

# HyperPUT: Generating Synthetic Faulty Programs to Challenge Bug-Finding Tools

Riccardo Felici · Laura Pozzi · Carlo A. Furia

USI Università della Svizzera italiana, Lugano, Switzerland

February 5, 2024

## Abstract

As research in automatically detecting bugs grows and produces new techniques, having suitable collections of programs with known bugs becomes crucial to reliably and meaningfully compare the effectiveness of these techniques. Most of the existing approaches rely on *benchmarks* collecting manually curated real-world bugs, or synthetic bugs seeded into real-world programs. Using real-world programs entails that extending the existing benchmarks or creating new ones remains a complex time-consuming task.

In this paper, we propose a complementary approach that automatically generates programs with seeded bugs. Our technique, called HyperPUT, builds C programs from a “seed” bug by incrementally applying program transformations (introducing programming constructs such as conditionals, loops, etc.) until a program of the desired size is generated. In our experimental evaluation, we demonstrate how HyperPUT can generate buggy programs that can challenge in different ways the capabilities of modern bug-finding tools, and some of whose characteristics are comparable to those of bugs in existing benchmarks. These results suggest that HyperPUT can be a useful tool to support further research in bug-finding techniques—in particular their empirical evaluation.

**Keywords**—Program Generation, Testing Benchmarks, Synthetic Bug Injection, Testing Frameworks, Fuzzing, Symbolic Execution.

## 1 Introduction

Research in detecting bugs automatically spans several decades, and has produced a wide array of diverse tools such as static analyzers, symbolic execution engines, and fuzzers—to mention just a few. In contrast to this long and successful history of developing bug-finding tools, there still is a somewhat limited agreement about how to rigorously evaluate and compare their bug-finding capabilities in realistic settings.

In the last few years, to address this conspicuous gap, we have seen several proposals of *ground-truth benchmarks*: curated collection of real programs including known bugs [36] or seeded with synthetic bugs [29, 56], complete with detailed information about the bugs’ location, triggering inputs, and other

fundamental characteristics. Ground-truth benchmarks have been instrumental in improving the rigor and thoroughness of bug-finding tools—especially those that generate test inputs using symbolic execution or fuzzing, which are the benchmarks’ usual primary focus. While the usefulness of ground-truth benchmarks is undeniable, extending a benchmark with additional bugs and programs—not to mention creating a new domain-specific benchmark from scratch—remains a complex and time-consuming endeavor.

In this paper, we explore a *complementary* approach to building ground-truth benchmarks, where we automatically generate from scratch programs with seeded bugs. The idea of constructing programs to be used as test inputs (PUTs: programs under test) has been successfully used for other purposes, such as to detect semantic compiler bugs that result in incorrect compilation [62].

Our technique, which we call HyperPUT, builds programs starting from a seed that consists of a simple block that fails when executed; this represents a seeded bug. Then, it repeatedly grows the program by adding features (branching, looping, and so on) that make it larger and more complex to test. HyperPUT is highly configurable: the user can choose aspects such as how many programs to generate, which syntactic features they should include, and the range of variability of their branching conditions. Clearly, there is no a priori guarantee that the synthetic PUTs generated by HyperPUT are representative of real-world bugs. However, a fully synthetic approach also has clear advantages over manually curated collections: since the whole process is automatic and customizable, producing new benchmarks collecting programs with specific characteristics is inexpensive. In addition, HyperPUT’s PUTs come with precise information about the bug location and any bug-triggering inputs. Thus, they can supplement the programs in curated ground-truth benchmarks to better evaluate the capabilities of bug-finding tools according to metrics such as number of discovered bugs and bug detection time, as well as to investigate which syntactic features of the faulty programs are more amenable to which bug-finding tools.

