

# Pending Constraints in Symbolic Execution for Better Exploration and Seeding

Timotej Kapus Frank Busse Cristian Cadar Imperial College London

## Symbolic Execution





- Program analysis technique
- Active research area
- Used in industry
  - IntelliTest, SAGE
  - KLOVER



# Why symbolic execution?

- No false positives!
  - Every bug found has a concrete input triggering it
- Can interact with the environment
   I/O, unmodeled libraries
- Only relevant code executed "symbolically", the rest is fast "native" execution



# Why (not) symbolic execution?

- Scalability, scalability, scalability
  - Constraint solving is hard
  - Path explosion



#### This talk

Introduce pending constraints which enhance the scalability of symbolic execution via aggressively tackling paths that are known to be feasible.

#### "known to be feasible"

Caching

- Cache assignments from previous solver queries
- Already widely adopted

Seeding

- External, usually valid concrete inputs
- Used to bootstrap symbolic execution
- From test-suites, examples, production data

Symbolic execution example: get\_sign

int get sign(int x) { **int** r = -1;if  $(x \ge 1) r = 1;$ if (x == 0) r = 0;return r;

```
int get_sign(int x) {
    int r = -1;
    if (x >= 1) r = 1;
    if (x == 0) r = 0;
    return r;
}
```

¥









































## Symbolic execution with pending constraints

- Explore paths that are known to be feasible
- Solve constraints only when necessary to make progress

int get\_sign(int x) {
 int r = -1;
 if (x >= 1) r = 1;
 if (x == 0) r = 0;
 return r;
}

```
int get_sign(int x) {
    int r = -1;
    if (x >= 1) r = 1;
    if (x == 0) r = 0;
    return r;
}
```



¥







### Pending constraints

- Not known to be feasible
- When only pending constraints left
  - Pick one and check







#### Pending constraints: still not known if feasible



### Pending constraints: known feasible path!





## Only pending constraints: check one













## Pending constraints: why would they be useful?

- Reversing md5 hash
  - Very hard for SMT solvers
- 1471037522 = md5("ase2020")[0]
  - $\circ \quad \text{Use as seed} \quad$

char msg[8] = symbolic; uint32\_t \*hash = md5(msg, 8); assert(hash[0] == 1471037522)

#### Suppose this exploration tree for md5



## Suppose this path

































## Solver queries: 4



















# Why pending constraints?

- More efficient use of solver solutions
  - Explore more instructions per query
  - Less time solving infeasible queries
- Prefers deeper search tree exploration
- Empowering search heuristics
  - Control over constraint solving
  - ZESTI





## Evaluation

- Based on an implementation in KLEE
- 8 real world applications
- Hard targets for symbolic execution



## Experiment design

- 2 hour runs
- With and without seeds
- 3 search strategies: **random path**, DFS, depth biased
- 3 repetitions

• Case study on SQLite3 with 24 hour runs

#### Vanilla vs Pending without seeds (random path)



#### Proportion of time spent solving queries that were infeasible



#### SQLite3: 24 hour run without seeds (random path)



#### Vanilla vs Pending with seeds (random path)



#### SQLite3: 24 hour run with seed



## **ZESTI** and seeding

- Extension of KLEE for augmenting test suites
- Explores paths "around" a seed
- Easy to implement with pending constraints
- Found 2 bugs in tar, dwarfdump that were fixed



## Conclusion

- Pending constraints
  - Tackles scalability of symbolic execution by aggressively following paths that are known to be feasible
- Effective in improving coverage for 8 challenging programs



#### Without seeds



#### Time spent constraint solving by vanilla KLEE



		depth	depth	depth	<sup>1₅2</sup> rp	rps1	rp₅2	
-	0.00	1.00	1.97	2.00	3.17	1.97	2.00	- depth
depth -	1.00	1.82	1.61	1.65	3.11	1.61	1.65	- depth <sub>s1</sub>
depth <sub>s1</sub> -	1.36	1.09	2.70	1.64	3.11	1.65	1.64	- depth <sub>s2</sub>
depth <sub>s2</sub> -	1.75	1.50	1.48	2.02	3.11	3.11	3.11	- rp
rp -	2.54	2.47	2.48	2.47	2.29	1.61	1.65	- rp <sub>s1</sub>
rp <sub>s1</sub> -	1.36		1.50	2.47	1.09	2.70	1.64	- rp <sub>s2</sub>
rp <sub>s2</sub> -	1.75		1.48	2.48	1.50	1.48	2.02	-
c	lepth de	p <sup>ths1</sup> de	pth <sub>52</sub>	rp	rp51	rp52	1	

