Zheng. 2022. Fa-gnn: Filter and augment graph neural networks for account classification in ethereum. *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering* 9, 4 (2022), 2579–2588.
- [14] Zhenguang Liu, Peng Qian, Xiaoyang Wang, Yuan Zhuang, Lin Qiu, and Xun Wang. 2021. Combining graph neural networks with expert knowledge for smart contract vulnerability detection. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 35, 2 (2021), 1296–1310.
- [15] Hanyu Mao, Tiezheng Nie, Hao Sun, Derong Shen, and Ge Yu. 2022. A survey on cross-chain technology: Challenges, development, and prospect. *Ieee Access* 11 (2022), 45527–45546.
- [16] Xiaoyu Mo, Zhiyu Huang, Yang Xing, and Chen Lv. 2022. Multi-agent trajectory prediction with heterogeneous edge-enhanced graph attention network. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 23, 7 (2022), 9554–9567.
- [17] Annamalai Narayanan, Mahinthan Chandramohan, Rajasekar Venkatesan, Lihui Chen, Yang Liu, and Shantanu Jaiswal. 2017. graph2vec: Learning distributed representations of graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.05005* (2017).
- [18] Jakob Svennevik Notland, Jingyue Li, Mariusz Nowostawski, and Peter Halland Haro. 2025. Sok: Cross-chain bridging architectural design flaws and mitigations. *Blockchain: Research and Applications* (2025), 100315.
- [19] Wei Ou, Shiyang Huang, Jingjing Zheng, Qionglu Zhang, Guang Zeng, and Wenbao Han. 2022. An overview on cross-chain: Mechanism, platforms, challenges and advances. *Computer Networks* 218 (2022), 109378.
- [20] Kaihua Qin, Zhe Ye, Zhun Wang, Weilin Li, Liyi Zhou, Chao Zhang, Dawn Song, and Arthur Gervais. 2025. Enhancing Smart Contract Security Analysis with Execution Property Graphs. *Proceedings of the ACM on Software Engineering* 2, ISSTA (2025), 1101–1122.
- [21] Fabian Schär. 2021. Decentralized finance: on blockchain and smart contract-based financial markets. *Review of the Federal Reserve Bank of St Louis* 103, 2 (2021), 153–174.
- [22] Michael Schlichtkrull, Thomas N Kipf, Peter Bloem, Rianne Van Den Berg, Ivan Titov, and Max Welling. 2018. Modeling relational data with graph convolutional networks. In *The semantic web: 15th international conference, ESWC, Heraklion, Crete, Greece, June 3–7, proceedings 15*. Springer, 593–607.
- [23] Stefan Schulte, Marten Sigwart, Philipp Frauenthaler, and Michael Borkowski. 2019. Towards blockchain interoperability. In *Business Process Management: Blockchain and Central and Eastern Europe Forum: BPM Blockchain and CEE Forum, Vienna, Austria, September 1–6, Proceedings 17*. Springer, 3–10.
- [24] Yizhou Sun, Jiawei Han, Xifeng Yan, Philip S Yu, and Tianyi Wu. 2011. Pathsim: Meta path-based top-k similarity search in heterogeneous information networks. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 4, 11 (2011), 992–1003.
- [25] Petar Velickovic, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Lio, Yoshua Bengio, et al. 2017. Graph attention networks. *stat* 1050, 20 (2017), 10–48550.
- [26] Jinhuan Wang, Pengtao Chen, Xinyao Xu, Jiajing Wu, Meng Shen, Qi Xuan, and Xiaoniu Yang. 2025. Tsgn: Transaction subgraph networks assisting phishing detection in ethereum. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TDSC.2025.3554215>.
- [27] Xiao Wang, Houye Ji, Chuan Shi, Bai Wang, Yanfang Ye, Peng Cui, and Philip S Yu. 2019. Heterogeneous graph attention network. In *The world wide web conference. 2022–2032*.
- [28] Jiajing Wu, Kaixin Lin, Dan Lin, Bozhao Zhang, Zhiying Wu, and Jianzhong Su. 2025. Safeguarding blockchain ecosystem: Understanding and detecting attack transactions on cross-chain bridges. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference*. 4902–4912.
- [29] Shaowei Yao, Tianming Wang, and Xiaojun Wan. 2020. Heterogeneous graph transformer for graph-to-sequence learning. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. 7145–7154.
- [30] Chuxu Zhang, Dongjin Song, Chao Huang, Ananthram Swami, and Nitesh V Chawla. 2019. Heterogeneous graph neural network. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 793–803.
- [31] Jiashuo Zhang, Jianbo Gao, Yue Li, Ziming Chen, Zhi Guan, and Zhong Chen. 2022. Xscope: Hunting for cross-chain bridge attacks. In *Proceedings of the 37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. 1–4.
- [32] Mengya Zhang, Xiaokuan Zhang, Josh Barbee, Yinqian Zhang, and Zhiqiang Lin. 2023. Sok: Security of cross-chain bridges: Attack surfaces, defenses, and open problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.12573* (2023).
- [33] Qianrui Zhao, Yinan Wang, Bo Yang, Ke Shang, Maozeng Sun, Haijun Wang, Zijiang Yang, and Haojie Xin. 2023. A comprehensive overview of security vulnerability penetration methods in blockchain cross-chain bridges. *Authorea Preprints* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.22541/au.169760541.13864334/v1>.
- [34] Yuan Zhuang, Zhenguang Liu, Peng Qian, Qi Liu, Xiang Wang, and Qinming He. 2021. Smart contract vulnerability detection using graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Conference on International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence*. 3283–3290.

Received 25 August 2025