After discussing HyperPUT’s design and implementation in Section 3, in Section 4 we design some experiments where we generated hundreds of PUTs with bugs using HyperPUT, and we ran three popular, mature bug-finding tools—AFL, CBMC, and KLEE—on these PUTs. Our goal is demonstrating that HyperPUT can generate bugs with diverse characteristics, which can challenge different capabilities of bug-finding tools and can usefully complement the programs in ground-truth benchmarks. To this end, we follow Roy et al. [56]’s description of the features of “ecologically valid” bugs, and analyze whether HyperPUT can generate bugs that are fair, reproducible, deep, and rare, and that can exercise the different capabilities of common bug-finding techniques. The high-level summary of the experiments, which we detail in Section 5, confirms that HyperPUT is capable of generating “interesting” buggy programs that share some characteristics with those of benchmarks. Thus, HyperPUT can support flexible empirical analysis of the capabilities of the various bug-finding tools in a way that complements and extends what is possible using manually-curated benchmarks.

**Contributions** This paper makes the following contributions:

- HyperPUT, a configurable technique to automatically generate PUTs with certain characteristics and seeded bugs.
- An implementation of the HyperPUT technique in a tool—also named HyperPUT.
- An experimental evaluation of HyperPUT that demonstrates its ability to generate bugs with characteristics comparable to “ecologically valid” ones [56], which exercise from different angles the capabilities of bug-finding tools.

The prototype implementation of HyperPUT is available in a public repository [4].

	Organic PUTs	Synthetic PUTs
<b>Organic bugs</b>	FuzzBench <u>MAGMA</u> CGC, Test-Comp, SV-Comp (datasets)	
<b>Synthetic bugs</b>	<u>LAVA</u> <u>Apocalypse</u>	CSmith <u>HyperPUT</u>

Table 1: Classification of evaluation benchmarks according to whether they consist of organic or synthetic bugs within organic or synthetic programs (PUTs). Underlined systems support the automatic generation of new benchmarks by seeding bugs into existing programs.

**Organization** The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses the main related work in the development of benchmarks of bugs, as well as bug-finding techniques and tools. Section 3 describes the HyperPUT technique and its current implementation as a tool with the same name that generates programs in C. Section 4 introduces the paper’s research questions, and the experiments that we carried out to answer the questions. Section 5 presents the results of the experiments, and how they address the research questions. Finally, Section 6 concludes with a summary and discussion of the paper’s contributions.

## 2 Related Work

We discuss related work in two areas: benchmarks of bugs to evaluate bug-finding tools (Section 2.1), and the main techniques and tools to find bugs and vulnerabilities in programs (Section 2.2). Consistently with the paper’s main focus, we principally consider techniques and tools that work on programs written in the C programming language used for systems programming.

### 2.1 Benchmarks of Bugs

Different applications of program analysis, including different approaches to test-case generation, use different benchmarks, consistent with the goals of the program analysis evaluated using the benchmark. Here, we focus on *extensible* benchmarks to evaluate the *bug-finding* capabilities of test-case generation frameworks (for brevity, testing framework).

Table 1 shows a natural classification in terms of the origin of programs and their bugs, and displays the category several well-known benchmarks belong to. A *program* included in a benchmark can be *organic* or *synthetic*. The *bugs* of a benchmark’s PUTs can also be *organic* or *synthetic*.

**Organic programs** An *organic program* is one that was designed and implemented by human programmers, and hence reflects the characteristics of real-world programs (or at least a sample of them). For this reason, many existing benchmarks are based on organic PUTs. For example, the International Competition on Software Testing (Test-Comp) [14] is a comparative evaluation of automatic tools for software test generation, which uses benchmarks consisting of C programs equipped with testing objectives (such as coverage, and bug finding). Similar benchmarks are used by the Competition on Software Verification (SV-Comp) [13]. Another example is the CGC dataset, which collects about 300 small

manually-written programs produced for the Darpa Cyber Grand Challenge [3]; for each bug in the programs, the CGC also includes a triggering input.

