## SMT-Based Refutation of Spurious Bug Reports in the Clang Static Analyzer

Mikhail R. Gadelha\*, Enrico Steffinlongo, Lucas C. Cordeiro, Bernd Fischer, Denis A. Nicole

\*Sidia Institute of Science and Technology

<u>m.gadelha@samsung.com</u>

### Static Analysis vs Testing



- Usually checks one path in the program.
- May miss errors.
- It's fast.



- Explores all executions, might over-approximate paths.
- Might present false positives due to overapproximations.
- Does not scale well (state/path explosion).

• Fast and easy to use state-of-the-art static analyzer framework built on top of clang.

- Fast and easy to use state-of-the-art static analyzer framework built on top of clang.
- Performs context-sensitive interprocedural analysis in each translation units of a project.

- Fast and easy to use state-of-the-art static analyzer framework built on top of clang.
- Performs context-sensitive interprocedural analysis in each translation units of a project.
- Offer a wide range of checkers, including pattern matching checkers and path-sensitive checkers.
  - Constraints generated from symbolically executing the program; no abstract interpretation involved.

- Fast and easy to use state-of-the-art static analyzer framework built on top of clang.
- Performs context-sensitive interprocedural analysis in each translation units of a project.
- Offer a wide range of checkers, including pattern matching checkers and path-sensitive checkers.
  - Constraints generated from symbolically executing the program; no abstract interpretation involved.
- Sacrifices precision for speed.

```
1 unsigned int func(unsigned int a) {
2 unsigned int *z = 0;
3 if ((a & 1) && ((a & 1) ^ 1))
4 return *z;
5 return 0;
6 }
```

Is this program safe?



• This program is safe, i.e., the null pointer dereference is unreachable.

#### Running the CSA

DEMO

• Why don't we replace the imprecise solver?

- Why don't we replace the imprecise solver?
- First SMT backend implemented (Z3) in late 2017 by Dominic Chan. It was aimed to replace the builtin constraint solver in the CSA.

- Why don't we replace the imprecise solver?
- First SMT backend implemented (Z3) in late 2017 by Dominic Chan. It was aimed to replace the builtin constraint solver in the CSA.
- It was up to 20 times slower than the built-in constraint solver :/

We developed an alternative solution: to use the more precise SMT solvers to reason about bug reachability only as a **post processing** step.

• Our extension refutes false bug reports produced by the path sensitive checkers.

- Our extension refutes false bug reports produced by the path sensitive checkers.
- We use SMT solvers to check the reachability of reported bugs: all the constraints in a bug path are encoded and checked for satisfiability.

- Our extension refutes false bug reports produced by the path sensitive checkers.
- We use SMT solvers to check the reachability of reported bugs: all the constraints in a bug path are encoded and checked for satisfiability.
- We implemented support for five different stateof-the-art SMT solvers in the CSA: Z3, Boolector, MathSAT, Yices and CVC4.

## Running the CSA with SMT refutation

## DEMO

# Clang Static Analyzer with SMT Refutation



- We evaluated twelve open-source projects:
  - tmux, Redis, openSSL, twin, git, postgreSQL, sqlite3, curl, libWebM, Memcached, Xerces-c, and XNU.
- Using five different SMT solvers:
  - Z3, Boolector, MathSAT, CVC4 and Yices
- Instructions to reproduce the experiments in: <u>https://github.com/mikhailramalho/analyzer-projects</u>

Projects	time (s) (no refutation)	time (s) (refutation)*	reported bugs (no refutation)	refuted bugs
redis	347.8	338.3	93	1
openSSL	138	128	38	2
twin	225.6	216.7	63	1
git	488.7	405.9	70	11
postgreSQL	1167.2	1112.4	196	6
SQLite3	1078.6	1058.4	83	15
xerces-c++	489.8	433.2	81	2
XNU	3441.7	3405.1	557	51
tmux	86.5	89.9	19	0
curl	79.8	79.9	39	0
libWebM	43.9	44.2	6	0
memcached	96	96.2	25	0

