

# Proofs as Relational Invariants of Synthesized Execution Grammars

CALEB VOSS, Georgia Institute of Technology

DAVID HEATH, Georgia Institute of Technology

WILLIAM HARRIS, Georgia Institute of Technology

---

The automatic verification of programs that maintain unbounded low-level data structures is a critical and open problem. Analyzers and verifiers developed in previous work can synthesize invariants that only describe data structures of heavily restricted forms, or require an analyst to provide predicates over program data and structure that are used in a synthesized proof of correctness.

In this work, we introduce a novel automatic safety verifier of programs that maintain low-level data structures, named `LTP`. `LTP` synthesizes proofs of program safety represented as a grammar of a given program's control paths, annotated with invariants that relate program state at distinct points within its path of execution. `LTP` synthesizes such proofs completely automatically, using a novel inductive-synthesis algorithm.

We have implemented `LTP` as a verifier for JVM bytecode and applied it to verify the safety of a collection of verification benchmarks. Our results demonstrate that `LTP` can be applied to automatically verify the safety of programs that are beyond the scope of previously-developed verifiers.

---

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Automatically verifying that a given program satisfies a desired safety property is a fundamental problem of program verification. Recent work has seen the development of powerful program verifiers that operate automatically [9, 22–25, 38]. Such verifiers can often determine if practical programs satisfy properties concerning their control flow and facts over a bounded collection of data values [5].

However, verifying the safety of programs that maintain unbounded low-level data structures remains an open problem. A significant body of previous work has developed *shape analyzers* [17, 26] that, given a program  $P$ , synthesize invariants of the reachable heaps of  $P$  represented in a particular shape domain, such as three-valued logical structures [35, 41, 45] or separation-logic formulas [12, 15, 42, 53]; the invariants synthesized by such analyzers can potentially imply facts about program states that establish that  $P$  is safe. Another body of work has developed automatic program verifiers [1, 4, 10, 14, 16, 19, 28, 29, 31, 34, 40, 43] and decision procedures [39, 46] that directly attempt to determine if  $P$  is safe by attempting to synthesize sufficient invariants in such domains.

Unfortunately, all such approaches suffer from at least one of several critical limitations. In particular, they either are only able to represent invariants over heaps of restricted forms [4, 14, 16, 28, 29, 31, 34] or require an analyst to manually provide abstractions [1, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19, 26, 31, 39–43, 45, 46, 53] or candidate inductive invariants [10, 28].

The main contribution of this work is an automatic verifier, named `LTP`, that attempts to determine the safety of a program that may maintain low-level data structures. `LTP` satisfies two key features that distinguish it from previous approaches. First, it can potentially prove the safety of programs by establishing inductive invariants that relate multiple low-level structures maintained by a program, each of which need not necessarily have a pre-specified shape, such as

list or tree. Second, `LTP` performs synthesis of these invariants completely automatically, without requiring an analyst to provide predicates over values or data-structure shapes from which to attempt to synthesize a proof.

We designed `LTP` to satisfy both of the above features by developing two key technical insights. The first insight is that the safety of a program that maintains low-level *data structures* can often be established by invariants that relate only values bound to variables (i.e., *local data*) at *multiple control points*. Each proof structure synthesized by `LTP` is an annotated *path grammar* of the program—i.e., a graph grammar in which the yield of each derivation is a program path. Each non-terminal  $A$  of the grammar is annotated with a formula that relates only the local values of a tuple of program points generated by each application of  $A$ . Such a formula is in the combination of a theory that axiomatizes the program’s data operations with the theory of uninterpreted functions.

The second insight is that proofs as relational invariants of graph grammars can potentially be synthesized automatically, using an *inductive synthesizer* [2, 47–50]. The inductive synthesizer implemented by `LTP`, given a program  $P$ , iteratively maintains a set of enumerated control paths of  $P$ . In each iteration, `LTP` synthesizes a candidate graph grammar  $\mathcal{G}$  from the structure of  $P$  and enumerated paths by reduction to constraint solving. `LTP` attempts to synthesize relational invariants of  $\mathcal{G}$  by reduction to logic programming [9, 44]. If a logic-programming solver determines that no such invariants exist, then `LTP` collects from the solver an unexplored control path which it uses to refine the proposed grammar in subsequent iterations.

We have developed an implementation of `LTP` that verifies programs represented in Java Virtual Machine (JVM) bytecode. We evaluated `LTP` by using it to attempt to verify the safety of a collection of challenging problems for shape analyses and verifiers, some of which are adapted from those presented in the SV-COMP verifier competition [20].

The results demonstrate that `LTP` is powerful enough to express non-local invariants, combining information separated in time by unboundedly many execution steps and separated in heap space by unboundedly many field accesses. Without manual assistance, `LTP` can prove unary and binary properties over lists, reachability properties, and even correlative properties between two disjoint data structures.

In summary, the design of `LTP` builds on and contributes to multiple topics in program analysis and verification. First, `LTP` constitutes a shape verifier with strengths that are distinct from all shape verifiers presented in previous work, though it does not necessarily subsume such verifiers, as discussed in §5.4. Second, `LTP` demonstrates that techniques from *relational verification* [6–8] which previously have been applied to prove properties of multiple programs by relating states *across* multiple runs, can be applied to prove shape properties by relating states *within* program runs. Third, `LTP` demonstrates that techniques from inductive synthesis, which have previously been applied to synthesize correct programs as completions of incomplete programs, can also be used to synthesize alternate representations of complete programs that are amenable to verification.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. §2 illustrates the operation of `LTP` by example. §3 reviews previous work on which `LTP` is based, §4 describes the proofs synthesized by `LTP`, and §5 describes `LTP`’s inductive-synthesis algorithm. §6 describes our empirical evaluation of `LTP`. §7 compares `LTP` to related work, and §8 concludes.

## 2 OVERVIEW

This section illustrates `LTP` by example. §2.1 introduces an example program as a verification problem. §2.2 introduces the proof of `buildInspect` synthesized by `LTP`. §2.3 describes how `LTP` synthesizes the proof automatically.

### 2.1 `buildInspect`: maintaining a low-level queue

```

1 class Element { Element next; }
2 public static void buildInspect(int num) {
3   Element head = new Element();
4   Element tail = head;
5   for (int i = 0; i < num; i++) {
6     Element tmp = new Element();
7     tail.next = tmp;
8     tail = tmp; }
9   Element elt = head;
10  for (int i = 0; i < num; i++)
11    elt = elt.next;
12  assert elt == tail; }

```

Fig. 1. `buildInspect`: constructs a queue with `num` elements and traverses it from head to tail.




Fig. 2. A control path of `buildInspect` containing two iterations of the loops, including data-dependence edges.

Figure 1 contains a program, named `buildInspect`, that maintains a low-level queue. The queue is represented as a linked list of `Element` objects (line 1). `buildInspect` first constructs a single `Element` object and binds it to variables that store both the queue’s head (line 3) and tail (line 4). `buildInspect` then iteratively creates new `Elements` and adds them to the end of the queue (lines 5–8). `buildInspect` then iterates over the elements in the queue, storing each element in `elt` (lines 10–11). Finally, `buildInspect` asserts that, on completion of the loop in lines 10–11, `elt` stores the tail element of the queue (line 12).

Each execution of `buildInspect` satisfies the assertion at line 12. The key invariant for the loop over lines 5–8 establishes that the `Element` object stored in `elt` reaches the object stored in `tail` over some number  $i$  of dereferences of the `next` pointer. The key invariant for the loop over lines 10–11 establishes that the `Element` object stored in `elt` reaches the `Element` object stored in `tail` over  $num - i$  dereferences of the `next` pointer, where  $n$  is the length of the queue. Unfortunately, it is challenging to design a verifier that can express such invariants and infer them automatically from a given program without supplied candidate invariants.

## 2.2 A proof of `buildInspect`’s safety as relational invariants of a path grammar

A key insight behind our approach is that proofs of the safety of a program  $P$  can be represented as a graph grammar that generates control paths of  $P$ , annotated with invariants that relate states at different path points when they co-occur in the same grammar rule. In this section, we give a grammar  $\mathcal{G}_{BI}$  of `buildInspect`’s control paths (§2.2.1) and relational invariants of  $\mathcal{G}_{BI}$  that represent a proof of the safety of `buildInspect` (§2.2.2).

*2.2.1 A grammar of `buildInspect`’s control paths.* Figure 2 contains the control path of `buildInspect` that includes two iterations of the loop at lines 5–8 and two iterations of the loop at lines 10–11. In Figure 2, each node is an instance of a control location, annotated with its line number. The line number of each node indicates the program has reached, but not executed, the instruction on that line. Control steps are depicted as solid edges. Each point that stores an object is connected to the point that loads the stored object by a dashed line.

A graph grammar  $\mathcal{G}_{BI}$  that generates the control paths of `buildInspect` is depicted in Figure 3.  $\mathcal{G}_{BI}$  contains two relations, `buildInspect` and `StLd`, with `buildInspect` the starting relation.  $\mathcal{G}_{BI}$  consists of three clauses, one for `buildInspect` and two for `StLd`. Each clause is depicted as a hypergraph. The nodes represent program control points and are labeled with an alphabetic character for reference and with the corresponding line number in the program. The edges consist of control-dependence edges, depicted as solid edges; the dashed edges depict data dependencies, and are




Fig. 3. A graph grammar that generates `buildInspect`'s control paths and has relational invariants that prove the safety of `buildInspect`. The grammar contains three clauses, each labeled with their head relation (either `buildInspect` or `StLd`).

described in §2.2.2. Each (ordered) hyperedge  $h$  is represented as a box labeled with a relation, and with the nodes in  $h$  labeled with their index in  $h$ . The hyperedge that each clause defines is represented implicitly, with the nodes in the hyperedge dashed and labeled with their index in the hyperedge.

The starting relation of  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{BI}}$ , `buildInspect`, has a single clause, `buildInspect[0]`, that generates fragments of a control path that model the initial step of `buildInspect` and the step of `buildInspect` from the exit of the loop at lines 5–9 to the entry of the loop at lines 10–11.

The relation `StLd` simultaneously derives a pair of paths, corresponding to the two loops of the program.  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{BI}}$  contains two clauses for `StLd`. Clause `StLd[0]` generates a pair of loop exit steps. Clause `StLd[1]` generates both a step through the loop at lines 5–9 that allocates a new `Element` object and stores it at the `next` field of a bound object, and a step through the loop at lines 10–11 that loads an `Element` object. Clause `StLd[1]` recursively includes an instance of the `StLd` relation, which can be further expanded in order to generate the rest of each loop.

The control path in Figure 2 is generated by  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{BI}}$ . In particular, it is generated by applying the following sequences of rules: `buildInspect[0]`, `StLd[1]`, `StLd[1]`, `StLd[0]`.

It should be noted that the grammar shown in Figure 3 is a simplification of the grammar required to prove the safety of `buildInspect`. In particular, the depicted grammar only allows expansions of `StLd` such that the two loops iterate the same number of times. It is true that every actual execution has this property, but this fact is not known *a priori*. Therefore, the grammar must allow paths with different numbers of iterations in each loop so that the underlying model checker can discover such an invariant through counterexamples.

**2.2.2 Relational invariants of `buildInspect`'s path grammar.** A second key observation that motivates our approach is that a proof of the safety of a program  $P$  can be represented as some grammar  $\mathcal{G}$  of the paths of  $P$  paired with relational invariants over the location instances in the interface of each of the relations of  $\mathcal{G}$ . In particular, a proof of the safety of `buildInspect` can be represented as the path grammar  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{BI}}$  (given in §2.2.1), paired with relational invariants over instances of control locations in the interface of `buildInspect` and `StLd` that establish that at the 0th interface node of `buildInspect`, `elt` = `tail`.

The relational invariant for `StLd` establishes that if `tail` at index 0 is equal to `elt` at index 2 and if the point in the path at which the `next` field of `tail` at index 1 was stored is the point at which the `next` field of `elt` at index 2 was stored, then `tail` at index 1 is `elt` at index 3. It also establishes that `i` at index 0 is equivalent to `i` at index 2, indicating




Fig. 4. An alternative graph grammar  $G'_{BI}$  that generates `ccbuildInspect`'s control paths, but does not have relational invariants that prove the safety of `buildInspect`.

that the loops will iterate the same number of times. The relational invariant for `StLd` can be expressed as the following formula, where integer subscripts indicate interface node indices and `next` indicates a function which maps each object to the path point at which it was last updated:

$$(\text{tail}_0 = \text{elt}_2 \wedge \text{next}_1(\text{tail}_0) = \text{next}_2(\text{elt}_2) \implies \text{tail}_1 = \text{elt}_3) \wedge i_0 = i_2 \quad (1)$$

Formula 1 entails that each run of `buildInspect` satisfies its assertion at line 12. Furthermore, it can be proved to hold over all tuples of path points in all paths generated by  $G_{BI}$ , by induction on the derivations of  $G_{BI}$ . In particular, (1) in clause `StLd[0]`, the semantic constraints of the instructions on generated control steps entail Formula 1 with the variables at index 0, 1, 2, and 3 replaced with variables that represent state at points  $a$ ,  $b$ ,  $c$ , and  $d$  respectively. (2) In clause `StLd[1]`, semantic constraints of the instructions on generated control steps, combined with Formula 1 with the variables at index 0, 1, 2, and 3 replaced with variables that model state at points  $d$ ,  $e$ ,  $h$ , and  $i$ , entail Formula 1 with variables at index 0, 1, 2, and 3 replaced with variables that represent state at path points  $a$ ,  $e$ ,  $f$ , and  $i$ .

### 2.3 Proving safety of `buildInspect` automatically

`LTP`, given a program  $P$  with an error location  $L$ , attempts to prove that  $L$  is unreachable in  $P$  by synthesizing a path grammar that has relational invariants that prove that  $L$  is unreachable in  $P$ . To prove that `buildInspect` always satisfies the assertion at line 12, `LTP` synthesizes the path grammar of `buildInspect` given in §2.2.1 and the relational invariants of the grammar given in §2.2.2.

`LTP`, given program  $P$  and error location  $L$ , attempts to synthesize a proof that  $L$  is unreachable in  $P$  as relational invariants by performing an inductive synthesis algorithm [2, 21, 32, 51]. The algorithm maintains an initially empty set of enumerated control paths of  $P$ .

In each iteration, `LTP` synthesizes a graph grammar  $\mathcal{G}$  that derives all control paths of  $P$  and that admits relational invariants proving the safety of all paths enumerated. As the set of enumerated paths is initially empty, the first graph grammar synthesized by `LTP` is likely a simple grammar whose structure directly corresponds to the control-flow graph of `buildInspect`, such as the grammar  $G'_{BI}$  given in Figure 3, in which each path is derived left-recursively. E.g., it could synthesize the graph grammar  $G'_{BI}$  given in Figure 3, in which each relation derives a single path left-recursively. As a heuristic, `LTP` could initially synthesize path grammars that use right-recursive definitions, the program's syntactic structure, or other sub-structures of the program's control-flow graph, such as components of its Bourdoncle decomposition [11]. However, no such fixed grammar can serve as a proof of correctness in general, and must be iteratively restructured.

After LTPP synthesizes a graph grammar  $\mathcal{G}$ , it attempts to determine if  $\mathcal{G}$  has relational invariants that represent a proof of the safety of  $P$ . LTPP reduces this problem to solving a system  $\mathcal{S}$  of *Constrained Horn Clauses* (see §3.2.2), and runs a solver on the generated system as a black box. If the solver determines that  $\mathcal{S}$  has a solution, then the solution contains relational invariants of  $\mathcal{G}$  that prove safety of  $P$ .

Otherwise, if the solver provides a counter-derivation  $D$  of  $\mathcal{S}$  that has no solution, then  $D$  defines a control path that cannot be proved safe by relational invariants of  $\mathcal{G}$ . For example, when given  $G'_{\text{BI}}$ , LTPP determines that some derivation of  $G'_{\text{BI}}$ , such as the one corresponding to the control path  $p$  given in Figure 2, has no solution. Such a derivation has no solution because nodes of the path that are the sites of matching stores and loads do not co-occur in the clauses of  $G'_{\text{BI}}$ .

LTPP then inspects the control path of the unsolvable derivation and determines if it is truly unsafe. If so, then LTPP determines that  $P$  is unsafe. Otherwise, as in the case of  $p$ , LTPP determines that the path is safe, adds it to the set of enumerated paths, and recurses. In LTPP's next iteration, it will synthesize a path grammar distinct from  $G'_{\text{BI}}$  that admits relation invariants proving the safety of  $p$ . LTPP eventually synthesizes  $G_{\text{BI}}$ , which proves safety for all paths.

### 3 BACKGROUND

In this section, we review foundations on which LTPP is built. In §3.1, we define the low-level imperative language targeted by LTPP. In §3.2, we review concepts from formal logic and logic programming used in the design of LTPP.

#### 3.1 A target imperative language

In this section, we define the structure (§3.1.1) and semantics (§3.1.2) of LTPP's target language.