Google’s FuzzBench is an open benchmarking platform and service [49] based on open source programs. FuzzBench has been useful both in the industrial and the academic fields—both to evaluate the capabilities of fuzzing frameworks and to identify their limitations and own bugs.

Organic benchmarks exist also for other programming languages, such as the DaCapo benchmarks [15] and Defects4J [37] for the Java programming language.

**Synthetic programs** In contrast, a *synthetic program* is one that is generated automatically from a set of templates, rules, or heuristics.

CSmith [62] is a program generator mainly employed for validating compilers through differential testing [48]. It has been used to find several security problems in popular compiler frameworks [46, 30], including GCC [59] and LLVM [42]. Timotej and Cadar [38] applied a similar combination of grammar-based program generation and differential testing in order to find bugs in symbolic execution engines. While tools such as CSmith could be used to build benchmarks that challenge testing frameworks, they are most directly useful for *differential* testing, where the goal is comparing the behavior of different versions of a compiler. HyperPUT revisits some of the ideas behind tools like CSmith (in particular, grammar-based program generation) so that they are directly applicable to generate PUTs with seeded bugs. Differently from CSmith, HyperPUT can also produce a triggering input for each buggy program it generates, which serves as the ground truth to assess and compare the capabilities of different bug-finding tools.

**Organic bugs** An *organic bug* is one that occurred “in the wild”, and hence comes from a program’s actual development history. Just like organic programs, organic bugs have the clear advantage of being realistic. In fact, the majority of current systems for the evaluation of testing frameworks consist of organic PUTs and organic bugs. The MAGMA benchmark [36] can extend the usability of such “fully organic” benchmarks by performing “forward-porting” of real bugs to recent version of the target PUT. This way, a historically relevant bug can still be reproduced (and tested for) in up-to-date setups. Still, applying MAGMA to new bugs and new PUTs requires substantial manual effort.

**Synthetic bugs** Seeding *synthetic* bugs into an existing program has become an increasingly popular approach to generate large benchmarks of bugs, thanks to its scalability compared to manual selection and curation. The Large-scale Automated Vulnerability Addition (LAVA) dataset [29]—commonly used to compare fuzzing frameworks—consists of synthetic bugs seeded into existing programs. LAVA’s bug injection is based on the PANDA dynamic analysis platform [28], built on top of the QEMU emulator [12]. First, an analysis of the target program identifies dead, unused, and available (DUA) bytes of the input, which can be altered (“fuzzed”) without affecting the program’s behavior. Then, LAVA seeds vulnerabilities, such as buffer overflows or other kinds of inconsistent memory access, that are triggered when an execution accesses the DUA bytes.

Apocalypse [56] is a bug injection system similar to LAVA and based on synthetic bugs and symbolic execution. It generates and seeds into existing programs bugs with specific requirements (some of which we describe in Section 4 in relation to our experiments). Apocalypse was experimentally evaluated to show it can generate seeded bugs with characteristics comparable to organic ones. In Section 5, we will assess the PUTs generated by HyperPUT using several of the same metrics.

In order to work on real-world programs, LAVA and Apocalypse incur some limitations. First, one cannot seed bugs at arbitrary locations but only at those that have been reached in a previous execution. Second, since they rely on symbolic execution to discover triggering inputs for the seeded bugs, it may be practically hard to find such triggering inputs for bugs that are nested very deeply into the program’s control flow structure. Since HyperPUT builds PUTs with seeded bugs from scratch, it does

not incur these limitations and can generate programs with arbitrarily complex nesting structure (as we demonstrate in Section 5.3).

Ferrer et al.’s work [31] is an example of fully synthetic benchmarks (consisting of synthetic bugs and synthetic PUTs) for the Java programming language. Their main goal is generating programs where every branch is reachable to serve as ground truth when evaluating the branch-coverage capabilities of testing frameworks.