Projects	time (s) (no refutation)	time (s) (refutation)*	reported bugs (no refutation)	refuted bugs
Teuis	347.0	330.3	30	
openSSL	138	128	38	2
twin	225.6	216.7	63	1
git	488.7	405.9	70	11
postgreSQL	1167.2	1112.4	196	6
SQLite3	1078.6	1058.4	83	15
xerces-c++	489.8	433.2	81	2
XNU	3441.7	3405.1	557	51
tmux	86.5	89.9	19	0
cun	19.0	79.9	39	U
libWebM	43.9	44.2	6	0
memcached	96	96.2	25	0

time (s) (no refutation)	time (s) (refutation)*	reported bug bug (no refutation,	s removed
347.0	<b>330.3</b>	90	
138	128	38	2
225.6	216.7	63	1
488.7	405.9	70	11
1167.2	1112.4	196	6
1078.6	1058.4	83	15
489.8	433.2	81	2
3441.7	3405.1	557	51
86.5	89.9	19	0
79.0 43.9	79.9 44.2	ა <del>ა</del> ნ	0
96	96.2	25	0
	time (s) (no refutation) 347.0 138 225.6 488.7 1167.2 1078.6 489.8 3441.7 86.5 79.0 43.9 96	time (s) (no refutation)time (s) (refutation)* $347.0$ $350.3$ $138$ $128$ $225.6$ $216.7$ $488.7$ $405.9$ $1167.2$ $1112.4$ $1078.6$ $1058.4$ $489.8$ $433.2$ $3441.7$ $3405.1$ $86.5$ $89.9$ $79.0$ $79.9$ $43.9$ $44.2$ $96$ $96.2$	time (s)time (s)reported bug (no refutation)*bug (no refutation)* $347.0$ $350.3$ $95$ $138$ $128$ $38$ $225.6$ $216.7$ $63$ $488.7$ $405.9$ $70$ $1167.2$ $1112.4$ $196$ $1078.6$ $1058.4$ $83$ $489.8$ $433.2$ $81$ $3441.7$ $3405.1$ $557$ $86.5$ $89.9$ $19$ $79.6$ $79.9$ $39$ $43.9$ $44.2$ $6$ $96$ $96.2$ $25$

 $\Delta verage 10\%$ 

Projects	time (s) (no refutatior,	speedup	reported bugs (no refutation)	refuted bugs
Teuis	347.0	<b>ა</b> ათ.თ	90	I
openSSL	138	128	38	2
twin	225.6	216.7	63	1
git	488.7	405.9	70	11
postgreSQL	1167.2	1112.4	196	6
SQLite3	1078.6	1058.4	83	15
xerces-c++	489.8	433.2	81	2
XNU	3441.7	3405.1	557	51
tmux	86.5	89.9	19	0
CUIT	19.0	/9.9	39	0
libWebM	43.9	44.2	6	0
memcached	96	96.2	25	0

Projects	time (s) (no refutation)	time (s) (refutation)*	reported bugs (no refutation)	refuted bugs
redis	347.8	338.3	93	1
openSSL	138	128	38	2
twin	225.6	216.7	63	1
git	488.7	405.9	70	11
postgreSQL	1167.2	1112.4	196	6
SQLite3	1078.6	1050 /	83	15
xerces-c++	489.8	Average 1%	81	2
XNU	3441.7	slowdown	557	51
fmux	86.5	8	19	- <u> </u>
curi	79.8	79.9	39	0
libWebM	43.9	44.2	6	0
memcached	96	96.2	25	0

• In total, 89 bugs were refuted and an in-depth analysis of them show that all of them were false positives.

- In total, 89 bugs were refuted and an in-depth analysis of them show that all of them were false positives.
- The average time to analyse the projects with refuted bugs was 35.0 seconds faster, a 6.25% speed up.

- In total, 89 bugs were refuted and an in-depth analysis of them show that all of them were false positives.
- The average time to analyse the projects with refuted bugs was 35.0 seconds faster, a 6.25% speed up.
- Out of the four projects where no bug was refuted the analysis was 1.0 second slower on average: a 1.24% slowdown.

# How do I run CSA on my project?

## DEMO

### Conclusions

- The technique removes from 0% to 20% bugs in real-world projects:
  - Empirical evidences shows that, on average, 50% of the bugs reported are spurious.
- The technique only incurs in a small overhead, and can actually make the analysis faster in a number of real-world projects.
- Further improvements can only be achieved through cross translation-unit support in the CSA.

### The future?

- D54978: Move the SMT API to LLVM:
  - Part of the clang 9.0.
- Validation of optimizations using SMT:
  - Already done in the ScalarEvolution pass.
- Maybe an SMT backend in LLVM:
  - Memory handling?
  - Loops?

### Acknowledgments

- Thank you to:
  - George Karpenkov
  - Artem Dergachev
  - Devin Coughlin
  - Anna Zaks
  - Réka Kovács
  - Dominic Chen
  - Gábor Horváth



### Thank you!

- Me: <u>mikhail.ramalho@gmail.com</u>
- Experiments: <u>https://github.com/mikhailramalho/analyzer-projects</u>
- Clang static analyzer: <a href="https://clang-analyzer.llvm.org/">https://clang-analyzer.llvm.org/</a>
- 5 min video: <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ylW5iRYNsGA</u>