**3.1.1 Structure.** A program is a set of instructions, each labeled with a control location and a target control location. The space of all *control locations* is denoted  $\text{Locs}$ , with distinguished *initial* location and *final* location  $L_I, L_F \in \text{Locs}$ . The finite spaces of value variables and object variables are denoted  $\text{DVars}$  and  $\text{OVars}$ , respectively; their union is denoted  $\text{Vars} = \text{DVars} \cup \text{OVars}$ . The finite spaces of *data fields* and *object fields* are denoted  $\text{DFields}$  and  $\text{OFields}$ , respectively. All spaces are mutually disjoint. LTPP can be applied to programs in languages with infinite spaces of variables and fields, because it only must consider the finite sets of variables and fields that occur in a given program. We assume that the spaces of variables and fields themselves are finite in order to simplify the presentation of LTPP.

The space of *data* instructions is denoted  $\text{Instrs}_V$ , and includes standard operations of Boolean and linear integer arithmetic. Let  $p, q \in \text{OVars}$ ,  $x \in \text{DVars}$ ,  $f \in \text{DFields}$ , and  $g \in \text{OFields}$  be arbitrary elements.  $y := p \rightarrow f$  is a *data load* and  $p \rightarrow f := y$  is a *data store*;  $q := p \rightarrow g$  is an *object load* and  $p \rightarrow g := q$  is an *object store*. The spaces of all data loads, data stores, object loads, and object stores are denoted  $\text{Fields}_D$ ,  $\text{Stores}_D$ ,  $\text{Lds}_O$ , and  $\text{Stores}_O$ , respectively.  $p := \text{new}()$  is an *allocation*,  $x := \text{isNil}(p)$  is a *nil test*, and  $1 := p = q$  is an *object-equality test*; the space of all allocations, nil tests, and object-equality tests are denoted  $\text{Allocs}$ ,  $\text{NilTests}$ , and  $\text{ObjEqs}$ , respectively. The space of all instructions is denoted

$$\text{Instrs} = \text{Instrs}_V \cup \text{Fields}_D \cup \text{Stores}_D \cup \text{Lds}_O \cup \text{Stores}_O \cup \text{Allocs} \cup \text{NilTests} \cup \text{ObjEqs}$$

A pre-location, instruction, and branch-target location is a *labeled instruction*; i.e., the space of labeled instructions is denoted  $\text{LblInstrs} = \text{Locs} \times \text{Instrs} \times \text{Locs}$ . For each labeled instruction  $i \in \text{LblInstrs}$ , the pre-location, instruction, and post-location of  $i$  are denoted  $\text{PreLoc}[i]$ ,  $\text{Instr}[i]$ , and  $\text{BrTgt}[i]$ , respectively.

Instruction	Updated Components	Updated Value
$i \in \text{Instrs}_V$	$\sigma_D$	$\sigma'_D \in \text{Ctxs}_V, \sigma_D \xrightarrow{i} \sigma'_D$
$x := p \rightarrow f$	$\sigma_D$	$\sigma_D[ \quad x \mapsto H(\sigma_O(p), f) \quad ]$
$p \rightarrow f := x$	$H_D$	$H_D[ \quad (\sigma_O(p), f) \mapsto \sigma_D(x) \quad ]$
$q := p \rightarrow f$	$\sigma_O$	$\sigma_O[ \quad q \mapsto H_D(\sigma_D(p), f) \quad ]$
$p \rightarrow f := q$	$H_O$	$H_O[ \quad (\sigma_O(p), f) \mapsto \sigma_O(q) \quad ]$
$x := p = q$	$\sigma_D$	$\sigma_D[ \quad x \mapsto \sigma_O(p) = \sigma_O(q) \quad ]$
$x := \text{isNil}(p)$	$\sigma_D$	$\sigma_D[ \quad x \mapsto \sigma_O(p) = \text{nil} \quad ]$
$p := \text{new}()$	$\sigma_O$	$\sigma_O[ \quad p \mapsto o \notin \text{Dom}(H_O) = \text{Dom}(H_D) \quad ]$
	$H_D$	$H_D[\{o\} \times \text{DFields} \mapsto 0 \quad ]$
	$H_O$	$H_O[\{o\} \times \text{OFields} \mapsto \text{nil} \quad ]$

Table 1. Resulting post-state of instructions from, for  $\sigma_D \in \text{Ctxs}_V, \sigma_O \in \text{Ctxs}_O, H_D \in \text{Heaps}_D$ , and  $H_O \in \text{Heaps}_O$ , the pre-state  $((\sigma_D, \sigma_O), (H_D, H_O))$ . In each instruction,  $p, q \in \text{OVars}, x \in \text{DVars}, d \in \text{DFields}$ , and  $f \in \text{OFields}$ . In the entry for  $p := \text{new}()$ , for each map  $m$ ,  $\text{Dom}(m)$  denotes the *domain* of  $m$ .

A program is a set of labeled instructions. I.e., the space of programs is  $\text{Lang} = \mathcal{P}(\text{LblInstrs})$ , where for any set  $S$ ,  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  denotes the powerset of  $S$ . For each  $P \in \text{Lang}$  and all  $L, L' \in \text{Locs}$ , there may be at most one  $i \in \text{LblInstrs}$  such that  $\text{PreLoc}[i] = L$  and  $\text{BrTgt}[i] = L'$ . In such a case,  $i$  is denoted alternatively as  $\text{Instr}[P](L, L')$ .

**3.1.2 Semantics.** A run of a program  $P$  is a sequence of states generated by a sequence of labeled instructions in which adjacent instructions have matching target locations and pre-locations. The space of *data* is  $\text{Data} = \mathbb{B} \cup \mathbb{Z}$ , the space of *non-nullable objects* is a countably-infinite space  $\text{Objs}'$ , and the space of *objects* is  $\text{Objs} = \text{Objs}' \cup \{\text{nil}\}$ .

The space of *local data states* is  $\text{Ctxs}_V = \text{DVars} \rightarrow \text{Data}$ , the space of *local object states* is  $\text{Ctxs}_O = \text{OVars} \rightarrow \text{Objs}$ , and the space of *local states* is  $\text{Ctxs} = \text{Ctxs}_V \times \text{Ctxs}_O$ . The space of *data heaps* is  $\text{Heaps}_D = \text{Objs}' \times \text{DFields} \rightarrow \text{Data}$ , the space of *object heaps* is  $\text{Heaps}_O = \text{Objs}' \times \text{OFields} \rightarrow \text{Objs}$ , and the space of *heaps* is  $\text{Heaps} = \text{Heaps}_D \times \text{Heaps}_O$ . The space of states is  $\text{States} = \text{Ctxs} \times \text{Heaps}$ .

For each  $i \in \text{Instrs}_V$ , there is a transition relation  $\xrightarrow{i} \subseteq \text{Ctxs}_V \times \text{Ctxs}_V$ . The transition relation of a value instruction need not be total: thus, labeled instructions can implement control branches using instructions that act as **assume** instructions. The transition relation of instructions is defined based on their structure. The transition relation of each instruction, defined over an arbitrary pre-state, is given in Table 1.

For each labeled instruction  $i \in \text{LblInstrs}$ , the transition relation of  $i$  is the transition relation of the instruction of  $i$ ; i.e.,  $\xrightarrow{i} = \xrightarrow{\text{Instr}[i]}$ . A program state  $\sigma$  may not be the source of any entry in the transition relation if it binds an object variable  $p$  to  $\text{nil}$  and executes an instruction that attempts to load from or store to  $\text{nil}$ . For the remainder of this paper, we do not consider a stuck state to be an error state; programs can be transformed so that stuck states are error states in our formulation.

For each finite space  $N$ ,  $E \subseteq N \times N$  such that  $(N, E)$  is a sequential graph and each  $\lambda : N \rightarrow \text{Locs}$ ,  $(N, E, \lambda)$  is a *control path*. For each  $P \in \text{Lang}$ , if  $(N, E, \lambda)$  is such that for all path edges  $(n, n') \in E$ , there exists an instruction  $\text{Instr}[P](\lambda(n), \lambda(n'))$ , then  $(N, E, \lambda)$  is a control path of  $P$ . The space of control paths of  $P$  is denoted  $\text{Paths}[P]$ . For each  $p \in \text{Paths}[P]$ , the nodes of  $p$  are denoted  $\text{Nodes}[p]$ .

A run of a program  $P$  is a control path  $p$  of  $P$  and a map from each node of  $p$  to a state such that states associated with adjacent nodes satisfy the transition relation of a corresponding instruction of  $P$ .

**Definition 1.** For  $P \in \text{Lang}$ , finite space  $N$ ,  $E \subseteq N \times N$ , and  $\lambda : N \rightarrow \text{Locs}$  such that  $(N, E, \lambda) \in \text{Paths}[P]$ , let  $\sigma : N \rightarrow \text{States}$  be such that for all  $n, n' \in N$  with  $(n, n') \in E$ ,  $\sigma(n) \rightarrow_{\text{Instr}[P](\lambda(n), \lambda(n'))} \sigma(n')$ . Then for  $p = (N, E, \lambda)$ ,  $(p, \sigma)$  is a run of  $p$  in  $P$ .

For  $p \in \text{Paths}[P]$ , the runs of  $p$  in  $P$  are denoted  $\text{Runs}[p]$ . For  $r \in \text{Runs}[p]$ ,  $p$  is denoted alternatively as  $\text{DerPathr}$ . If  $\text{Runs}[p]$  is empty, then  $p$  is *infeasible*. The runs of  $P$  are the runs of all paths of  $P$ ; i.e., the runs of  $P$  are denoted  $\text{Runs}[P] = \bigcup_{p \in \text{Paths}[P]} \text{Runs}[p]$ . If  $\text{Runs}[P]$  is empty, then  $P$  is *safe*. The core problem addressed in this work is, given program  $P$ , to determine if  $P$  is safe.

## 3.2 Constraint solving and Constrained Horn Clauses

**3.2.1 Formal logic.** The quantifier-free fragment of the theory of the combinations of linear arithmetic and uninterpreted functions is denoted EUFLIA. For each space of logical variables  $X$ , the space of EUFLIA formulas over  $X$  is denoted  $\text{Forms}[X]$ . For each formula  $\varphi \in \text{Forms}[X]$ , the set of variables that occur in  $\varphi$  (i.e., the *vocabulary* of  $\varphi$ ) is denoted  $V(\varphi)$ . For formulas  $\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_n, \varphi \in \text{Forms}[X]$ , the fact that  $\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_n$  entail  $\varphi$  is denoted  $\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_n \models \varphi$ . The models of variables  $X$  are denoted  $\text{Models}[X]$ . The fact that a model  $m$  satisfies a formula  $\varphi$  is denoted  $m \models \varphi$ . LTTP uses a decision procedure for EUFLIA, named ISSAT. We assume that for each  $i \in \text{Instr}_V$ , LTTP may access some formula  $\text{SymRel}_V[i] \in \text{Forms}[\text{EUFLIA}]$ .

**3.2.2 Constrained Horn Clauses.** Constrained Horn Clauses are a class of logic-programming problems that formulate problems in program verification [9, 18, 22, 44].

*Structure.* A Constrained Horn Clause is a body, consisting of uninterpreted relational predicates applied to logical variables and a constraint, and a head application. Relational predicates are symbols associated with arities.

**Definition 2.** For each space of symbols  $\mathcal{R}$  and function  $a : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ ,  $(\mathcal{R}, a)$  is a space of relational predicates.

An application is a relational-predicate symbol paired with a sequence of logical variables of length matching its arity. To simplify the presentation, all objects defined in the remainder of the section are defined over a fixed space of predicate symbols  $\mathcal{R}$  in which each symbol has arity  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , and a fixed space of logical variables  $X$ .

**Definition 3.** For relational predicate  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  and sequence of variables  $Y \in X^*$  such that  $|Y| = k$ ,  $(R, Y)$  is an application of  $\mathcal{R}$  over  $X$ .

The space of applications of symbols in  $\mathcal{R}$  over  $X$  is denoted  $\text{Apps}[\mathcal{R}, X]$ . For each application  $A \in \text{Apps}[\mathcal{R}, X]$ , the predicate symbol and argument sequence of  $A$  are denoted  $\text{Rel}[A]$  and  $\text{Args}[A]$  respectively. A clause is a set of applications, a constraint over logical variables, and a head relational predicate.

**Definition 4.** For  $B \in \text{Apps}[\mathcal{R}, X]^*$ ,  $\varphi \in \text{Forms}[X]$ , and  $H \in \mathcal{R}$ ,  $(B, \varphi, H)$  is a Constrained Horn Clause.

The space of Constrained Horn Clauses over  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $X$  is denoted  $\text{CHC}_{\mathcal{R}, X}$ . For each  $C \in \text{CHC}_{\mathcal{R}, X}$ , the body of applications, constraint, and head of  $C$  are denoted  $\text{Apps}[C]$ ,  $\text{Ctr}[C]$ , and  $\text{Head}[C]$ , respectively. A set of Constrained Horn Clauses and a query relational-predicate symbol is a *system* of Constrained Horn Clauses; i.e., the space of systems of Constrained Horn Clauses is denoted  $\text{CHCs}_{\mathcal{R}, X} = \mathcal{P}(\text{CHC}_{\mathcal{R}, X}) \times \mathcal{R}$ .

*Models.* A *model* of  $\mathcal{S}$  is a collection of logical models that certify that  $\mathcal{S}$  does not have a solution. A derivation of a CHC system  $\mathcal{S}$  is a tree  $D$  labeled with relational predicates of  $\mathcal{S}$  such that all children with a common parent  $p$  are labeled with relational symbols of applications in the body of a common clause of  $\mathcal{S}$  with  $p$  as its head. For  $C \subseteq \text{CHC}_{\mathcal{R}, X}$ , let each relational predicate that is not the head of any clause of  $C$  be a *ground* relational predicate of  $C$ .

**Definition 5.** For  $C \subseteq \text{CHC}_{\mathcal{R}, X}$  and  $Q \in \mathcal{R}$ ,  $E \subseteq N^* \times N \times C$ , and  $\lambda_E : E \rightarrow C$  be such that  $(N, E)$  is an directed hypertree and there is some labeling function  $\lambda_N : N \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  such that: **(1)** for  $r \in N$  the root of  $(N, E)$ ,  $\lambda_N(r) = Q$ ; **(2)** for each  $n \in N$  a leaf of  $(N, E)$ ,  $\lambda_N(n)$  is a ground relational predicate of  $C$ ; **(3)** for all  $n_0, \dots, n_k, n \in N$  with  $e = ([n_0, \dots, n_k], n) \in E$ , it holds that **(a)**  $\lambda_N(n) = \text{Head}[\lambda_E(e)]$  and **(b)** for each  $0 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $\lambda_N(n_i) = \text{Rel}[\text{Apps}[C]_i]$ . Then  $(N, E, \lambda_E)$  is a derivation of  $(C, Q)$ .

For  $\mathcal{S} \in \text{CHCs}_{\mathcal{R}, X}$ , the space of derivations of  $\mathcal{S}$  is denoted  $\text{Ders}(\mathcal{S})$ . For each  $D \in \text{Ders}(\mathcal{S})$ , the nodes and hyperedges of  $D$  are denoted  $\text{Nodes}[D]$  and  $\text{HypEdges}(D)$ .

A model of a CHC system  $\mathcal{S}$  is a derivation  $D$  of  $\mathcal{S}$  and a model indexed on nodes of  $D$  that satisfies the clauses that label the edges of  $D$ .

**Definition 6.** For  $\mathcal{S} \in \text{CHCs}_{\mathcal{R}, X}$ , finite space  $N$ ,  $E \subseteq N^* \times N$ ,  $\lambda_E : E \rightarrow \text{Clauses}[\mathcal{S}]$  such that  $(N, E, \lambda_E) \in \text{Ders}(\mathcal{S})$ , let  $m$  be an EUFLIA model and let  $i : N \rightarrow \text{Models}[X]$  be such that for all  $n, n_0, \dots, n_k \in N$  and each  $C \in \text{Clauses}[\mathcal{S}]$  with  $e = ([n_0, \dots, n_k], n) \in E$ , it holds that for  $C = \lambda_E(e)$ , **(1)**  $m, i(n) \vdash \text{Ctr}[C]$ ; **(2)** for each  $0 \leq j \leq k$ ,  $i(m)(\text{Args}[\text{Apps}[C]_j]) = i(n_j)(\text{Params})$ . Then  $(D, m, i)$  is a model of  $\mathcal{S}$ .

We denote the models of  $\mathcal{S}$  as  $\text{Models}[\mathcal{S}]$ . For each  $D \in \text{Ders}(\mathcal{S})$ , if there is some EUFLIA model  $m$  and  $i : \text{Nodes}[D] \rightarrow \text{Models}[X]$  such that  $(D, m, i)$  is a model of  $\mathcal{S}$ , then  $D$  is *feasible*; otherwise,  $D$  is *infeasible*. If some derivation of  $\mathcal{S}$  is feasible, then  $\mathcal{S}$  is feasible (otherwise,  $\mathcal{S}$  is infeasible).

A CHC *solver* is a procedure that, given CHC system  $\mathcal{S}$ , returns either the value `Infeas` to denote that  $\mathcal{S}$  is infeasible, or a model of  $\mathcal{S}$ ; several CHC solvers have been proposed in previous work [9, 44]. LTTP uses a CHC solver, named `SOLVECHC`, as a black box.

*Solutions.* A solution of a clause  $C$  is an interpretation of relational predicates such that the conjunction of interpretations of all relational predicates in the body of  $C$  and the constraint of  $C$  entail the interpretation of the head of  $C$ . A solution of a CHC system  $\mathcal{S}$  is a solution of each clause in  $\mathcal{S}$  that interprets the query relational predicate of  $\mathcal{S}$  as an unsatisfiable formula.