Mutation testing is another approach based on injecting synthetic bugs in organic programs [40, 41]. The original goal of mutation testing was to measure the bug-detection capabilities of a test suite: the more “mutants” (i.e., variants of program with injected bugs) trigger failures in the test suite, the more comprehensive the test suite is [55]. More recently, mutation testing ideas have been applied to different dynamic analysis techniques, such as fault localization [53, 19]. As a bug-injection technique [33], mutation testing suffers from the problem of *equivalent mutants*, which occur when a mutation does not alter a program’s behavior, and hence the mutant does not actually have a bug; a number of approaches have tried to address this problem [52, 63, 57].

It is also interesting to consider which metrics are supported by the benchmarks. The most common ones are number of detected bugs, detection time, and maximum code coverage achieved during testing; these are easily applicable to all benchmarks. In addition, one may want to relate the syntactic features of the buggy programs to the capabilities of the bug-finding tools; HyperPUT’s approach supports this kind of experiments, since it can generate batches programs with similar characteristics (e.g., nesting structure or kinds of statements).

## 2.2 Bug-finding Tools

A detailed discussion of the main techniques used to find bugs in programs is beyond the scope of the present paper; we refer the interested readers to surveys [23, 22, 10] and textbooks [7, 55]. In this section, we briefly describe the bug-finding techniques and tools that feature in our evaluation of HyperPUT—which are also widely used outside of research.

**Fuzzing** Fuzz testing (or *fuzzing*) encompasses a broad spectrum of dynamic techniques to generate program inputs [45, 39]. It is widely used to find bugs in software; Google, for instance, found thousands of security-related bugs in their software using fuzzing [9]. The key idea of fuzzing is to *randomly mutate* a known valid program input (the “seed”) to generate new inputs that may cause the program to crash or expose other kinds of vulnerabilities. Fuzzers differ according to the kind of strategies they use to randomly mutate program inputs. In particular, black-box fuzzers do not have access to the target program’s control flow, and hence can only generate new inputs independently of the program’s structure. In contrast, white-box fuzzers can take the program’s control flow into account in order to generate new inputs that exercise specific portions of the program.

American Fuzzy Lop (AFL) is one of the most popular fuzzing frameworks for C programs. It is a gray-box coverage-based fuzzer, which means that some of its fuzzing strategies are driven by coverage information about the analyzed program. Originally developed by Zalewsky [64], different extensions of AFL—such as REDQUEEN [8], AFLFast [17] and AFL++ [32]—have been introduced more recently and remain widely used.

**Symbolic execution** As the name suggests, symbolic execution executes a program with *symbolic* inputs, which are placeholders for every possible valid inputs [22, 10]. As it enumerates different execution paths, symbolic execution builds *path constraints*, which are logic formula that encode each path’s feasibility. Then, a constraint solver such as Z3 [50] determines which abstract paths are feasible, and generates matching concrete inputs.

Most modern implementations of symbolic execution perform *dynamic symbolic execution* (also called “concolic” execution), which combines symbolic and concrete state in order to overcome some limitations of symbolic execution (such as its scalability and applicability to realistic programs) [18]. EXE [21] and DART [34] pioneered the idea of dynamic symbolic execution. More recently, other tools perfecting and extending this technique include KLEE [20], SAGE [35], S2e [24], and Angr [58]. KLEE is one of the most widely used dynamic symbolic execution engines for C programs. It is implemented on top of LLVM [42], and has been successfully employed to find several bugs in production software, such as the MINIX [61] and BUSYBOX [1] tools.

Driller is a vulnerability discovery tool that combines symbolic execution and fuzzing [60]. When the latter fails to make progress, it uses the former to continue the exploration of new execution paths. This approach is effective to improve code coverage, and to test features such as cryptographic hash functions and random number generators, which are notoriously difficult for approaches that are exclusively based on constraint solving. The T-Fuzz fuzzer [54] applies program transformations in order to remove the conditions guarding some code blocks that are hard to reach. If a crash occurs in these code blocks, it then checks a posteriori whether the locations are actually reachable in the original program.

**Model checking** In a nutshell, model checking is verification technique for finite-state models, which can exhaustively check properties expressed in temporal logic (including reachability properties, which can be expressed as assertions in the code) or find counterexamples when the properties do not hold in general [25].

Since real-world programs are not finite state, one needs to introduce some kind of finite-state abstraction in order to be able to apply model checking to them. A natural way of doing so is by *bounding* the program state to be within a finite (but possibly very large) range. Then, model checking such a bounded abstraction is not equivalent to verifying the original program, but can still be a very effective way of thoroughly *testing* the program and finding bugs. In this paper, we experiment with the popular CBMC [26] bounded model checker for C programs.

An alternative classification for testing framework benchmarks is based on the employed evaluation criteria. The most common ones are the detection time for a particular bug, the number of detected bugs in the benchmark and the code coverage testing frameworks achieve during program execution, measured in terms of number of lines or branches visited in the PUT control flow graph. Every benchmark described in this section support the first two mentioned criteria, while coverage measurements can be easily incorporated at compilation time. HyperPUT, in addition, can also evaluate testing frameworks depending on the structure of the produced PUT, as described in Section 3.

## 3 Methodology and Implementation

HyperPUT builds arbitrarily complex PUTs by recursively applying parametric transformations of different kinds to an initial simple program.

### 3.1 Transformations

A *transformation* consists of a program *template* with (typed) parameters and holes. When we *apply* a transformation, we choose concrete values for its parameters and holes. A parameter can be replaced with any constant or variable of suitable type. A hole is replaced by another snippet of code, which can be given explicitly or as the result of nesting another transformation. Table 2 lists the transformations HyperPUT currently supports, together with the code they correspond to. There are five main kinds of transformations:

**IC (integer comparison)** introduces a conditional that checks whether the two integer parameters  $v_1, v_2$  are equal.

TRANSFORMATION	CODE
$IC(v_1: \text{long}, v_2: \text{long}, T, E)$	<pre>if (v1 == v2) { T } else { E }</pre>
$SC(s_1: \text{char}^*, s_2: \text{char}^*, T, E)$	<pre>if (strcmp(s1, s2) == 0) { T } else { E }</pre>
$FL(e: \text{long long}, B)$	<pre>for (long long j = 0; j &lt; e; j++) { do_something(); } B</pre>
$PC(s: \text{char}^*, n: \text{int}, B)$	<pre>if (strlen(s) &lt; n) exit(0); size_t l = 0, h = strlen(s) - 1; while (h &gt;= l) { if (s[h] != s[l]) exit(0); h--; l++; } B</pre>
$CC(s: \text{char}^*, c: \text{char}, n: \text{int}, T, E)$	<pre>int count = 0; for (int k = 0; k &lt; strlen(s); k++) { if (s[k] == c) count++; } if (count == n) { T } else { E }</pre>

Table 2: HyperPUT’s transformations and the corresponding generated code. In a transformation, lowercase letters denote parameters and uppercase letters denote holes.

**SC (string comparison)** introduces a conditional that checks whether the two string parameters  $s_1, s_2$  are equal.

**FL (for loop)** introduces a loop that iterates  $e$  times (where  $e$  is the transformation’s integer parameter), and then executes code  $B$ .

**PC (palindrome check)** introduces a loop that checks whether the string parameter  $s$  is a palindrome of length at least  $n$ ; if it is, it executes code  $B$ .

**CC (character counting)** introduces a loop that counts the number of occurrences of character parameter  $c$  in string parameter  $s$ ; if the count equals the integer parameter  $n$ , it executes code  $T$ ; if not, it executes code  $E$ .

Let’s present a few more details about transformation IC, as an example to illustrate how transformations work. Transformation IC consists of two parameters  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  and two holes  $T$  and  $E$ . The parameters denote two integer values or variables. Then, the transformation introduces a conditional `if` that checks whether  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  have the same value. If they have,  $T$  executes; otherwise,  $E$  executes.