**Definition 7.** For  $C \subseteq \text{CHC}_{\mathcal{R}, X}$  and  $Q \in \mathcal{R}$ , let  $i : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \text{Forms}[\text{Params}]$  be such that under each EUFLIA model, **(1)** for each  $B \in \text{Apps}[\mathcal{R}, X]^*$ ,  $H \in \mathcal{R}$ , and  $\varphi \in \text{Forms}[X]$  such that  $(B, H, C) \in C$ ,

$$\{i(\text{Rel}[A])[\text{Vars}[A]]\}_{A \in B}, \varphi \models i(H)$$

**(2)**  $i(Q) \models \text{False}$ . Then  $i$  is a solution of  $(C, Q)$ .

When a CHC solver determines that a given system is empty, the solver can synthesize a solution that certifies emptiness. If LTTP runs `SOLVECHC` on a system  $\mathcal{S}$  and `SOLVECHC` determines that  $\mathcal{S}$  is empty, then LTTP does not require `SOLVECHC` to provide the generated solution. However, LTTP could be adapted to generate the CHC system that it synthesizes, accompanied by its solution found by `SOLVECHC`, as a proof of safety that can be independently certified.

## 4 PROOFS AS RUN GRAMMARS

In this section and §5, we present LTP in technical detail. In this section, we give a class of proofs of program safety as grammars of program runs annotated with invariants.

LTP, given program  $P$ , attempts to determine whether or not  $P$  is safe by synthesizing a CHC system  $S$  such that (1) each run of  $P$  corresponds to a model of  $S$  and (2)  $S$  has no models. LTP attempts to certify that  $S$  has no models by synthesizing a solution of  $S$  in the theory  $\mathcal{T}_{D, \text{Uif}}$ . Let  $P$  be a fixed, arbitrary program for the remainder of the section.

Let the theory  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Lang}}$  be  $\mathcal{T}_{D, \text{Uif}}$  restricted to contain the following uninterpreted function symbols. The nullary symbols of  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Lang}}$  contain, for each  $L \in \text{Locs}$ , the symbol  $L$ . The unary symbols of  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Lang}}$  contain symbols  $\text{Loc}$  and  $\text{Succ}$ ; for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \text{DVars}$ , the symbol  $\mathbf{x}$ ; for each  $\mathbf{p} \in \text{OVars}$ , the symbol  $\mathbf{p}$ . The binary symbols of  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Lang}}$  contain for each  $\mathbf{f} \in \text{DFields}$ , the symbol  $\mathbf{f}$ ; for each  $\mathbf{g} \in \text{OFields}$ , the symbol  $\mathbf{g}$ .

If for each  $m \in \text{Models}[S]$  with domain  $N$ , the graph  $(N, >_m, \text{Loc}_m)$  is a control path of  $P$ , then  $S$  is a *run grammar* of  $P$ . The space of run grammars of  $P$  is denoted  $\text{CHCs}_{\text{Lang}}P$ . Let  $S \in \text{CHCs}_{\text{Lang}}P$  be a fixed, arbitrary element for the remainder of the section.

LTP uses a procedure  $\text{DerPath}$  that, given  $m \in \text{Models}[S]$ , returns the control path of the run of  $m$ .  $\text{DerPath}$  is implemented by returning the interpretations of symbols  $\text{Loc}$  and  $\text{Succ}$  in  $m$ .

Each run  $r$  defines a map for each data and object field  $\mathbf{f}$ , from each control point  $p$  of  $r$  and object  $o$  allocated while executing  $r$  to the control point in  $r$  at which the  $\mathbf{f}$  field of  $o$  was last updated when  $r$  reached  $p$ . In particular, let  $N$  be a finite space,  $L : N \rightarrow \text{Locs}$ ;  $> : N \rightarrow N$ ;  $\sigma : N \rightarrow \text{States}$  be such that  $((N, >, \text{Loc}), \sigma) \in \text{Runs}[P]$ . For each  $\mathbf{x} \in \text{DVars}$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_r : N \rightarrow \text{Vals}$  is such that for each  $n \in N$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_r(n) = \sigma(n)(\mathbf{x})$ , and for each  $\mathbf{p} \in \text{OVars}$ ,  $\mathbf{p}_r : N \rightarrow \text{Objs}$  is defined similarly. For each  $\mathbf{f} \in \text{DFields}$ , let  $ccf_r : N \times \text{Objs} \rightarrow N$  be such that for all  $n_i, n_j \in N$  and  $o \in \text{Objs}$ , if  $n_i$  is the last node before  $n_j$  such that  $\text{Instr}[P](\text{Loc}(n_{i-1}), n_i) \equiv \mathbf{p} \rightarrow \mathbf{f} := \mathbf{x}$  and  $\sigma(n_i)_O(\mathbf{x}) = o$ , then  $\mathbf{f}_r(n_j, o) = n_i$ . For each  $\mathbf{g} \in \text{OFields}$ , let  $\mathbf{g}_r : N \times \text{Objs} \rightarrow N$  be defined similarly. Both collections of symbols are called *update histories*.

For  $S \in \text{CHCs}_{\text{Lang}}P$ , let domain  $N$  combined with  $L, >, \{\mathbf{x}_r \mid \mathbf{x} \in \text{DVars}\}, \{\mathbf{p}_r \mid \mathbf{p} \in \text{OVars}\}, \{\mathbf{f}_r \mid \mathbf{f} \in \text{DFields}\}, \{\mathbf{g}_r \mid \mathbf{g} \in \text{OFields}\}$  as interpretations of  $\text{Loc}, \text{Succ}, \text{DVars}, \text{OVars}, \text{DFields},$  and  $\text{OFields}$  be the model of  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Lang}}$  denoted  $m_r$ . If  $m_r$  is a model of  $S$ , then  $r$  is a *run* of  $S$ . If each run of  $P$  is a run of  $S$ , then  $P$  is *simulated* by  $S$ .

For  $\mathbf{p} \in \text{Paths}[P]$ , if for each  $r \in \text{Runs}[\mathbf{p}]$ ,  $m_r$  is not a model of  $S$ , then  $\mathbf{p}$  is *refuted* by  $S$ . For  $Q \subseteq \text{Paths}[P]$ , if for each  $\mathbf{p} \in Q$ , it holds that  $\mathbf{p}$  is refuted by  $S$ , then  $Q$  are refuted by  $S$ . If  $\text{Paths}[P]$  are refuted by  $S$ , then  $P$  is refuted by  $S$ .

If a program is simulated and refuted by a CHC system, then the program is safe.

**Lemma 1.** *If  $P$  is simulated by  $S$  and  $P$  is refuted by  $S$ , then  $P$  is safe (§3.1.2).*

If  $P$  is simulated by a run grammar  $S$ , then a solution of  $S$  (which certifies that  $S$  is infeasible and thus refutes  $P$ ), can be viewed as *relational invariants* that prove the safety of  $P$ .

**Example 1.** *Recall  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{BI}}$ , the grammar partially depicted in §2.2.1, Figure 3. If we encode the runs of  $\text{buildInspect}$  using the structure of  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{BI}}$ , we could simulate every run, and showing the emptiness of that grammar could show the safety of  $\text{buildInspect}$ .*

However, a safe program  $P$  may be simulated by a CHC system that does not refute it.

**Example 2.** *Recall  $\mathcal{G}'_{\text{BI}}$ , the simplistic grammar proposed in Figure 4. If we try to encode  $P$  using this structure, we are compelled to overapproximate by dropping state information because an unbounded separation arises between a load and*

**Input** :  $P \in \text{Lang}$ .  
**Output**: Decision as to whether  $P$  is safe.

```

1 Procedure  $L\text{TTP}(P)$ 
2   Procedure  $L\text{TTP}'(F)$ 
3      $\mathcal{G} := \text{SYNGRAMMAR}(P, F)$ ;
4     switch  $\text{SOLVECHC}(\mathcal{G})$  do
5       case Infeas: do
6         return True
7       case  $D \in \text{Ders}(\mathcal{G})$ : do
8          $p := \text{DerPath}(D)$ ;
9         if  $\text{ISFEAS}(p)$  then
10        return False;
11        else
12        return  $L\text{TTP}'(p \cup \{F\})$ ;
13        end
14      end
15    end
16  return  $L\text{TTP}'(\emptyset)$ 

```

**Algorithm 1:**  $L\text{TTP}$ : a safety verifier based on inductive synthesis.  $L\text{TTP}$  uses procedures  $\text{SYNGRAMMAR}$  (§5.2, §5.3),  $\text{SOLVECHC}$  (§3.2.2),  $\text{DerPath}$  (§4), and  $\text{ISFEAS}$  (§5.1.1).

**Input** :  $P \in \text{Lang}$  and  $p \in \text{Paths}[P]$ .  
**Output**: A minimal refuting neighborhood  
 $v : \text{Nodes}[p] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{Nodes}[p])$  for  $p$ .

```

1 Procedure  $\text{DEPS}(P, p)$ 
2    $v := v_{\text{All}}$ ;
3   for  $n, n' \in \text{Nodes}[p]$  do
4      $v' := v[n \mapsto v(n) \setminus \{n'\}]$ ;
5     if  $\neg \text{ISSAT}(\text{SymPath}(P, p, v'))$  then  $v := v'$ ;
6   end
7   return  $v$ 

```

**Algorithm 2:**  $\text{DEPS}$ : given  $P \in \text{Lang}$  and infeasible  $p \in \text{Paths}[P]$ , returns a minimal refuting neighborhood for  $p$ . The map  $v_{\text{All}}$  and the formula  $\text{SymPath}$  are defined in §5.1.1.

its matching store. Every runs of  $\text{buildInspect}$  is present in  $\mathcal{G}'_{\text{BI}}$ , but there are additional models not corresponding to actual runs. This non-empty grammar simulates  $\text{buildInspect}$ , even though  $\text{buildInspect}$  is safe.

## 5 INDUCTIVE SYNTHESIS OF PROOFS USING $L\text{TTP}$

In this section, we describe  $L\text{TTP}$ , a verifier that attempts to prove the safety of a given program by inductively synthesizing a run grammar as proof.

Alg. 1 contains pseudocode for  $L\text{TTP}$ .  $L\text{TTP}$  defines a procedure  $L\text{TTP}'$  which, given infeasible paths  $F \subseteq \text{Paths}[P]$ , attempts to determine if  $P$  is safe by synthesizing a run grammar that overapproximates the runs of  $P$  and refutes  $F$  (line 2—line 15).  $L\text{TTP}$  invokes  $L\text{TTP}'$  on the empty set of control paths and returns the result (line 16).

$L\text{TTP}'$ , given  $F$ , synthesizes a run grammar  $\mathcal{G}$  that simulates  $P$  and refutes  $F$  by a procedure  $\text{SYNGRAMMAR}$  on  $P$  and  $F$  (line 3). An implementation of  $\text{SYNGRAMMAR}$  that performs a reduction to constraint solving is described in §5.3.  $L\text{TTP}'$  then determines if  $\mathcal{G}$  refutes  $P$  by running the CHC solver  $\text{SOLVECHC}$  (described in §3.2.2) on  $\mathcal{G}$  to determine if  $\mathcal{G}$  is infeasible. If  $\text{SOLVECHC}$  determines that  $\mathcal{G}$  is infeasible (line 5), then  $L\text{TTP}'$  returns that  $P$  is safe.

Otherwise,  $\text{SOLVECHC}$  returns a feasible derivation  $D$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  (line 7).  $L\text{TTP}'$  extracts from  $D$  some  $p \in \text{Paths}[P]$  not refuted by  $\mathcal{G}$  (line 8).  $L\text{TTP}'$  then tests if  $p$  is feasible by running a procedure  $\text{ISFEAS}$  on  $p$  (line 9); if  $\text{ISFEAS}$  determines that  $p$  is feasible, then  $L\text{TTP}'$  returns that  $P$  is not safe.

Otherwise, if  $\text{ISFEAS}$  returns that  $p$  is feasible, then  $L\text{TTP}'$  recurses on  $F$  extended with  $p$ , and returns the result of the recursion (line 12).

We now describe the implementation of each procedure used by  $L\text{TTP}$ . In §5.1, we describe an implementation of  $\text{ISFEAS}$ . In §5.2 and §5.3, we describe the two steps performed by  $\text{SYNGRAMMAR}$ .

## 5.1 Testing path feasibility using IsFEAS

The procedure IsFEAS, given  $P \in \text{Lang}$  and  $p \in \text{Paths}[P]$ , returns whether or not  $p$  is a feasible path of  $P$ . Let finite space  $N$ ,  $E \subseteq N \times N$ , and  $\lambda : N \rightarrow \text{Locs}$ , be such that  $p = (N, E, \lambda)$ . IsFEAS generates a constraint  $\varphi \in \text{Forms}[\overline{\mathcal{T}}\text{Lang}]$  for which each model corresponds to run of  $p$ .

*5.1.1 Symbolic constraints over update histories.*  $\varphi$  is constructed as a conjunction of clauses, each of which models the effect of an instruction executed in a step of  $p$  on its local variables and update histories. The effect of each  $i \in P$  executed in a step of  $p$  is formulated by a constraint  $\text{SymRel}[i]$  parameterized on  $N$ , along with distinguished  $n, n' \in N$  that model state before executing  $i$  and state that immediately results from executing  $i$ .

$\text{SymRel}[i](n, n', N)$  is defined casewise by the structure of  $i$ . In many cases,  $\text{SymRel}[i]$  is defined using formulas that constrain equality of logical terms that model state. In particular, let  $\text{EqDVars}[n, n']$ ,  $\text{EqOVars}[n, n']$ ,  $\text{EqDFields}[n, n', N]$ , and  $\text{EqOFields}[n, n', N]$  constrain that the states at  $q$  and  $n'$  have equal local value states, local object states, data timestamps, and object timestamps, respectively. I.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{EqDVars}[n, n'] &\equiv \bigwedge_{x \in \text{DVars}} x(n) = x(n') \\ \text{EqDFields}[n, n', N] &\equiv \bigwedge_{\substack{f \in \text{DFields} \\ p \in \text{OVars} \\ n'' \in N}} f(n, p(n'')) = f(n', p(n'')) \end{aligned}$$

$\text{EqOVars}[n, n']$  and  $\text{EqOFields}[n, n', N]$  are defined similarly.

If  $i \in \text{Instrs}_V$ , then  $\text{SymRel}[i]$  constrains that the value local state at  $n$  and the value local state at  $n'$  are in the transition relation of  $i$ , and that their object stores are identical. I.e.,  $\text{SymRel}[i](n, n', N)$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SymRel}_V[i][\text{DVars}(n), \text{DVars}(n')] \wedge \text{EqOVars}[n, n'] \wedge \\ \text{EqDFields}[n, n', N] \wedge \text{EqOFields}[n, n', N] \end{aligned}$$

For each  $i \in \text{NilTests}$  or  $i \in \text{ObjEqs}$ , the constraint  $\text{SymRel}[i]$  is defined similarly.

For  $x \in \text{Vars}_V$ ,  $p \in \text{OVars}$ , and  $f \in \text{DFields}$ ,  $\text{SymRel}[p \rightarrow f := x](n, n', N)$  constrains that at  $n'$ , the most recent store to the  $f$  field of the object bound to  $p$  is  $n'$ . The local states and update history of all other fields are identical between  $n$  and  $n'$ . I.e.,  $\text{SymRel}[p \rightarrow f := x](n, n', N)$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{EqDVars}[n, n'] \wedge \text{EqOVars}[n, n'] \wedge f(n', p(n')) = n' \wedge \bigwedge_{\substack{p \in \text{OVars} \\ n'' \in N}} f(n', p(n'')) = f(n, p(n'')) \wedge \\ \bigwedge_{\substack{g \neq f \in \text{DFields} \\ p \in \text{OVars} \\ n'' \in N}} g(n', p(n'')) = g(n, p(n'')) \wedge \text{EqOFields}[n, n', N] \end{aligned}$$

For each  $i \in \text{Stores}_O$ , the constraint  $\text{SymRel}[i]$  is defined similarly.

**Example 3.** *buildInspect* contains an object store on line 7. The relation which models this instruction constrains the local state after the instruction such that the most recent store for the next field of the object tail is set to tmp.

For each  $x \in \text{DVars}$ ,  $p \in \text{OVars}$  and  $f \in \text{DFields}$ ,  $\text{SymRel}[x := p \rightarrow f](n, n', N)$  inspects all states bound to variables in  $Q$  to determine if some  $n'' \in N$  is the point of the most recent store to  $f$ . If so, the value in  $x$  at  $n'$  is constrained to be

the value stored when stepping to  $n'$ ; otherwise, the value bound to  $\mathbf{x}$  at  $n'$  is unconstrained. Let  $\text{DStoreLocp} \subseteq \text{Locs}$  be control locations that are sources of data stores in  $\text{P}$ , and let  $\text{Stored}[\text{P}] : \text{DStoreLocp} \rightarrow \text{DVars}$  map each such control location to the data variable that holds that value stored by the instruction. Then  $\text{SymRel}[\mathbf{x} := \text{p} \rightarrow \mathbf{f}](n, n', N)$  is

$$\bigwedge_{n'' \in N, \lambda(n'') \in \text{DStoreLocp}} \mathbf{f}(q, \text{p}(q)) = n'' \implies \mathbf{x}(q') = \text{Stored}[\text{P}](n'') \wedge \bigwedge_{\mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{x} \in \text{DVars}} \mathbf{y}(n') = \mathbf{y}(n) \wedge \text{EqOVars}[n, n'] \wedge \text{EqDFields}[n, n', N] \wedge \text{EqOFields}[n, n', N]$$

For each  $\mathbf{i} \in \text{Lds}_O$ , the constraint  $\text{SymRel}[\mathbf{i}]$  is defined similarly.