### 3.2 Transformation Sequences

More complex PUTs combine several transformations by nesting one inside another. When we specify a *sequence* of transformations, we can give a concrete value to any transformation *parameter* or use a fresh identifier. In the latter case, HyperPUT will instantiate the parameter with a suitable random value (usually within a range)—for every PUT generated from the transformation sequence. For example, the expression  $IC(\text{atoll}(\text{argv}[1]), \beta, \text{assert } 0 == 1, \text{exit}(0))$ , where  $\beta$  is a fresh identifier, denotes a conditional that checks whether the first command-line argument `argv[1]`, when interpreted as an integer, is equal to a random integer value; if it is, the program fails (`assert 0 == 1`), otherwise, it exits normally (`exit(0)`).

We can also use fresh identifiers, instead of concrete code snippets, for *holes*, to denote that the next transformation in the sequence will instantiate the hole. In other words, this is just a notational shorthand that helps readability by avoiding nesting transformations explicitly. For example, the sequence of two transformations

$$SC(\text{argv}[2], \text{"hello"}, ;, E) IC(\text{atoll}(\text{argv}[1]), 69, \text{assert } 0 == 1, \text{return}(0)) \quad (1)$$

nests an integer comparison inside the else branch of a string comparison, and thus it is equivalent to the explicitly nested expression

$$SC\left(\text{argv}[2], \text{"hello"}, ;, \left(IC(\text{atoll}(\text{argv}[1]), 69, \text{assert } 0 == 1, \text{return}(0))\right)\right)$$

and determines the PUT in Figure 1.

```
1  int main(int argc, char** argv) {
2    if (strcmp(argv[2], "hello") == 0)
3      ;
4    else {
5      if (atoll(argv[1]) == 69)
6        assert 0 == 1;
7      else
8        return 0;
9    }
10 }
```

Figure 1: Specification of a PUT that combines transformations SC and IC as in (1).

Figure 1 also shows that HyperPUT inserts the code generated by applying a sequence of transformations into a template main function, so that the PUT is a complete program. HyperPUT also automatically generates boilerplate code—such as library includes, and checks that the required command-line arguments are indeed present—that makes PUTs syntactically correct programs. For simplicity, Figure 1 and all other PUTs shown in the paper omit this boilerplate code.

**Reaching inputs** The structure of every transformation also suggests which values of the transformation’s parameters determine an execution of the resulting PUT that reaches code in any of the transformation’s holes. For example, hole  $T$  in transformation IC executes for any  $v_1 = v_2$ ; hole  $B$  in transformation FL always executes; hole  $T$  in transformation CC executes if  $s$  includes  $n$  occurrences of characters  $c$ ; and so on. Based on the transformations’ structure and how they are combined, HyperPUT outputs, for every PUT it generates, values for all variables used in any transformation’s parameters that reach any of the PUT’s holes. In Figure 1’s example, there are two variables `argv[1]` and `argv[2]`, and three leaf holes at lines 3, 6, and 8; HyperPUT determines that the inputs  $\langle "", "hello" \rangle$ ,  $\langle "69", "" \rangle$ , and  $\langle "", "" \rangle$  respectively reach each of the leaves.

### 3.3 Implementation Details

We implemented the HyperPUT technique in a tool with the same name. The tool is implemented in a combination of C (for the core program-generation functionalities), Python (front end and connection of the various modules), and Bash scripts (to run batches of experiments).

The user input to HyperPUT consists of a sequence of transformations specified as described in Section 3.2, and a number of PUTs to be generated. HyperPUT’s *front end* processes this input and passes the information to the *generator engine*, which takes care of generating PUTs by applying the transformation sequences, embedding the resulting code into a main function to build a complete program, and also recording a reaching input for every generated PUT.

**Extensibility** HyperPUT is extensible with new transformations. However, as we demonstrate in Section 5, the current selection of transformations is already sufficient to generate a large number of “interesting” PUTs, which can challenge different test-case generators and share some characteristics with the programs in widely used test-case generation benchmarks.