**Example 4.** *buildInspect* contains an object load on line 11. The relation which models this instruction constrains the local state after the instruction such that the variable `elt` is set to the most recent store for the next field of the object `elt`.

For  $\mathbf{x} \in \text{OVars}$ ,  $\text{SymRel}[\mathbf{x} := \text{new}(\text{C})](n, n', N)$  constrains that the identity of the allocated object is  $n'$ ; the fields of the allocated object are initialized at  $n'$ .

$$\text{EqDVars}[n, n'] \wedge \mathbf{x}(n') = n' \wedge \bigwedge_{\mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{x} \in \text{OVars}} \mathbf{y}(n') = \mathbf{y}(n) \wedge \text{Stored}(n') = 0 \wedge \bigwedge_{\mathbf{f} \in \text{DFields} \cup \text{OFields}} \mathbf{f}(n', \mathbf{x}(n')) = n' \wedge \bigwedge_{\mathbf{f} \in \text{DFields} \cup \text{OFields}} \mathbf{f}(n', \mathbf{y}(n')) = \mathbf{f}(n, \mathbf{y}(n))$$

For a path  $p = (N, \lambda, E) \in \text{Paths}[\text{P}]$ , define the constraint  $\text{SymPath}(\text{P}, p, \nu) \in \text{Forms}[\mathcal{T}_{\text{Lang}}]$ , where  $\nu : N \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(N)$ , as follows:

$$\bigwedge_{(n, n') \in E} \text{SymRel}[\text{Instr}[\text{P}](\lambda(n), \lambda(n'))](n, n', \nu(n'))$$

Let  $\nu_{\text{All}} : N \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(N)$  be such that for each  $n \in N$ ,  $\nu_{\text{All}}(n) = N$ . `ISFEAS` generates the constraint  $\varphi = \text{SymPath}(\text{P}, p, \nu_{\text{All}})$ . `ISFEAS` returns that  $\text{p}$  is a feasible path of  $\text{P}$  if and only if `ISSAT` (see §3.2.2) decides that  $\varphi$  is satisfiable.

`ISFEAS` is a sound and complete procedure for testing path feasibility.

**Lemma 2.** *If  $p$  is a feasible path of  $\text{P}$ , then  $\text{ISFEAS}(\text{P}, p) = \text{True}$ . Otherwise,  $\text{ISFEAS}(\text{P}, p) = \text{False}$ .*

`ISFEAS` could be implemented alternatively by reduction to satisfiability testing in alternative theories that can soundly and completely model the feasibility of bounded paths, such as combinations of the theory of arrays. We have presented `ISFEAS` as using `ISSAT` in order to introduce the symbolic relations on update histories for each instruction, which `LTP` also uses in queries in order to synthesize run grammar skeletons (§5.2), and as components of run grammars (§5.3).

## 5.2 Synthesizing a run-grammar skeleton using constraint solving

In this section and in §5.3, we describe an implementation of `SYNGRAMMAR`, which given  $\text{P} \in \text{Lang}$  and  $\text{F} \subseteq \text{Paths}[\text{P}]$ , synthesizes a run grammar  $\mathcal{G}$  that simulates  $\text{P}$  and refutes  $\text{F}$ . `SYNGRAMMAR` synthesizes such a run grammar by performing two steps, described in this section and §5.3. In the first step, `SYNGRAMMAR` finds the relations of  $\mathcal{G}$  and the sets of variables in each clause body to which relational predicates are applied. We refer to such an object as a CHC system *skeleton*. `SYNGRAMMAR` finds a skeleton by reduction to constraint solving.

`SYNGRAMMAR` obtains a clause skeleton for  $\text{P}$  and  $\text{F}$  by running a procedure `SYNSKELETON` on  $\text{P}$  and  $\text{F}$ . The implementation of `SYNSKELETON` that we present always makes progress, in the sense that for each  $\text{P}$  and  $\text{F}$ , it synthesizes a

well-formed skeleton for  $P$  and  $F$ . However, the implementation is not complete, in that there are some safe programs whose required skeletons are not expressible in this particular constraint-based approach to SYNSKELETON. We have found that the present implementation is sufficiently expressive for LTP to be able to prove correctness of interesting verification challenge problems (discussed in §6). We leave the design of alternative, more expressive, or more efficient implementations of SYNSKELETON for future work.

*5.2.1 Run-grammar skeletons.* In its first step, SYNGRAMMAR synthesizes a run-grammar *skeleton*, which defines the control paths generated by run grammar constructed from completing it. We define a restricted implementation of SYNGRAMMAR that only generates run grammars in which each non-terminal derives exactly two control subpaths of  $P$ . In particular, let  $R_{\text{Skel}}$  be a set of relational predicates of fixed, common arity  $n$ . Let  $Q$  be a space of variable symbols, and let  $Q' \in Q^*$  be fixed sequence of  $n$  distinct variables in  $Q$ . For  $R \in R_{\text{Skel}}$ ,  $A \in \text{Apps}[R_{\text{Skel}}, Q]$ ,  $L : Q \rightarrow \text{Locs}$ ,  $q, q' \in Q$ ,  $C = (R, A, L, q, q')$  is a *clause skeleton*. The space of clause skeletons is denoted  $\text{ClauseSkels}$ . A set of clause skeletons combined with four maps from  $R_{\text{Skel}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_n$  is a run-grammar skeleton. For the remainder of this section, let  $R, A, L, q, q'$ , and  $S \subseteq \text{ClauseSkels}$  and  $F = \text{Pre}_0, \text{Post}_0, \text{Pre}_1, \text{Post}_1 : R_{\text{Skel}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_n$  be a fixed, arbitrary elements.

*Synthesizing a skeleton that simulates a given program.*  $(S, F)$  simulate  $P$  if when each clause in  $S$  is extended with a suitable constraint to form a clause, the resulting run grammar generates all control paths of  $P$ . In particular, for  $\varphi \in \text{Forms}[\mathcal{T}_{\text{Lang}}]$ , let  $((A, \varphi), R)$  be the *completion* of  $C$ . Let  $S' \in \text{CHCs}_{\text{Lang}}$  such that each clause in  $S'$  is a completion of a clause  $(R, A, L, q, q')$  with a constraint  $\bigwedge_{q \in Q} \text{Loc}(q) = L(q) \wedge q' = \text{Succ}(q)$  be the *control-path grammar* of  $S$ . If for each  $\mathcal{R}' \in R_{\text{Skel}}$  and each model  $m$  of  $\mathcal{R}'$ , there is a control path from  $m(\text{Pre}_0(\mathcal{R}'))$  to  $m(\text{Post}_0(\mathcal{R}'))$  and a control path from  $m(\text{Pre}_1(\mathcal{R}'))$  to  $m(\text{Post}_1(\mathcal{R}'))$ , then  $(S, F)$  is *well-formed*. If  $S'$  simulates  $p$ , then  $S$  simulates  $P$ . If all  $r, r' \in \text{Runs}[S']$  that have the same control path have the same derivation in  $S'$ , then  $S$  is *unambiguous*.

SYNSKELETON synthesizes a well-formed, unambiguous control-path grammar that simulates  $P$  by reduction to constraint solving. In particular, LTP generates an EUFLIA constraint  $\varphi_P$  such that each *model* of  $\varphi_P$  defines a set of *clause skeletons* that simulate  $P$ . For each clause skeleton  $C$ , the problem of choosing a relational predicate to apply in the body of  $C$ , the set of variables to which it is applied, the map from variables to locations, and instruction source and destination variables can be encoded directly as an EUFLIA constraint.

*Synthesizing a skeleton that refutes control paths.*  $C$  refutes  $F$  if for each  $p \in F$ , the derivations of the control extension of  $C$  simultaneously derive sufficient sets of matching loads and stores in  $p$  that a suitable extension of  $C$  (described in §5.3) refutes  $p$ . Such sufficient sets are formulated precisely as a minimal refuting neighborhood of  $p$ .

For  $p \in F$  with  $N = \text{Nodes}[p]$  and  $v : N \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(N)$  such that  $\text{SymPath}[P, p, v]$  is unsatisfiable,  $v$  is a *refuting neighborhood* of  $p$ . For all  $v, v' : N \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(N)$ , if for all  $n \in N$ ,  $v'(n) \subseteq v(n)$ , then  $v'$  is *contained* by  $v$ ; if, in addition,  $v$  is not contained by  $v'$ , then  $v'$  is *strictly contained* by  $v$ . If for each  $v' : N \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(N)$  that is strictly contained by  $v$ , it holds that  $v'$  is not refuting neighborhood of  $p$ , then  $v$  is a *minimal refuting neighborhood* of  $p$ .

DEPS (Alg. 2), given  $P$  and an infeasible  $p \in \text{Paths}[P]$ , returns a minimal refuting neighborhood of  $p$ . DEPS maintains a refuting neighborhood of  $p$ , from which it iteratively minimizes entries until it obtains a minimal refuting neighborhood. DEPS constructs  $v_{\text{All}}$  as an initial refuting neighborhood (line 2). For all  $n, n' \in N$ , it determines if the map  $v'$  obtained by removing  $n'$  from the image of  $n$  in its maintained refuting neighborhood  $v$  (line 4) is a refuting neighborhood. To determine this fact, DEPS runs ISAT on  $\text{SymPath}[P, p, v']$  (line 5). If  $v'$  is a refuting neighborhood, then DEPS updates its maintained refuting neighborhood to be  $v'$  (line 5).

For each  $p \in F$  with  $N = \text{Nodes}[p]$ , SYN SKELETON synthesizes a minimal refuting neighborhood of  $p$ , named  $v_p : N \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(N)$  by running DEPS on  $P$  and  $p$ . SYN SKELETON then constructs a constraint  $\varphi_p$  in which each solution defines (1) a set of clause skeletons, over the vocabulary interpreted as a clause skeleton in each solution of  $\varphi_p$ , and (2) a derivation  $D$  of  $p$  in which for each  $n \in N$  and each  $n' \in v_p(n)$ ,  $n$  and  $n'$  are derived in a common instance of a clause in  $D$ .

**Example 5.** Recall once again  $\mathcal{G}'_{BI}$ , the simplistic grammar of Figure 4. As a skeleton,  $\mathcal{G}'_{BI}$  fails to refute even a short infeasible path of *buildInspect*. For example, if a path performs a store and a load (the transitions from line 7 to 8 and from line 11 to 10), a refuting neighborhood must put the state at line 10 into the neighborhood of the state at line 8 or vice versa. One way to do this is to modify  $\mathcal{G}'_{BI}$  to include a special case rule for this path. A better way is to construct the grammar  $\mathcal{G}_{BI}$  from Figure 3, which refutes much large set of infeasible paths. In fact, this skeleton refutes all paths in *buildInspect*.

We have described a particular implementation of SYN SKELETON that we have implemented in the current version of LTP. The current of implementation of SYN SKELETON is restricted, in that it only synthesizes skeletons of run grammars that are linear and unambiguous. SYN SKELETON finds such skeletons by reduction to constraint solving. The key motivation for adopting such limitations was that a relatively simple but useful version of SYN SKELETON could be designed by reusing existing, heavily-optimized algorithms implemented in constraint solvers. However, LTP only requires that an implementation of SYN SKELETON, given program  $P$  and infeasible paths  $F$ , synthesize a skeleton encodes all paths of  $P$ , including refuting neighborhoods for the paths in  $F$ . Alternative, explicit implementations of SYN SKELETON may yield significant benefits over the current version based on constraint solving.

### 5.3 Synthesizing a run grammar from a skeleton

In its second step, SYN GRAMMAR completes  $C \subseteq \text{Skels}$ , a set of clause skeletons that simulates  $P$  and a refutes  $F$  synthesized by SYN SKELETON, to generate a run grammar  $\mathcal{G} \in \text{CHCs}_{\text{Lang}}$  that simulates  $P$  and refutes  $F$ . Let  $R \in R_{\text{Skel}}$ ,  $L : Q \rightarrow \text{Locs}$ ,  $q, q' \in Q$  be such that  $(R, L, q, q') \in \text{Skels}$ . From  $(R, A, L, q, q')$ , SYN GRAMMAR generates  $\varphi \in \text{Forms}[\mathcal{T}_{\text{Lang}}]$ , and includes in  $\mathcal{G}$  the clause  $C = (A, \varphi, R)$ .

$\varphi$  is a conjunction of constraints that model the effect of  $i$ , and effects of allocations and stores performed in steps of execution other than  $i$  (§5.3.1). The first conjunct  $\varphi_0$  constrains that each instance of  $q'$  is a control success of each instance of  $q$ ; i.e.,  $\varphi_0 \equiv q' = \text{Succ}(q)$ . The second conjunct  $\varphi_1$  constrains that for path points  $n$  and  $n'$  bound to  $q$  and  $q'$  at an instance of  $C'$ , the state at  $n'$  is the result of transitioning from the state at  $n$ , under the instruction that connects  $n$  and  $n'$ . I.e.,  $\varphi_1 \equiv \text{SymRel}[\text{Instr}[P](L(n), L(n'))](q, q', Q)$ .

The third conjunct  $\varphi_2$  models the effect of all instructions that connect points derived by other clause instances on the objects in scope when the step of  $C$  executes. The construction of the constraint is described in detail below.

*5.3.1 Formulating the effect of instructions derived outside of a clause instance.* The space of valid runs with update histories is partially constrained by the symbolic relations for each instruction, defined in §5.1.1. For each  $i \in \text{Instrs}$ ,  $\text{SymRel}[i]$  models the effect of executing  $i$  on a finite set of states. When  $\text{SymRel}[i]$  is used to determine feasibility of an entire path, in which case the set consists of all states in the path. When  $\text{SymRel}[i]$  is used as a conjunct of a clause constraint, the set of states consists of all states that are derived in the same instance of a clause  $C$  that derives the states connected by  $i$ . However, it does not include the set of all states in the derived path, namely states that occur

exclusively in subderivations of  $C$ , or that occur in a subderivation outside of the derivation of  $C$  and are not provided as arguments to  $C$ .

$\varphi_3$  constrains the effect of instructions executed in steps from such states on objects that may only be bound to object variables in states derived in an application of  $C$ . If  $i$  is not an object load or allocation, then each object in scope bound to a variable in an application of  $C$  is in scope for its child or and parent; as a result,  $\varphi \equiv \text{True}$ .

Otherwise, let  $p \in \text{OVars}$  be the object variable bound by  $i$ . Then  $\varphi_3$  is a conjunction of two constraints. Let  $\mathcal{R}_A \in \text{R}_{\text{Skel}}$  and  $Q_A \in Q^*$  be such that  $A = \mathcal{R}_A(Q_A)$ . The first constraint,  $\varphi_3^0 \in \text{Forms}[\mathcal{T}_{\text{Lang}}]$ , constrains that if the object  $o$  bound to  $p$  at  $q$  is not in the scope of any states bound to  $Q_A$ , then the update histories of  $o$  is identical across both control subpaths derived by the derivation with head  $A$ . I.e.,  $\varphi_3^0$  is

$$\begin{aligned} & \bigwedge_{\substack{q'' \in Q_A \\ p' \in \text{OVars}}} p(q) \neq p'(q'') \implies \\ & \bigwedge_{f \in \text{OFields} \cup \text{DFields}} f(Q_A[\text{Pre}_0(\mathcal{R}_A)], p(q)) = f(Q_A[\text{Post}_0(\mathcal{R}_A)], p(q)) \wedge \\ & \quad f(Q_A[\text{Pre}_1(\mathcal{R}_A)], p(q)) = f(Q_A[\text{Post}_1(\mathcal{R}_A)], p(q)) \end{aligned}$$

The second constraint,  $\varphi_3^1 \in \text{Forms}[\mathcal{T}_{\text{Lang}}]$ , constrains that if  $o$  is not in an argument of  $\mathcal{R}$  when  $C$  is applied, then the update histories of  $o$  is identical between the end of the first control subpath that it derives and the beginning of the second control subpath that it derives. I.e.,  $\varphi_3^1$  is

$$\begin{aligned} & \bigwedge_{\substack{q'' \in Q' \\ p' \in \text{OVars}}} p(q) \neq p'(q'') \implies \\ & \bigwedge_{f \in \text{OFields} \cup \text{DFields}} f(Q'[\text{Post}_0(\mathcal{R})], p(q)) = f(Q'[\text{Pre}_1(\mathcal{R})], p(q)) \end{aligned}$$

**5.3.2 Key properties.** The partial correctness of  $\text{LTTP}$  depends only on the fact that  $\text{SYNGRAMMAR}$ , given a program and set of infeasible paths, synthesizes a run grammar that simulates the program.

**Lemma 3.**  *$P$  is simulated by  $\text{SYNGRAMMAR}(P, F)$ .*

$\text{SYNGRAMMAR}$  also synthesizes a run grammar that refutes  $F$ . However, this fact is primarily useful for proving that  $\text{LTTP}'$  progresses, in that it never collects the same control path from distinct invocations of  $\text{SOLVECHC}$ .

## 5.4 Key features

$\text{LTTP}$  is correct on all programs on which it terminates.

**Theorem 1.** *If  $\text{LTTP}(P) = \text{True}$ , then  $P$  is safe, and if  $\text{LTTP}(P) = \text{False}$ , then  $P$  is not safe.*

Because the problem of verifying safety of programs in  $\text{Lang}$  is undecidable, there are some programs on which  $\text{LTTP}$  will not terminate.

One limitation of  $\text{LTTP}$  as presented above is that it can only effectively determine the safety of programs that contain all stores of objects that they load. Defining a logic of program summaries that  $\text{LTTP}$  can both use and validate is a conceptually challenging and critical direction for future work.  $\text{LTTP}$  is motivated by a number of practical applications which it can be applied to. However, having a program summary logic would enable a direct and formal comparison on the theoretical level to other approaches, particularly separation logic [42] and effectively propositional reasoning [29].

## 5.5 Discussion

The prototype of SYN-SKELETON, developed in §5.2, has some shortcomings which make it worthwhile to pursue a replacement. It is deficient in the expressivity of the grammars it can return, and it is intractable on modest programs. For an infeasible path  $p$  in the feedback set  $F$ , the existing constraint-based approach cannot enforce that every derivation of  $p$  include a refuting neighborhood  $v$  for  $p$ , merely that one such derivation does; hence, the expressivity of SYN-SKELETON must be artificially limited to unambiguous grammars. If it were possible to additionally supply negative examples to SYN-SKELETON (graphs of  $p$  not including any refuting neighborhood), then ambiguity would be permissible.

Learning a linear string grammar (a regular expression) through queries to an oracle is a solved problem due to Angluin’s  $L^*$  algorithm [3]. To be precise, one supposes a teaching oracle which can answer membership queries for a secret language  $L$  and which can confirm or deny with a counterexample that a proposed DFA  $D$  has the property  $L(D) = L$ .  $L^*$  is an efficient algorithm for using this oracle to learn such a  $D$  through both positive and negative examples.  $L^*$  is guaranteed to terminate when  $L$  is regular. The parallel between this problem statement and the task of SYN-SKELETON in LTTP is striking. In LTTP, a grammar  $C$  for an unknown language of graphs is sought.  $\text{ISFEAS}(P, p, v)$  answers the query of whether the control path graph  $p = (N, \lambda, E)$  unioned with the data edges  $E_{\text{Data}}$  implied by  $v$  is a member of this language. When a run grammar  $\mathcal{G}$  is proposed,  $\text{SOLVECHC}(\text{SYNGRAMMAR}(P, F))$  attempts to confirm or deny with a counterexample that  $\mathcal{G}$  correctly describes the language.

The task of SYN-SKELETON is more difficult than the regular language learning task of  $L^*$  because the unknown language is a set of graphs, not strings. However, there is work towards  $L^*$ -like algorithms for richer classes of languages such as learners of context-free grammars [3, 13, 54] and *multiple context-free (MCF) grammars* [55]. A single non-terminal symbol in an MCF grammar is not a hole in a single string, but a vector of  $r$  holes, where the *rank*  $r$  is bounded. The rule for a non-terminal of rank  $r$  can invoke other non-terminals of rank  $r$  by producing characters at the holes, of rank less than  $r$  by filling a hole, and of rank greater than  $r$  by splitting a hole into two adjacent holes. Again, a striking parallel with LTTP arises: this behavior of MCF non-terminals is exactly the behavior of skeleton grammars returned by SYN-SKELETON, where control edges play the role of characters. It remains an open question to determine if an MCF learner can be adapted to include the data edges of a refuting neighborhood  $v$  for each positive example  $p$ .

## 6 EVALUATION

We empirically evaluated LTTP in order to answer the following questions: **(1)** Can LTTP verify the safety of low-level programs that operate on unbounded data structures where existing approaches fail? **(2)** Can LTTP verify the safety of such programs efficiently?

We implemented LTTP as a verifier for programs represented in Java Virtual Machine (JVM) bytecode. The set of benchmarks consists of some programs adapted from challenge benchmarks in the SV-COMP benchmark collection [20], a program that cannot be verified by a competing approach [30], novel benchmarks designed to exhibit particular capabilities of LTTP, and a program which demonstrates that LTTP is limited to properties that can be expressed in a context free way.

In short, the results of our experiments indicate that LTTP can be applied to verify the safety of programs that cannot be verified by existing shape analyzers or verifiers. The time required for the LTTP implementation to perform verification varies dramatically, and we diagnose what causes intractability in some cases.

§6.1 describes our implementation of `LTP` for JVM and our experimental procedure; §6.2 summarizes each benchmark; §6.3 provide a qualitative evaluation of `LTP` by describing the proofs that it synthesizes in order to prove the safety of several illustrative benchmarks. §6.4 provides a quantitative evaluation of `LTP` by analyzing its performance.

## 6.1 Implementation and experimental procedure

We implemented `LTP` as a verifier for JVM bytecode. `LTP` can thus be applied to verify programs written in Java, Scala, or other languages with compilers that target the JVM. The hypothetical language, `Lang`, targeted by `LTP` was defined in §3.1, including classes of instructions that perform operations over objects, such as loads, stores, and allocations. Each such instruction directly corresponds to an instruction in the JVM instruction set. In addition, the implementation of `LTP` can be applied to programs that use common operations over scalar data, such as linear arithmetic and Boolean functions. `LTP` does not currently support programs that consist of multiple procedures.

`LTP` for JVM supports program specifications through library operations that implement the semantics of `assume` and `assert` instructions. There are further operations for retrieving non-deterministic data. The semantics of `Lang` do not include the concept of a `NullPointerException` or any other exception. Accessing the fields of a `null` object is legal, undefined behavior in `Lang`. `LTP` does not model exception-throwing runs of JVM programs. Even so, one can verify the absence of a `NullPointerException` in the original program by injecting a `null` check before every field access.

`LTP` for JVM implements several optimizations, in comparison to the conceptual version of `LTP` for `Lang` given in §5. In particular, the performance of both the procedure `SYNGRAMMAR` for synthesizing a run grammar (§5) and `SOLVECHC` is heavily affected by the number of control locations of a given program. `LTP` for JVM coalesces sequences of value instructions, allocations, and control branches that are not loop back-edges a single block to reduce the number of effective control locations. The benefit of this optimization is that `SYNSKELETON` can represent the space of alternative run-grammar skeletons more compactly, and `SYNGRAMMAR` can generate CHC systems with fewer relational predicates and clauses. The disadvantage of this optimization is that the constraints in the generated CHC system are more complex. In practice, the optimization results in a significant improvement in performance.

Furthermore, instead of modeling the value of each program variable at each control point using an uninterpreted function (§4), `LTP` translates the program into static single assignment form, and introduces first-order variables in generated CHC systems that correspond to program variables. This increases the total number of first-order variables included in a system, but allows the `LTP` implementation to perform fixed-point analyses such as alias and object liveness analysis that are relatively cheap compared to the performance cost of a CHC solver. `LTP` runs such analyses to simplify the constraints in the CHC clauses before solving.

Finally, on practical benchmarks, solving a given CHC system to obtain a counterexample is often far more expensive than an explicit search through all possible program paths. Accordingly, before attempting to solve a given system, our implementation of `LTP` unrolls the system to enumerate all paths up to some heuristic depth and examines each one with Alg. 2 to determine if it is a counterexample.

`LTP` uses the Sawja program analysis framework [27] to process JVM bytecode input and the Z3 theorem prover [56] to solve  $\mathcal{T}_{D, \text{UF}}$  satisfiability queries (§3.2.1). `LTP` uses as a CHC solver (§5) the implementation of `DUALITY` [9] that accompanies Z3, modified to apply Z3’s aggressive formula simplifier after each iteration of its solving algorithm; The original version of `DUALITY` performs only cheap simplifications, which often caused a problematic explosion in the size

of the invariants. `LTP` uses the XSB Datalog engine [52] to execute the fixed-point analyses for optimization prior to solving. Aside from these components, the `LTP` codebase consists of approximately 12,300 lines of OCaml.

We also implemented a *baseline* verifier for JVM bytecode which encodes programs using the theory of arrays to model the heap. The baseline generates a CHC system with one relation for each control location and a clause for each pair of adjacent control locations to model a step of execution. The heap of a program is modeled as a collection of logical arrays, one for each field, that each map each object to the value stored at that field. Load and store instructions are modeled with *select* and *store* operations of the theory of arrays, and objects are represented as integer identifiers. In this way, the baseline reduces the problem of deciding program safety to the problem of solving a CHC system in the theory of arrays with linear arithmetic, `AUFLIA`. The baseline verifier coalesces instructions similarly to `LTP` as described above, and attempts to solve the resulting system by running `DUALITY`.

We applied both the baseline and `LTP` to a set of benchmarks to determine if `LTP` could verify the safety of programs that could not be verified using other theories that accurately model the semantics of memory operations. For each benchmark program `P`, we gave `P` to `LTP` and the baseline verifier and observed the result of, and resources used by, each verifier to attempt to prove that `P` satisfies its single (without loss of generality) `assert` statement. For most benchmarks, we discovered divergent behavior in the successive invariants generated by the baseline verifier so that the solver would inevitably exceed any memory or time limits imposed. This behavior is reported as failure of the baseline verifier.

We ran all experiments on a machine with 16 2.8 GHz processors and 16 GB of RAM. The current implementations of `LTP` and the baseline verifier execute using a single thread.

## 6.2 Description of benchmarks

The behavior of the thirteen benchmarks programs tested is as follows.

The benchmarks programs `buildInspect`, `peel`, `unary`, and `binary` perform similar tasks, but with increasing complexity for `LTP`. All four programs construct a singly-linked list (using a `next` field) from front to back, with some property, and then proceed to scan the list from front to back, ensuring that the property holds. In `buildInspect` and `peel`, the property to check is that the final non-null element scanned is indeed the final element that was added to the list. In order to model the traversal of this list, `LTP` must synchronize the matching iterations of the two loops, as depicted in Figure 3. The grammar relations here each have two negative control pairs, representing control flow of the two loops. While `buildInspect` has the list initialization peeled out of the first loop, in `peel` `LTP` must discover that this peel is needed to match the iterations correctly. A data field is added to `unary` and `binary`. The first checks a unary property over the entire list (that all data fields are zero), while the second checks a binary property (that the integer data is increasing monotonically). A program like `unary` can be found in the `SV-COMP` benchmark collection.

The verification of `allocator` constitutes a demonstration that the encoding of unique object allocation is correct. After an unbounded list is constructed on the heap, a final object `o` is allocated and subsequently compared to every item in the list to check uniqueness.

`lag2` constructs a list and scans it within the same loop. However, a given item is scanned exactly two iterations after it is created.

An unbounded list ending with a fixed-length cycle is built by `finiteCycle`; it then scans this structure and fails the assertion if the scan ever terminates.

Alternatively, `breakCycle` constructs a cycle of unbounded size and proceeds to consume it by destroying the `next` pointers. Thus it asserts that the traversal terminates when it revisits the node from which it started. SV-COMP contains a cycle-constructing program as well. However, the SV-COMP version of the program is fundamentally easier than `breakCycle` because the data is never overwritten; the starting point is instead recognized by its integer data.

We adapted `sameLength` directly from a program given by Itzhaky et al. [30] which cannot be handled by effectively propositional reasoning (EPR). The program simultaneously constructs two disjoint lists, and then simultaneously scans them to check that they have the same length. This property relies on an invariant correlating the two disjoint structures, which is not expressible by heap reachability (see §6.3).

The `tree` benchmark constructs a non-list data structure. Each element has two fields, a `left` pointer and a `right` pointer. A loop non-deterministically allocates a left or right child for the last item allocated and maintains a counter for the size of the structure. The program then follows the pointers to the end, and asserts that the same number of nodes were traversed.

Two more SV-COMP benchmarks which we adapted are `simpleSearch` and `uniqueItem`. Our `simpleSearch` constructs an unbounded list of consecutive integers of length at least 5, beginning with zero. It then expects to find the integers 1 and 3. The original benchmark built a list of at least ten elements. Our `uniqueItem` constructs an unbounded list with all `data` fields set to `False`, except for exactly one element, which has its `data` set to `True`. The program then checks that there is one and only one such element. The original benchmark performed a more complicated construction, wherein the unique element is inserted after the list is constructed.

The program named `order` constructs the first part of a list, of unbounded length, adds two distinguished list elements `a` and `b`, then constructs the remainder of a list, of unbounded length. The scanning loop verifies that it does not find `b` before finding `a`.

Finally, `ctxSensitive` behaves like `lag2` in that the scanning of elements lags behind their construction in the same loop. However, two elements are constructed and only one is scanned in each iteration. Incremental integer data is stored with each element, and the program asserts that the data value in final element scanned is half of the data value in the final element constructed.

### 6.3 Illustrative benchmark

In this section, we discuss in detail an additional benchmark and the operation of LTP in verifying its safety.

*A program with queues of equal length: `sameLength`.* Figure 5 contains a program `sameLength` that builds two queues simultaneously in a loop, then traverses the queues to check that they contain the same number of elements. This benchmark was given in a previous study of Effectively Propositional Reasoning (EPR) in order to illustrate a class of programs that techniques based on EPR cannot prove safe because their necessary invariants cannot be represented in Effectively Propositional Logic (EPL) [29].

`sameLength` performs the following steps over an execution. `sameLength` first initializes two queues (lines 3–7). In each iteration of the loop (lines 8–16, referred to as the *building* loop), `sameLength` adds an element to the tail of each queue. `sameLength` non-deterministically chooses to exit the building loop. It then traverses both queues, loading one element in each iteration of a loop at lines 17–19, referred to as the *traversal* loop. `sameLength` exits the traversal loop when it reaches the end of one of the queues. Finally, `sameLength` asserts that it has reached the end of both queues (line 20).

```

1 class Element { Element next; }
2 public static void sameLength() {
3   Element head1 = new Element();
4   Element tail1 = head1;
5   Element head2 = new Element();
6   Element tail2 = head2;
7   boolean done = false;
8   while (!done) {
9     done = *;
10    Element tmp;
11    if (done) tmp = null;
12    else tmp = new Element();
13    tail1.next = tmp; tail1 = tmp;
14    if (done) tmp = null;
15    else tmp = new Element();
16    tail2.next = tmp; tail2 = tmp; }
17 while (head1 != null && head2 != null) {
18   head1 = head1.next;
19   head2 = head2.next; }
20 assert head1 == null && head2 == null; }

```

Fig. 5. `sameLength`: Constructs two queues in a loop where each iteration adds one element to each queue, then traverses both in a second loop to show both queues have the same length.

```

1 class Element { Element next; int data; }
2 public static void contextSensitive() {
3   Element head = new Element();
4   head.data = 0;
5   Element tail = head;
6   int count = 1;
7   while (*) {
8     Element tmp = new Element();
9     tmp.data = count;
10    tail.next = tmp; tail = tmp;
11    tmp = new Element();
12    tmp.data = count+1;
13    tail.next = tmp; tail = tmp;
14    head = head.next;
15    count = count + 2; }
16 assert head.data == count/2; }

```

Fig. 6. `ctxSensitive`: A program which LTP cannot prove safe.




Fig. 7. A graph grammar that generates `sameLength`'s control paths and data dependencies.

In order to prove that `sameLength` satisfies its assertion, a verifier must establish an invariant for the loop on lines 17–19 that expresses the fact that the lengths of both of the maintained queues are equal. Such an invariant cannot be represented in EPL [29].

Figure 7 depicts a run grammar  $G$  that simulates and refutes `sameLength`, and is synthesized automatically by LTP.  $G$  contains two relational predicates, `sameLength` and `Loops`. The query relational predicate, `sameLength`, is the head of one clause, `sameLength[0]`. The clause derives paths that step from the entry of `sameLength` to the entry of its building loop (a–b), the step from the exit of the building loop to the entry of the traversal loop (c–d), and from the exit of the traversal loop to the exit of the program (e).

The relational predicate `Loops` is the head of two clauses. Clause `Loops[0]` derives termination of both the building and traversal loops. Clause `Loops[1]` derives simultaneous, data-dependent iterations of the building loop and traversal loop. The clause derives a control path f–g in an iteration of the building loop up to its store that adds an element to the first queue, a control path g–h from the store that adds to the first queue to a store that adds to the second queue, a control path j–k that steps in a corresponding iteration of the traversal loop up to the load from the head of

Benchmark	Source	LoC	Iter	Rel	Cls	SYNSKELETON Time	SOLVECHC Time	LTPP	Base
allocator	Novel	22	3	7	13	17s	4m 30s	✓	-
binary		29	7	13	19	1h 13m 32s	5m 25s	✓	-
buildInspect		22	5	7	13	19s	1m 18s	✓	-
ctxSensitive		21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
finiteCycle		19	8	8	15	59s	1m 18s	✓	-
lag2		24	4	9	13	20s	6s	✓	✓
order		32	7	14	24	8h 19m 18s	4h 10m 2s	✓	-
peel		25	8	10	16	7m 4s	7m 47s	✓	-
tree		38	4	11	16	41m 50s	16m 18s	✓	-
sameLength		EPR	28	2	11	17	23m 22s	7m 54s	✓
breakCycle	SVC	25	10	13	21	5h 0m 46s	55m 30s	✓	-
simpleSearch		33	6	12	18	3h 19m 38s	5h 28m 15s	✓	-
unary		26	6	12	18	56m 27s	6m 41s	✓	-
uniqueItem		36	4	11	17	33m 26s	40m 10s	✓	-

Table 2. Results of our evaluation of LTPP. Information about the program source, features of the learned grammar, and execution times of LTPP are reported. The columns of the table indicate the name of the benchmark (“Benchmark”), the source of the program (“Source”), the number of lines of source code in the program (“LoC”), the number of iterations required to learn the final grammar (“Iter”), the final number of relations and clauses in the final grammar (“Rel”, “Cls”), the total time spent in calls to the SYNSKELETON prototype, (“SYNSKELETON Time”), the total time spent in calls to DUALITY (“SOLVECHC Time”), and whether LTPP and the baseline verifiers ultimately solved the verification problem (“LTPP”, “Base”).

the first queue, and a control path  $j-1$  that steps from the load from the head of the first queue to a load from the head of the second queue. Figure 7 also depicts data dependencies from stores at instances of node  $g$  to corresponding loads at instances of  $k$  and from stores at instances of  $h-1$ . As in previous examples, we omit rules which derive non-corresponding steps of the loops, to simplify the presentation.