In principle, HyperPUT’s pipeline could also generate PUTs in programming languages other than C. To this end, one should extend it with transformations that generate valid snippets of code in other programming languages.



## 4 Experimental Design

The experimental evaluation of HyperPUT addresses the following research questions:

**RQ1:** Can HyperPUT generate bugs that are *fair*?

**RQ2:** Are the bugs generated by HyperPUT *reproducible*?

**RQ3:** Can HyperPUT generate bugs that are *deep* and *rare*?

**RQ4:** Can HyperPUT generate diverse programs that exercise different *capabilities* of bug-finding techniques?

This section describes the experiments we designed to answer these research questions. Our experimental design is after Roy et al. [56]’s, modified to suit our goal of evaluating the characteristics of HyperPUT’s synthetic PUTs.

### 4.1 Testing Frameworks

To assess the characteristics of the bugs generated by HyperPUT, we ran several testing frameworks on the generated PUTs and determined which bugs each framework could uncover.

We used testing frameworks implementing different bug-finding techniques for C programs:

- AFL [64] is a popular grey-box fuzzer, which combines random generation of input and coverage metrics.
- CBMC [26] is a bounded model checker for C/C++ programs. Bounded model-checking exhaustively explores a program’s state-space up to a finite size bound, checking for the violation of basic correctness properties (such as memory safety) and assertions within this explored space.
- KLEE [20] is a state of the art dynamic-symbolic execution engine. Dynamic-symbolic execution is a white-box testing technique, which uses constraint solving to generate inputs that lead to exploring new paths in the PUT.

These tools offer numerous configuration options; Table 3 lists the configurations that we used in the experiments. We deploy each tool in two configurations: we first execute it with its first configuration; if it fails to find a bug before the timeout expires, we execute it again on the same PUT with its second configuration (using any remaining time). For brevity, henceforth we use the expression “we run  $X$  on a program  $P$ ” to mean “we run the testing framework  $X$  using sequentially the two configurations in Table 3 on  $P$ ”.

ID	FRAMEWORK	CONFIGURATIONS
$A$	AFL	<code>afl-clang-fast</code> with options CMPLOG [2], LAF [6], MOpt [44] <code>afl-clang-fast</code> with default options
$C$	CBMC	automated bounded loop unwinding loop unwinding with bound 10
$K$	KLEE	symbolic arguments, random state search, LLVM optimization symbolic arguments, default options

Table 3: Configurations of the testing tools used in the experiments. Each row specifies two configurations for a testing tool in terms of the used options.

BATCH	$n$	#PUTS	INPUTS USED AS PARAMETERS $v_1, s_1, s$
$B_1$	1	10	<code>argv[1]</code>
$B_2$	2	45	<code>argv[1], argv[2]</code>
$B_{10}$	2–10	200	<code>argv[1], . . . , argv[10]</code>
$B_{100}$	100	100	<code>argv[1], . . . , argv[100]</code>
$B_{1000}$	1000	100	<code>argv[1], . . . , argv[1000]</code>

Table 4: List of the batches of PUTs used in HyperPUT’s experimental evaluation to answer RQ1, RQ2, and RQ3. For each BATCH, the table lists the number  $n$  of transformations used to generate each PUT in the batch, the number #PUTS of different PUTs in the batch, and the command-line input arguments used as parameters in the transformations.