Loop is empty; one solution contains an interpretation of Loop as an invariant that establishes that the building loop terminates if and only if both queues are null in a corresponding iteration of the traversal loop:

$$\begin{aligned}
F(\text{head}, \text{tail}) &\equiv \text{tail}_0 = \text{head}_2 \wedge \text{next}_1(\text{tail}_0) = \text{next}_2(\text{head}_2) \implies \text{head}_3 = \text{tail}_1 \\
(\text{done}_1 &\iff \text{head}_3 = \text{null} \wedge \text{head}_2_3 = \text{null}) \wedge F(\text{head}_1, \text{tail}_1) \wedge F(\text{head}_2, \text{tail}_2) \quad (2)
\end{aligned}$$

sameLength illustrates the ability of LTPP to prove safety of programs for which safety depends on properties that relate disjoint unbounded, low-level data structures. LTPP does so by synthesizing invariants over relational predicates that derive steps of execution that both load and store from related data structures. This ability enables LTPP to prove the safety of programs that cannot be proved safe by existing techniques based on EPL [16, 29, 31]. These approaches can prove properties expressed in terms of heap reachability within a linked list, but cannot verify properties that require application-specific inductive definitions [29].

#### 6.4 Results and analysis

The results of our evaluation are contained in Table 2. Each of the programs in Table 2 was proved safe by LTPP. Only one of the benchmarks, lag2, was proved safe by the baseline verifier, which took three seconds.

SYNSKELETON converges to the correct grammar after only 4 infeasible path examples in verifying buildInspect, but requires 7 examples for convergence on peel. The SYNSKELETON time for unary and binary is an order of

magnitude longer than for `peel`, which is in turn an order of magnitude longer than for `buildInspect`. This illustrates the poor scalability of the constraint-based prototype as the program complexity increases.

Each time an object is allocated in `allocator`, the run grammar constraints can only ensure that the object is distinct from a bounded number of other objects. Yet  $o$  is verified to be distinct from every element of the unbounded list, indicating that the earlier allocations were aware of the eventual occurrence of  $o$ . This foresight is achieved because the scanning of the list produces a grammar similar to that of `buildInspect`. Had the list not been scanned,  $o$  could not be constrained to be distinct from the other elements, which is a safe approximation precisely because the list is not scanned.

`lag2` stands out as the only one which is determined to be safe by the baseline verifier, despite the fact that the benchmark uses an unbounded heap structure. The baseline determines the program is safe in just three seconds. An informal explanation is that though the entire structure is unbounded, only a bounded subset of it is live. The distance between a store and its matching load is bounded at exactly two iterations of the loop. This special property permits the invariants to be easily synthesized by DUALITY in the theory of arrays as a formula over a bounded number of indices. This same property also manifests in LTP, without the theory of arrays. The trivial first SYNGRAMMAR( $P, \emptyset$ ) result is almost correct: a state variable must be kept in a relation for two iterations following its use in a control edge.

`finiteCycle` illustrates that LTP can prove cyclicity of the visited control locations from the cyclicity of a data structure.

Showing correctness of `breakCycle` depends on the ability of LTP to accurately model a field which is written to and read from more than once, with an unbounded number of heap modifications in between. If a verifier could not prove that the nulled pointers remain null after traversing the unbounded cycle, there would be no guarantee of ending at the correct element of the cycle.

LTP is well-suited to verify `sameLength`, though it is inexpressible in EPR, because LTP can capture correlations between control flow and data movement in the structure of the CHC system.

Verifying `tree` shows that LTP is not confined to lists since the data structure to be traversed proceeds non-deterministically through `left` and `right` child pointers.

LTP solved `simpleSearch`, although its CHC system was the hardest one tested, taking 5.5 hours for DUALITY to find inductive invariants. Because of the lower bound on the list size, the shortest of the feedback paths given to SYNSKELETON must execute the list construction step at least 5 times, since the vacuous refuting neighborhood is all that is required to show infeasibility shorter paths. Moreover, it is speculated that the CHC solver must also explore unwindings of the CHC system to that depth before meaningful invariants begin to be discovered.

LTP is able to solve `uniqueItem`, illustrating its ability to model a program which can leave a special item at a non-deterministic point in an unbounded list, and not only find it again, but prove that there is exactly one such item. That LTP can further solve `order` shows yet more expressivity in reachability conditions regarding multiple elements in a list. A verifier would fail if it were only able to express that the elements `a` and `b` were reachable from the head of list, and not that the elements are ordered.

`ctxSensitive` is unsolvable by both LTP and the baseline verifier, despite its similarity to `lag2`, which both verifiers performed very well on. LTP did not synthesize a correct grammar no matter how many feedback paths it received. The key difference from `lag2` is that the distance between a load and its matching store increases with each iteration. The limitation of LTP in this case is discussed in below.

*Limitations:* While `LTP` can verify a large class of programs which manipulate heap data structures, there are certain types of programs which it cannot. In particular, the current implementation of `LTP` is restricted to the subset of programs which can be refuted using a context-free grammar.

Figure 6 contains the source code for a program, `ctxSensitive`, for which `LTP` cannot synthesize a proof. `ctxSensitive` constructs and consumes a queue in a single loop where each iteration appends two new elements and consumes only one previous element. The program checks that the last element read was the middle element written. First, the program initializes a queue with a single element and initializes a counter, `count`, to 1 (lines 3–6). The program iterates an arbitrary number of times. In each iteration, two new elements are added to the tail of the queue. The first element added has its `data` field set to `count` and the second has its `data` field set to `count + 1` (lines 7–13). Then, the first element of the queue is removed by moving through the `head`’s `next` field (line 14). At the end of each iteration `count` is incremented by 2 (line 15). Once the loop finishes, the program asserts that the `data` field of the front of the queue is equal to half of the current value in `count` (line 16).

The problem with this benchmark is that the distance between corresponding stores and loads widens as the program progresses. In other words, the data dependency is sensitive to the number of iterations of the loop that have occurred. Therefore, the path-grammar required to describe the data dependencies of `ctxSensitive` is not context-free.

Non-context-free grammars are a fundamental limitation of the presented approach. Extending our technique with the capability of handling more complex grammars is a compelling direction for future work.

## 7 RELATED WORK

Three-valued logic analysis (TVLA) represents sets of program heaps as canonical structures [35, 41, 45]. Recent work has introduced automatic shape analyses that represent sets of program heaps as formulas in separation logic [12, 15, 42, 53], forest automata [26], or memory graphs [17]. `LTP` can be applied to programs that maintain perform arbitrary low-level heap operations and data operations. Such approaches can potentially infer invariants of heaps that maintain a variety of data structures, such as lists or trees. However, each analyses synthesizes invariants using an abstraction fixed for the run of the analysis: thus, the analysis can only potentially be effective if an analysis designer provides a sufficient set of predicates for maintaining invariants required to prove that a program satisfies a desired property. Variants of TVLA have been extended to automatically refine an abstraction used by applying *Inductive Logic Programming (ILP)*. However, previous work has established only have ILP can be applied to refine structural abstractions, not abstractions over structure and data.

Recent work has also proposed decision procedures for separation logic [39, 46] and an automatic verifier that represents sets of states as separation-logic formulas [1]. Such approaches require a fixed set of recursively-defined predicates for reasoning about fixed classes of heap data structures. `LTP` can verify program correctness without requiring such predicates.

Previous work has developed automatic verifiers that implement predicate abstraction in shape logics. Such approaches can only synthesize invariants that describe which cells of a heap may reach each other over heap fields [4, 14], can be applied only to programs that maintain particular data structures—such as linked lists [34]—or require an analyst to provide loop invariants [10], predicates over which invariants are constructed [19, 40, 43], or heuristics that ensure that the analysis converges [14]. Relational invariants of path grammars can prove correctness of programs that maintain non-list data structures. `LTP` can potentially synthesize such invariants without requiring an analyst to provide predicates or loop invariants.

Previous work has proposed verifiers that determine if a program satisfies an assertion by inferring shape invariants represented as formulas in effectively-propositional logics [16, 29, 31]. Such verifiers enjoy strong completeness properties not satisfied by *LTP*, but the class of invariants that they synthesize cannot express invariants over non-list data structures or that relate multiple lists. Relational invariants over path grammars can prove the safety of programs that maintain such data structures, and *LTP* can potentially synthesize such invariants automatically.

One such verifier [31] is in fact one instance of a verification framework that could potentially be instantiated with logics other than effectively-proposition logics. However, the general framework requires an analyst to provide predicates over which verification is to be performed. *LTP* does not require such predicates to be provided.

Further work on effectively-propositional logic describes a verifier that can verify properties of heap-paths of data-structures that are not necessarily lists [28]. However, the verifier requires pre-conditions and post-conditions to be given explicitly. It cannot verify programs with loops, although loops annotated with invariants could presumably be verified by directly adapting the verification technique. In either case, *LTP* is distinct from the verifier in that *LTP* can potentially prove safety of an iterative program automatically.

Previous work has described verifiers that verify that a given program satisfies a desired shape property by axiomatizing and inferring invariants in the theory of arrays. One approach attempts to infer invariants that are quantified over array indices and use range predicates that describe the values at different ranges of indices in an array [33]. Such invariants are well-suited to inferring invariants that describe logical arrays that model arrays operated on by a program, but not logical arrays that model a program's heap fields.

Previous work has proposed approaches that attempt to verify a given program by synthesizing a tree-decomposition of the heaps that it maintains [36, 37]. *LTP* is similar to such approaches in that it reasons about tree-structured artifacts that model program executions, namely the derivation trees of a grammar of program paths. Unlike previous approaches, *LTP* reasons about the derivation of control paths, rather than of a decomposition of the heap.

Techniques from *relational verification* [6–8] establish properties over states in multiple runs of a program, such as robustness and information-flow security, or over states in runs of multiple programs, such as observational equivalence. *LTP* can be viewed as an instance of relational verification, in that it attempts to synthesize proofs that establish properties over multiple states. *LTP* is distinct from previous work in that it attempts to establish properties of states within the same run in order to prove safety of low-level programs. Combining existing relational verification techniques with *LTP* in order to prove relational properties of programs that maintain low-level data structures and to automate relational verification seems to be a promising direction for future work.

*SKETCH* synthesizes finite programs [50], bit-streaming programs [50], and stencils [47] by iteratively synthesizing a candidate version of a program, attempting to verify it, and using a counterexample to verification to guide the search for the next version of the program. Synthesizers that are instances of the SyGuS framework [2] attempt to synthesize a program accompanied with a proof of correctness, using a counterexample-guided, iterative process. *LTP* is similar to *SKETCH* and instances of SyGuS in that it is an inductive synthesizer. *LTP* is distinct from *SKETCH* and instances of SyGuS in that each of them, given a partially-complete program, attempt to complete the program with instances of a language of possible syntactic combinations of atomic operations. *LTP*, given a program *P*, attempts to synthesize the basic structure of a logic program that simulates *P*, without synthesizing new atomic operations.

Previous work has reduced the problem of verifying concurrent programs that use a bounded number of threads to solving a system of Constrained Horn Clauses (CHC's) [22] and proposed a solver for CHC's over the theory of linear arithmetic. Previous work has developed automatic verifiers for programs with a single procedure [38] and

multiple recursive procedures [23] that have been generalized to design CHC solvers that use an interpolating theorem prover [9, 44]. `LTP` uses a CHC solver for the theory of uninterpreted functions as a black box. In principle, `LTP` can use any CHC solver; the implementation evaluated uses a solver that itself uses an interpolating theorem prover [9].

## 8 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have presented a novel verifier, named `LTP`, designed to verify programs that maintain low-level data structures. The key feature of `LTP` is that, given a program  $P$ , it attempts to synthesize a proof of the safety of  $P$ , represented as a graph grammar, i.e. a CHC system, that generates the control paths of  $P$ , annotated with invariants that relate the local values at multiple points in each path. `LTP` is completely automated, using an inductive-synthesis algorithm that synthesizes candidate path grammars by reduction to constraint solving and validates candidate grammars by reduction to logic programming. Such proofs can establish correctness of programs that previously could only be proven correct using manually-provided predicates over values and structure.

We have implemented `LTP` as a verifier for JVM bytecode and evaluated it on a set of challenging problems for shape verifiers. `LTP` for JVM succeeded in learning a suitable grammar for thirteen of the fourteen benchmarks. Each of the suitable grammars was given as a CHC system to the CHC solver `DUALITY`, which was able to find inductive invariants to prove program safety.

The design of `LTP` establishes that shape-verification problems can potentially be solved by applying techniques from relational verification and inductive synthesis. Further work strengthening this connection could result in significant development of each of the related fields.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by the National Science Foundation under awards 1526211 and 1650044.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Albarghouthi, J. Berdine, B. Cook, and Z. Kincaid. Spatial interpolants. In *ESOP*, 2015.
- [2] R. Alur, R. Bodik, G. Juniwal, M. M. K. Martin, M. Raghothaman, S. A. Seshia, R. Singh, A. Solar-Lezama, E. Torlak, and A. Udupa. Syntax-guided synthesis. In *FMCAD*, 2013.
- [3] D. Angluin. Learning regular sets from queries and counterexamples. *InfComp*, 75(2):87–106, 1987.
- [4] I. Balaban, A. Pnueli, and L. D. Zuck. Shape analysis by predicate abstraction. In *VMCAI*, 2005.
- [5] T. Ball, V. Levin, and S. K. Rajamani. A decade of software model checking with SLAM. *Commun. ACM*, 54(7), 2011.
- [6] G. Barthe, J. M. Crespo, and C. Kunz. Relational verification using product programs. In *FM*, 2011.
- [7] G. Barthe, J. M. Crespo, and C. Kunz. Beyond 2-safety: Asymmetric product programs for relational program verification. In *LFCS*, 2013.
- [8] N. Benton. Simple relational correctness proofs for static analyses and program transformations. In *POPL*, 2004.
- [9] N. Bjørner, K. L. McMillan, and A. Rybalchenko. On solving universally quantified horn clauses. In *SAS*, 2013.
- [10] C. Bouillaguet, V. Kuncak, T. Wies, K. Zee, and M. C. Rinard. Using first-order theorem provers in the jahob data structure verification system. In *VMCAI*, 2007.
- [11] F. Bourdoncle. Efficient chaotic iteration strategies with widenings. In *Formal Methods*, pages 128–141, 1993.
- [12] C. Calcagno, D. Distefano, P. W. O’Hearn, and H. Yang. Compositional shape analysis by means of bi-abduction. *J. ACM*, 58(6), 2011.
- [13] A. Clark. Distributional learning of some context-free languages with a minimally adequate teacher. In *ICGI*, volume 6339, pages 24–37, 2010.
- [14] D. Dams and K. S. Namjoshi. Shape analysis through predicate abstraction and model checking. In *VMCAI*, 2003.
- [15] D. Distefano, P. W. O’Hearn, and H. Yang. A local shape analysis based on separation logic. In *TACAS*, 2006.
- [16] S. Drews and A. Albarghouthi. Effectively propositional interpolants. In *CAV*, 2016.
- [17] K. Dudka, P. Peringer, and T. Vojnar. Byte-precise verification of low-level list manipulation. In *LNCS*, 2013.
- [18] C. Flanagan. Automatic software model checking using CLP. In *ESOP*, 2003.
- [19] C. Flanagan and S. Qadeer. Predicate abstraction for software verification. In *POPL*, 2002.
- [20] Github - sosy-lab/sv-benchmarks: svcomp17. <https://github.com/sosy-lab/sv-benchmarks>, 2017. Accessed: 2017 July 1.
- [21] S. Gulwani, S. Jha, A. Tiwari, and R. Venkatesan. Synthesis of loop-free programs. In *PLDI*, 2011.

- [22] A. Gupta, C. Popeea, and A. Rybalchenko. Predicate abstraction and refinement for verifying multi-threaded programs. In *POPL*, 2011.
- [23] M. Heizmann, J. Hoenicke, and A. Podelski. Nested interpolants. In *POPL*, 2010.
- [24] T. A. Henzinger, R. Jhala, R. Majumdar, and K. L. McMillan. Abstractions from proofs. In *POPL*, 2004.
- [25] T. A. Henzinger, R. Jhala, R. Majumdar, and G. Sutre. Lazy abstraction. In *POPL*, 2002.
- [26] L. Holik, O. L. O. A. Rogalewicz, J. Šimáček, and T. Vojnar. Fully automated shape analysis based on forest automata. In *CAV*, 2013.
- [27] L. Hubert, N. Barré, F. Besson, D. Demange, T. P. Jensen, V. Monfort, D. Pichardie, and T. Turpin. Sawja: Static analysis workshop for Java. In *FoVeOOS*, 2010.
- [28] S. Itzhaky, A. Banerjee, N. Immerman, O. Lahav, A. Nanevski, and M. Sagiv. Modular reasoning about heap paths via effectively propositional formulas. In *POPL*, 2014.
- [29] S. Itzhaky, A. Banerjee, N. Immerman, A. Nanevski, and M. Sagiv. Effectively-propositional reasoning about reachability in linked data structures. In *CAV*, 2013.
- [30] S. Itzhaky, A. Banerjee, N. Immerman, A. Nanevski, and M. Sagiv. Effectively-propositional reasoning about reachability in linked data structures. Technical report, Tel Aviv University, 2013.
- [31] S. Itzhaky, N. Björner, T. W. Reps, M. Sagiv, and A. V. Thakur. Property-directed shape analysis. In *CAV*, 2014.
- [32] S. Izhaky, S. Gulwani, N. Immerman, and M. Sagiv. A simple inductive synthesis methodology and its applications. In *OOPSLA*, 2010.
- [33] R. Jhala and K. L. McMillan. Array abstractions from proofs. In *CAV*, 2007.
- [34] S. K. Lahiri and S. Qadeer. Verifying properties of well-founded linked lists. In *POPL*, 2006.
- [35] A. Loginov, T. W. Reps, and S. Sagiv. Abstraction refinement via inductive learning. In *CAV*, 2005.
- [36] R. Manevich, J. Berdine, B. Cook, G. Ramalingam, and M. Sagiv. Shape analysis by graph decomposition. In *TACAS*, 2007.
- [37] R. Manevich, T. Lev-Ami, M. Sagiv, G. Ramalingam, and J. Berdine. Heap decomposition for concurrent shape analysis. In *SAS*, 2008.
- [38] K. L. McMillan. Lazy abstraction with interpolants. In *CAV*, 2006.
- [39] J. A. N. Pérez and A. Rybalchenko. Separation logic + superposition calculus = heap theorem prover. In *PLDI*, 2011.
- [40] Z. Rakamaric, J. D. Bingham, and A. J. Hu. An inference-rule-based decision procedure for verification of heap-manipulating programs with mutable data and cyclic data structures. In *VMCAI*, 2007.
- [41] T. W. Reps, S. Sagiv, and R. Wilhelm. Static program analysis via 3-valued logic. In *CAV*, 2004.
- [42] J. C. Reynolds. Separation logic: A logic for shared mutable data structures. In *LICS*, 2002.
- [43] P. M. Rondon, M. Kawaguchi, and R. Jhala. Low-level liquid types. In *POPL*, 2010.
- [44] P. Rümmer, H. Hojjat, and V. Kuncak. Disjunctive interpolants for horn-clause verification. In *CAV*, 2013.
- [45] S. Sagiv, T. W. Reps, and R. Wilhelm. Parametric shape analysis via 3-valued logic. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 24(3), 2002.
- [46] S. A. Seshia, S. K. Lahiri, and R. E. Bryant. A hybrid SAT-based decision procedure for separation logic with uninterpreted functions. In *DAC*, 2003.
- [47] A. Solar-Lezama, G. Arnold, L. Tancau, R. Bodik, V. A. Saraswat, and S. A. Seshia. Sketching stencils. In *PLDI*, 2007.
- [48] A. Solar-Lezama, C. G. Jones, and R. Bodik. Sketching concurrent data structures. In *PLDI*, 2008.
- [49] A. Solar-Lezama, R. M. Rabbah, R. Bodik, and K. Ebcioglu. Programming by sketching for bit-streaming programs. In *PLDI*, 2005.
- [50] A. Solar-Lezama, L. Tancau, R. Bodik, S. A. Seshia, and V. A. Saraswat. Combinatorial sketching for finite programs. In *ASPLOS*, 2006.
- [51] S. Srivastava, S. Gulwani, S. Chaudhuri, and J. Foster. Path-based inductive synthesis for program inversion. In *PLDI*, 2011.
- [52] Xsb datalog. <https://http://xsb.sourceforge.net/>, 2017. Accessed: 2017 July 1.
- [53] H. Yang, O. Lee, J. Berdine, C. Calcagno, B. Cook, D. Distefano, and P. W. O’Hearn. Scalable shape analysis for systems code. In *CAV*, 2008.
- [54] R. Yoshinaka. Towards dual approaches for learning context-free grammars based on syntactic concept lattices. In *Developments in Language Theory*, pages 429–440, 2011.
- [55] R. Yoshinaka and A. Clark. Polynomial time learning of some multiple context-free languages with a minimally adequate teacher. In *Formal Grammar*, pages 192–207, 2012.
- [56] Z3prover/z3 - github. <https://github.com/Z3Prover/z3>, 2017. Accessed: 2017 July 1.

```

1 class Element { Element next; }
2 enum St { W, RW, R, DONE; }
3 public static void lag() {
4   Element head = new Element();
5   Element tail = head;
6   St s = St.W;
7   while (s != St.DONE) {
8     if (s == St.W || s == St.RW) {
9       Element tmp = new Element();
10      tail.next = tmp;
11      tail = tmp; }
12    if (s == St.RW || s == St.R) { head = head.next; }
13    if (s == St.W) { s = St.RW; }
14    else if (s == St.RW && *) { s = St.R; }
15    else if (s == St.R) { s = St.DONE; } }
16  assert head == tail; }

```

Fig. 8. lag: Constructs and consumes a queue, with each load occurring one iteration after the corresponding store.

```

1 class Element { Element next; }
2 public static void order() {
3   Element head = new Element();
4   Element tail = head;
5   while (*) {
6     Element tmp = new Element();
7     tail.next = tmp; tail = tmp; }
8   Element a = new Element();
9   tail.next = a; tail = a;
10  Element b = new Element();
11  tail.next = b; tail = b;
12  while (*) {
13    Element tmp = new Element();
14    tail.next = tmp; tail = tmp; }
15  boolean ordered = true;
16  while (head != a) {
17    if (head == b) ordered = false;
18    head = head.next; }
19  assert ordered; }

```

Fig. 9. order: Constructs and queue with two distinguished elements. It then consumes the queue to ensure the distinguished elements remain in the order they were inserted.




Fig. 10. A graph grammar that generates lag’s control paths and data dependencies.

## A ADDITIONAL ILLUSTRATIVE BENCHMARKS

*A program with nodes shared across clauses:* lag. Figure 8 contains the source code for a program, lag, which builds and consumes a queue. Both the loads and stores occur in a single loop, where each item that is loaded was stored on the previous iteration. The program operates in the context of a small state machine. First, lag initializes the queue and sets itself in a *write-only* state (lines 4–6). Next, if lag is in a *write* state, then it adds a new element to the end of the list and sets the tail to this new element (lines 7–11). If lag is in a *read* state, it moves the head to the next element (line 12). lag then performs state transitions (lines 13–15). lag moves from the *write-only* state to the *read-write* state and from the *read-only* state to the *done* state after a single iteration. lag moves from the *read-write* state to the *read-only* state after an arbitrary number of iterations. Finally, lag asserts that the head element reached by this loop is the same as the tail (line 16).

Figure 10 depicts a graph grammar,  $\mathcal{G}$ , which describes the control paths and data dependencies of lag. The grammar contains two relations, lag and Loop, where lag is the query relation.  $\mathcal{G}$  has three clauses. lag[0] generates fragments of the control path which describe the loop entry (a–b), through the first store (b–c), and through the first state transition without performing a load (c–d). Loop[0] generates fragments of the control path which store the next item in the queue (g–h), load the front of the queue, and perform a state transition (h–i). In addition, Loop[0] contains a data dependency (f–i): The store from the previous loop iteration




Fig. 11. A graph grammar that generates `order`'s control paths and data dependencies.

provides the data for the load in this iteration. `Loop[1]` generates the final fragment which skips from the beginning of the loop to just after the loop (1–m).

A noteworthy feature of  $\mathcal{G}$  is node `f`. In particular, `f` provides a data dependency, but is not connected directly to the control path through `Loop0`. This demonstrates the capability of graph grammars to separate data dependencies from control dependencies.

*A program for which some heap operations have no data dependencies: `order`.* Figure 9 contains the source code for a program, `order`, which creates a queue with two distinguished elements, then consumes the queue until it can check these two elements remain relatively ordered. First, `order` initializes the queue and adds an arbitrary number of elements to the tail (lines 3–7). Next, it inserts two distinguished elements, `a` and `b` (lines 8–11). `order` continues to expand the queue with an arbitrary number of new elements (lines 12–14). `order` traverses the queue until it reaches element `a`. If `b` is encountered before the end of this loop, then the queue has become unordered (lines 15–18). Finally, `order` asserts that the distinguished elements remain in order (line 19).

Each execution of `order` satisfies the assertion. The key invariant which could prove the safety property establishes that for each iteration of the loop on lines 12–14, traversing the `next` pointer reaches `a` before it reaches `b`. This invariant is difficult to express without knowing particular facts about the relationships of linked lists. However, a graph grammar can express the idea of this invariant by simulating the first and third program loops together.

Figure 11 depicts a graph grammar,  $\mathcal{G}$ , which encodes `order`.  $\mathcal{G}$  has three relations and five clauses. The query relation, `order`, has only one clause, `order[0]`, which contains the entry to the first program loop (`a–b`), the insertion of the two distinguished elements and entry of the second loop (`c–d`), the entry to the third loop (`e–f`), a final execution of the third loop and the program assertion (`g–h`), and a data link between the first distinguished element and the final load (`d–h`). The two clauses of `Loop0`, `Loop0[0]` and `Loop0[1]`, describe the simultaneous execution of the first and third program loops. These clauses are similar to `StLd[0]` and `StLd[1]` from §2.2.1. The two clauses of `Loop1`, `Loop1[0]` and `Loop1[1]` describe the execution of the second program loop. For brevity, we omit some clauses for `Loop0` that iterate the two loops a differing number of times. We annotate `Loop0` with an inductive relational invariant which can prove the safety of `order`:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tail}_1 \neq a_2 \wedge \text{head}_3 = \text{tail}_1 \wedge \text{ordered}_3 \wedge \text{tail}_0 = \text{head}_2 \wedge \\ \text{next}_1(\text{tail}_0) = \text{next}_2(\text{head}_2) \implies \text{head}_3 = \text{tail}_1 \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

This invariant maintains that the flag `ordered` is always true at the end of third loop. In addition, it establishes that the simultaneous iteration of the first and third loop terminates before the distinguished element `a` is reached. Interestingly, the second loop is irrelevant to proving the safety property, so the relational invariant for `Loop1` is simply `true`.

Previous examples have all contained data dependencies for every store and load. `order` demonstrates that this is not a limitation of LTP. The stores performed in the second program loop have no corresponding loads. This is reflected by the lack of data dependencies in the clauses of the relation `Loop1`.

```

1 class Tree { Tree left; Tree right; }
2 public static void tree () {
3   Tree root = new Tree();
4   Tree t = root;
5   int c = 0;
6   Tree l,r,tmp;
7   while (t != null) {
8     c++;
9     if (*) tmp = new Tree();
10    else tmp = null;
11    if (*) l = tmp; r = null;
12    else l = null; r = tmp;
13    t.left = l; t.right = r;
14    t = tmp; }
15  t = root;
16  int d = 0;
17  do {
18    d++;
19    l = t.left; r = t.right;
20    if (l != null) t = l; else t = r;
21  } while (l != null || r != null);
22  assert c == d; }

```

Fig. 12. `tree`: Constructs a tree by arbitrarily adding left or right nodes, then follows the path to ensure the length when consumed is the same as the length of the constructed path.

A program with a tree data structure: `tree`. Figure 12 contains a program, named `tree`, that constructs a tree data structure. `tree` builds the tree by non-deterministically choosing to continue to build the left or right subtree of a given node for a non-deterministically chosen number of iterations. `tree` then traverses the data structure and ensures that the number of steps taken to traverse it is the same as the number of steps used to build it.

In particular, `tree` enters the loop in lines 7–14 (i.e., its *building* loop) by initializing the tree and initializing a counter `c` of the number of nodes. Before each iteration of the loop, `tree` tests if the tree node bound to `t` is `null`, and if so, exits the loop (line 7). In each iteration of the loop, `tree` increments `c` (line 8) and non-deterministically chooses whether to stop adding new nodes (lines 9–10). The new node is then stored in either the `left` or `right` field of the node bound to `t` (lines 11–13).

After executing the loop, `tree` binds `t` to the root of the build tree (line 15) and initializes a new counter `d` to 0 (line 16). When `tree` executes the loop on lines 17–21 (i.e., its *traversal* loop), it traverses the constructed path by loading either the `left` or `right` child of a node maintained in `t`, depending on which child is not `null` (lines 17–20). `tree` executes its traversal loop until it reaches a node such that both children are `null` (line 21). `tree` then asserts that the number of nodes added is the same as the number of nodes traversed (line 22).

`tree` satisfies the safety property tested by its assertion at line 22. However, the loop invariants required to prove the property must express a complex property that relates data structure and values. Such invariants must establish that the tree contains `c` elements while `tree` executes the loops in lines 7–14, and that `c – d` elements are reachable from the object in `t` while `tree` executes the loop in lines 17–21. To our knowledge, no automated invariants can synthesize proofs in a language that can express such properties.

Figure 13 depicts a run grammar  $\mathcal{G}$  that simulates and refutes `tree`.  $\mathcal{G}$  contains two relational predicates, `tree` and `Loops`. The query relational predicate, `tree`, is the head of clause `tree[0]`. Clause `tree[0]` derives a control path that steps from program entry to the entry of `tree`'s building loop (a–b), a path that steps from the exit of the building loop to the entry of the traversal loop (c–d), and a path that steps from the exit of the traversal loop to the assertion (e).

`Loops` is the head of three different clauses. Clause `Loops[0]` derives steps in which the building loop non-deterministically chooses to exit; in the corresponding step of traversal loop, it determines that it has reached the end of the tree. Clause `Loops[1]` derives simultaneous steps of both loops such that the building loop chooses to build a subtree from the `left` field of the maintained tree node. `f–g` derives a path through the building loop, while `i–j` depicts the corresponding path through the traversal loop. Each path point derived as an instance of `g` is a data dependence of the node derived as an instance of `j` in the same clause instance, depicted by the data-dependence edge from `g` to `j`. Clause `Loops[2]` is similar to `Loops[0]`, but derives corresponding steps of both loops in which the building loop builds a tree at the `right` field of the maintained tree node. Similar to the presentation of `buildInspect` in §2, we




Fig. 13. A graphical depiction of a run grammar that simulates and refutes `tree`. Control and data dependencies between path points are depicted similarly to Figure 3.

have omitted clauses that derive extraneous iterations of either the building or traversal loops. Such clauses are necessary to represent a run grammar that simulates all control flow paths of `tree`, since it is not known *a priori* that every execution has an equal number of iteration in each loop.

$\mathcal{G}$  simulates `tree` and is empty; one solution of  $\mathcal{G}$  includes an interpretation of `Loops` as a relational invariant that establishes that `c` and `d` have the equal values at the end of iterations on which they store to and load from the same field:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{lnull}(ix0, ix1) &\equiv \text{left}_{ix0}(t_{ix1}) = \text{null} \wedge \text{right}_{ix0}(t_{ix1}) = \text{null} \\ c_1 = d_3 \wedge (\text{lnull}(1, 0) &\iff \text{lnull}(2, 2)) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

In this invariant we define a formula macro `lnull` over two indices which specifies that the `left` and `right` fields of the variable `t` are both null at the given indices. To our knowledge, no automatic shape verifier developed in previous work can prove the safety of `tree` without being guided to use a manually-defined recursive predicate that describes the shape of trees, and relevant predicates over data variables `c` and `d`. However, `LTP` can prove the safety of `tree` automatically.

## B IMPLEMENTING SYNSKELETON BY REDUCTION TO CONSTRAINT SOLVING

We now formalize some concepts that will assist in proving the lemmas and explaining more precisely how the constraints used to implement `SYNSKELETON` work. In the following sections, let a program  $P \in \text{Lang}$  be given. Let  $C$  be a CHC system, and let the space to which  $C$  belongs be denoted  $\text{CHCS}_{\mathcal{R}, X}$ . Assume, without loss of generality, that the arity of every  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  is  $n$ . Let  $\text{ldxs} = \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid i \leq n\}$ . Let  $\alpha(Y, i)$  be the  $i$ th item in the sequence  $Y$  for  $Y \in X^n$  and  $i \in \text{ldxs}$ . Further, for every control location  $l \in \text{Locs}[P]$ , let  $L_l$  be a unary interpreted function. Further, let `Ctrl`, `Data`, and `Conn` be binary uninterpreted functions.

*Location consistency.* Suppose there exists  $\hat{\lambda} : \mathcal{R} \times \text{ldxs} \rightarrow \text{Locs}$  with the following property for all clauses  $C = (B, \varphi, H) \in C$ , all applications  $(R, Y) \in B \cup \{H\}$ , and all indices  $i \in \text{ldxs}$ :

$$\varphi \models \bigwedge_{l \in \text{Locs}} (l = \hat{\lambda}(R, i) \iff L_l(\alpha(Y, i))).$$

Then  $C$  is *location consistent*. Also define the map  $\hat{\lambda}_C : X \rightarrow \text{Locs}$  for each clause  $C = (B, \varphi, H) \in C$  such that if  $\varphi \models L_l(x)$  then  $\hat{\lambda}_C(x) = l$ , for all variables  $x \in X$  and locations  $l \in \text{Locs}$ .  $\hat{\lambda}_C$  is well-defined because  $C$  is location consistent.

*Control consistency.* Suppose  $C$  is location consistent. Let  $\hat{\lambda}_C$  be given for all clauses  $C \in C$ . Suppose there exists  $\hat{E}_C \subseteq X \times X$  for each clause  $C = (B, \varphi, H) \in C$  with the following properties for all variables  $x_1, x_2 \in X$ :

- (1) If there does not exist an instruction  $\text{Instr}[P](\hat{\lambda}_C(x_1), \hat{\lambda}_C(x_2))$ , then  $\varphi \models \neg \text{Ctrl}(x_1, x_2)$ ;
- (2)  $\varphi \models \hat{E}_C(x_1, x_2) \iff \text{Ctrl}(x_1, x_2)$ .

Then  $C$  is *control consistent*.

*Path consistency.* Suppose  $C$  is control consistent, and let  $\hat{E}_C$  be given for all clauses  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ . Suppose there exist a total ordering  $<_R$  over  $\text{Idxs}$  and a map  $\text{sgn}_R : \text{Idxs} \rightarrow \{+, -\}$  for every relation  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ , such that the following properties hold for all clauses  $C = (B, \varphi, H) \in \mathcal{C}$ , all applications  $(R_1, Y_1), (R_2, Y_2) \in B \cup \{H\}$ , all indices  $i, j, k \in \text{Idxs}$ , and all variables  $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in X$ :

- (1) If  $(\alpha(Y_1, i), \alpha(Y_2, j)) \in \hat{E}_C$  then  $\varphi \models \text{Conn}(\alpha(Y_1, i), \alpha(Y_2, j))$  and
  - (a) if also  $(R_1, Y_1) = H$  then  $\varphi \models \text{sgn}_{R_1}(i) < 0$ ,
  - (b) if also  $(R_1, Y_1) \in B$  then  $\varphi \models \text{sgn}_{R_1}(i) > 0$ ;
- (2) If  $(\alpha(Y_1, i), \alpha(Y_2, j)) \notin \hat{E}_C$  and if  $\varphi \models \alpha(Y_1, i) = \alpha(Y_2, j)$  then  $\text{sgn}_{R_1}(i) = \text{sgn}_{R_2}(j)$ ;
- (3)  $\varphi \models \text{Conn}(x_1, x_2) \wedge \text{Conn}(x_2, x_3) \implies \text{Conn}(x_1, x_3)$ ;
- (4)  $\varphi \models i <_{R_1} j \iff \text{Conn}(\alpha(Y_1, i), \alpha(Y_1, j))$ .

Then  $C$  is *path consistent*.

For a path consistent  $C$ , define sets of index pairs  $\rightsquigarrow_R^+$  and  $\rightsquigarrow_R^-$  for each relation  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  as follows. Let  $\rightsquigarrow_R^+ = \{(i, j) \mid \text{sgn}_R(i) > 0 \wedge i <_R j \wedge \nexists k \in \text{Idxs}(i <_R k <_R j)\} \subseteq \text{Idxs} \times \text{Idxs}$ . Define  $\rightsquigarrow_R^-$  similarly, but with  $\text{sgn}_R(i) < 0$ . The sets  $\rightsquigarrow_R^+$  and  $\rightsquigarrow_R^-$  are the *positive* and *negative control pairs* of  $R$ , respectively. Informally, at any node  $d$  of any derivation tree  $D$  of  $C$ , with head  $(R, Y)$ , the control path between  $\alpha(Y, i)$  and  $\alpha(Y, j)$  is constructed entirely within the subtree of  $D$  rooted at  $d$  if  $i \rightsquigarrow_R^- j$ . Similarly, the control path is constructed entirely outside of the subtree of  $D$  rooted at  $d$  if  $i \rightsquigarrow_R^+ j$ . For convenience, define the application of  $\rightsquigarrow_R^+$  to variable tuple  $Y \in X^n$  as the set of variable pairs  $\rightsquigarrow_R^+(Y) = \{(\alpha(Y, i), \alpha(Y, j)) \mid i \rightsquigarrow_R^+ j, i, j \in \text{Idxs}\} \subseteq X \times X$ . Define  $\rightsquigarrow_R^-(Y)$  similarly.

*Neighborliness.* Let  $C$  be such that for each  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  and all  $x_1, x_2 \in X$ ,

$$\varphi \models \text{Data}(x_1, x_2).$$

Then  $C$  is *neighborly*.

*Completeness and Correctness.* If every path  $p \in \text{Paths}[\mathbb{P}]$  is induced as the control graph of some model of  $C$ , then  $C$  is *complete* for  $\mathbb{P}$ .

Let  $p \in \text{Paths}[\mathbb{P}]$  be infeasible. If each derivation of  $C$  that induces  $p$  as a control graph also induces a  $v$  a refuting neighborhood of  $p$ , then  $C$  is *correct* for  $p$ . If  $C$  is complete for  $\mathbb{P}$  and correct for all infeasible paths  $p \in \text{Paths}[\mathbb{P}]$ , then  $C$  is *correct* for  $\mathbb{P}$ .

There is a direct correspondence between the models  $m \vdash \text{SymPath}(\mathbb{P}, p, \nu_{\text{All}})$  and runs of  $p$ . Model  $m$  corresponds to run  $(p, \sigma)$  with  $\sigma$  defined by  $\sigma(n) = (\gamma^n, U^n)$ , where  $\gamma^n(a) = m(a(\sigma_n))$  and  $U^n(f, x) = n'$  where  $m(f(\text{t}_{\text{now}}(\sigma_n), x(\sigma_n))) = m(\text{t}_{\text{now}}(\sigma_{n'}))$  if any such  $n'$  exists, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $a \in \text{Vars}$ ,  $x \in \text{OVars}$ ,  $f \in \text{Fields}$ .

*Generating a skeleton from constraint solutions.* The prototype implementation of SYNSKELETON is a constraint-based approach to grammar synthesis. We encode a space  $\mathbb{G}$  of grammars using uninterpreted functions to model the structure of relations and clauses.

With loss of generality, the prototype only considers linear grammars, in the sense that every clause has at most one relation in the body. LTP has been formulated for only single procedure programs, whose control flow can be described linearly, and a need for non-linear grammars has not yet been encountered in LTP. The prototype also requires as input a budget specifying the maximum arity of relations and the maximum number of relations for systems in  $\mathbb{G}$ . This configuration is encoded as the set of constants and uninterpreted functions of an SMT query.

The following properties of every  $C \in \mathbb{G}$  are achieved by SMT constraints:

- (1) Location consistency: This gives rise to  $\hat{\lambda}_C : X \rightarrow \text{Locs}$  for each clause  $C$ .
- (2) Control consistency: WLOG, each clause  $C$  entails exactly one control edge, i.e.,  $\hat{E}_C = \{(a, b)\}$ .
- (3) Path consistency: The arguments of every relation are partitioned into some number of negative control pairs and some number of single *auxiliary* variables. Let  $(R_2, \varphi, R_1)$  be a clause. Under path consistency,  $R_1$  is responsible for completing the control paths between its negative pairs, and  $R_2$  inherits what is not explicitly completed by  $R_1$ . Assume that  $R_1$  constructs the control edge  $(a, b)$  between negative pair  $(a', b')$ . If  $(a, b) = (a', b')$ , then this pair is completed and  $a, b$  become

auxiliary variables in  $R_2$ . If  $b \neq b'$ , then only  $a'$  becomes auxiliary and  $a \rightsquigarrow_{R_2}^- b'$ . Likewise for  $a \neq a'$ . If both  $a \neq a'$  and  $b \neq b'$ , then the control pair is split in two in  $R_2$ :  $a' \rightsquigarrow_{R_2}^- a \rightsquigarrow_{R_2}^+ b \rightsquigarrow_{R_2}^- b'$ . Auxiliary variables (those not in any negative pair) may or may not be forwarded to  $R_2$ . In the general case, for  $x \rightsquigarrow_{R_1}^+ y \rightsquigarrow_{R_1}^+ z$ , when  $y$  is not forwarded,  $x \rightsquigarrow_{R_2}^+ z$ .

- (4) Completeness as a path grammar: For each clause with control edge  $(a, b)$ ,  $\hat{\lambda}_C(a)$  is uniquely determined by the head relation. For each relation  $R$ , there is (at least) one clause with head  $R$  for each possible value of  $\hat{\lambda}_C(b)$ . The query relation contains the unique (WLOG) initial and final control locations as a negative control pair. By induction over the clauses, each  $R$  completes all possible paths between every negative control pair.
- (5) Unambiguity (with loss of generality): For each relation  $R$ , there is at most one clause with head  $R$  for each possible value of  $\hat{\lambda}_C(b)$ , guaranteeing that every control path  $p$  has a unique derivation.
- (6) Correctness for a path  $p \in F$ : A collection of uninterpreted functions witnesses a derivation of  $p$  by the grammar and further witnesses that the neighborhood  $v = \text{DEFS}(P, p)$  is achieved, assuming neighborliness. That this holds for all derivations of  $p$  is trivial with unambiguity.

## C PROOFS OF LEMMAS AND THEOREMS

**Lemma 1.** *If  $P$  is simulated by  $S$  and  $P$  is refuted by  $S$ , then  $P$  is safe (§3.1.2).*

PROOF.  $S$  has no model that is a run  $P$ , by the assumption that  $P$  is refuted by  $S$ . Therefore  $P$  has no run by the assumption that  $P$  is simulated by  $S$ . Thus  $P$  is safe, by the definition of safety (§3.1.2).  $\square$

**Lemma 2.** *If  $p$  is a feasible path of  $P$ , then  $\text{ISFEAS}(P, p, v_{\text{All}}) = \text{True}$ . Otherwise,  $\text{ISFEAS}(P, p, v_{\text{All}}) = \text{False}$ .*

PROOF. *Sketch.*  $\text{ISFEAS}$  uses the formula  $\text{SymPath}(P, p, v_{\text{All}})$ , which is a conjunction of constraints which precisely model the semantics of each instruction in  $p$ . Notably, for every load there is at most one matching store. Every load is constrained with the value of its matching store since the neighborhood  $v_{\text{All}}$  allows for every control state of  $p$  to be examined in search of the unique match. Thus, the semantics of  $\text{Lang}$  are not approximated, and  $\text{SymPath}(P, p, v_{\text{All}})$  is satisfiable exactly when  $p$  has a run.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $p = (N, \lambda, E) \in \text{Paths}[P]$  and a neighborhood  $v_0 : N \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(N)$  be given.  $\text{SymPath}(P, p, v_0) \models \text{SymPath}(P, p, v_{\text{All}})$ .*

PROOF.  $\text{SymPath}(P, p, v)$  is a conjunction of constraints modeling the instruction on each edge  $(u, v) \in E$ , which is  $\text{SymRel}[i](u, v, v(v))$  for the instruction  $i = \text{Instr}[P](\lambda(u), \lambda(v))$ . For every  $n \in N$ ,  $v_0(n) \subseteq v_{\text{All}}(N) = N$ . We have that  $\text{SymRel}[i](u, v, v_0(v)) \models \text{SymRel}[i](u, v, N)$ , shown case-wise for every possible instruction  $i$ :

- If  $i \in \text{Instr}_S$ , then  $\text{SymRel}[i](u, v, Q)$  does not depend on the set of states  $Q$ .
- If  $i \in \text{Stores} \cup \text{Loads} \cup \text{AllLocs}$ , then  $\text{SymRel}[i](u, v, Q)$  takes only a conjunction over the  $q \in Q$ . Since  $v_0(v) \subseteq N$ ,  $\text{SymRel}[i](u, v, v_0(v))$  is no stronger than  $\text{SymRel}[i](u, v, N)$ .

Since  $\text{SymPath}$  is only a conjunction of  $\text{SymRel}$  constraints,  $\text{SymPath}(P, p, v_0)$  cannot be any stronger than  $\text{SymPath}(P, p, v_{\text{All}})$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.** *Let a control path  $p = (N, \lambda, E) \in \text{Paths}[P]$  and any neighborhood graph  $(N, E_{\text{Data}})$  be given. Let  $v : N \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(N)$  be the neighborhood induced by  $(N, E_{\text{Data}})$ . Suppose  $p$  with  $v$  are modeled by some derivation  $D$  of a skeleton  $C$ . Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the run grammar corresponding to  $C$ . Then there is a model of  $D$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  iff there is a model of  $\text{SymPath}(P, p, v)$ .*

PROOF. Let a model of  $D$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  be given as  $(D, m_D, i)$ , where  $m_D$  is a model of the background theory and  $i : \text{Nodes}[D] \rightarrow \text{Models}[X]$  maps derivation nodes to models of the CHC variables  $X$ . Since  $C$ , a skeleton, is control consistent by the specification of  $\text{SYNSKELETON}$ , every control edge  $(u, v) \in E = m_D(\text{Ctrl})$  via the constraint  $\varphi$  of the clause  $C$  of some node  $d$  in  $D$ , as follows: Let  $\hat{\lambda}_C, \hat{E}_C$  be given. There exists a pair  $(x_1, x_2) \in \hat{E}_C$  such that  $i(d)(x_1) = u$ ,  $i(d)(x_2) = v$  and  $\varphi \models \text{Ctrl}(x_1, x_2)$ . There is a corresponding clause in  $\mathcal{G}$  with a constraint  $\psi \models \varphi$ . Moreover, because  $\psi \models \text{SymRel}[\text{Instr}[P](\hat{\lambda}_C(x_1), \hat{\lambda}_C(x_2))](x_1, x_2, X)$ , and because  $\mathcal{G}$  is location consistent and neighborly,  $i(d) \vdash \text{SymRel}[\text{Instr}[P](\lambda(u), \lambda(v))](u, v, v(v))$ . Let  $m$  be a model over language of  $\text{SymPath}(P, p, v)$  such that  $m$  restricted to  $\{u, v\} \cup v(v)$  is  $i(d)$ . Since this property of  $m$  holds for all control edges  $(u, v) \in E$  then  $m \vdash \text{SymPath}(P, p, v)$  by the definition of  $\text{SymPath}$ .

Now, let a model  $m$  of  $\text{SymPath}(P, p, \nu)$  be given. The process above can almost be reversed to obtain models  $m_D$  and  $i(d)$  for each  $d \in \text{Nodes}[D]$ , but for each clause in  $\mathcal{G}$  with constraint  $\psi$ , care must be taken surrounding the extra condition which  $\psi$  entails, described in §5.3.1. Because the encoding of loads and stores requires that every live object be held by some local state variable, if an object is not passed from  $R$ , resp. to  $R$ , this object is guaranteed to not have any of its fields modified on the control paths between any of the  $\rightsquigarrow_R^+$  pairs, resp.  $\rightsquigarrow_R^-$  pairs. Therefore,  $\psi$  does not overconstrain  $i(d)$ , and we have a model  $(D, m_D, i)$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  inducing  $p$  and  $(N, E_{\text{Data}})$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.**  *$P$  is simulated by  $\text{SYNGRAMMAR}(P, F)$ .*

PROOF.  $\text{SYNGRAMMAR}$  begins by creating a CHC system  $C = \text{SYNSKELETON}(P, F)$ . By the specification of  $\text{SYNSKELETON}$ ,  $C$  is complete for  $P$ ; i.e., every path  $p \in \text{Paths}[P]$  is the control graph modeled by some derivation of  $C$ .

$\text{SYNGRAMMAR}$  then constructs the run grammar  $\mathcal{G}$  corresponding to  $C$ . By Lemma 5, for every path  $p \in \text{Paths}[P]$ , there is a derivation  $D$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  iff there is a model of  $\text{SymPath}(P, p, \nu)$  for some neighborhood  $\nu$ . By Lemma 4 and Lemma 2, there is a model of  $D$  iff there is a run of  $p$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{G}$  simulates every path  $p \in \text{Paths}[P]$ , and thus simulates  $P$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 1.** *If  $\text{LTTP}(P) = \text{True}$ , then  $P$  is safe, and if  $\text{LTTP}(P) = \text{False}$ , then  $P$  is not safe.*

PROOF.  $\text{LTTP}$  returns  $\text{True}$  only if  $\text{SOLVECHC}$  finds a solution to  $\mathcal{G} = \text{SYNGRAMMAR}(P, F)$ , which proves that  $\mathcal{G}$  is empty. By Lemma 3,  $\mathcal{G}$  simulates  $P$ , and with Lemma 1, this proves  $P$  is safe.

$\text{LTTP}$  returns  $\text{False}$  only if a derivation and model  $(D, m, i)$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  is found for which  $\text{ISFEAS}(P, p) = \text{True}$ , where  $p$  is the control graph induced by  $(D, m, i)$ . (And  $p$  is path of  $P$  because  $\mathcal{G}$  is a path grammar of  $P$ .) By Lemma 2,  $p$  is feasible run of  $P$ , witnessing that  $P$  is not safe.  $\square$