## 4.2 Experimental Subjects

We generate PUTs in batches, where each batch runs HyperPUT with a sequence of  $n \geq 1$  transformations:

$$T_1(p_{1,1}, p_{1,2}, \dots, H_{1,1}, \dots) T_2(p_{2,1}, p_{2,2}, \dots, H_{2,1}, \dots) \dots T_n(p_{n,1}, p_{n,2}, \dots, \text{fail}(), \dots) \quad (2)$$

and a matching sequence of actual parameters  $p_{1,1}, p_{1,2}, \dots, p_{n,1}, p_{n,2}, \dots$ . Each transformation  $T_k$  in (2) is one of IC, SC, FL, PC, and CC listed in Table 2. In the experiments, we always nest into the “then” hole  $T$  of conditional transformations IC and SC; therefore, all “else” holes  $E$  are simply filled with a “skip” snippet that does nothing. Snippet `fail()` indicates code that triggers a crashing bug when executed; for example, an assertion failure `assert 0 == 1` or an out-of-bound error `int a[3]; a[4] = 0`. In our experiments, we always add the snippet `fail()` in the innermost transformation  $T_n$ .

Each actual parameter  $p_j$  is either a random constant of the appropriate type (chosen within a limited range) or *i*) `argv[i]` (for  $i \geq 1$ ) for parameters of type `char*`; *ii*) `atoll(argv[i])` (for  $i \geq 1$ ) for parameters of integer type (`int`, `long`, `long long`). More precisely, parameters  $v_1$  in transformation IC,  $s_1$  in transformation SC, and  $s$  in transformations PC and CC are always instantiated with a command-line argument; all other parameters are chosen as random constants within a small range. Table 5 shows the actual ranges for the randomly chosen parameters in each transformation in the batches that we used in the experiments. For example, every instance of IC uses an integer between 0 and 255 as its second parameter  $v_2$ . We introduce the described restrictions on the choice of parameters so as to generate PUTs of homogeneous characteristics, where the number and kinds of transformations used to generate them are the primary determinant of their complexity. These constraints also ensure that, in every generated PUT, *i*) there is exactly one bug; *ii*) there is (at least one) program input that triggers the bug. HyperPUT’s reaching input for the unique bug’s location is thus also the triggering input that ensures that the bug is executable.

**Batches** For the experiments with HyperPUT to answer RQ1, RQ2, and RQ3, we generated a total of 455 PUTs in 5 batches. Table 4 outlines the characteristics of each batch.

**Batch  $B_1$**  includes 10 PUTs, each consisting of a single transformation.

**Batch  $B_2$**  includes 45 PUTs, each consisting of two different transformations.

**Batch  $B_{10}$**  includes 200 PUTs, each consisting of between 2 and 10 transformations (possibly with repetitions), with the transformations and the actual length chosen randomly. More precisely, this batch includes: *i*) 1 PUT consisting of 2 transformations; *ii*) 4 PUTs consisting of 3 transformations; *iii*) 9 PUTs consisting of 4 transformations; *iv*) 41 PUTs consisting of 5 transformations;

TRANSFORMATION	PARAMETER	MIN	MAX
IC	$v_2$	0	255
SC	$s_2$	"0"	"255"
FL	$e$	0	255
PC	$n$	1	20
CC	$n$	1	20

Table 5: Range of values, between a MINIMUM and a MAXIMUM value, for the PARAMETERS of the TRANSFORMATIONS in Table 2 used in the experiments.




Figure 2: Distribution of size (in number of transformations) of the PUTs used in the experimental evaluation.

v) 44 PUTs consisting of 6 transformations; vi) 43 PUTs consisting of 7 transformations; vii) 29 PUTs consisting of 8 transformations; viii) 20 PUTs consisting of 9 transformations; ix) 9 PUTs consisting of 10 transformations.

**Batch**  $B_{100}$  includes 100 PUTs, each consisting of exactly 100 transformations (possibly with repetitions) chosen randomly.

**Batch**  $B_{1000}$  includes 100 PUTs, each consisting of exactly 1000 transformations (possibly with repetitions) chosen randomly.

Henceforth,  $B$  denotes the union of all batches  $B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_{10} \cup B_{100} \cup B_{1000}$ . Figure 2 overviews the distribution of all PUTs in  $B$ .

For the experiments with HyperPUT to answer RQ4, we generated another 60 PUTs in 6 batches  $B_{IC}, B_{SC}, B_{FL}, B_{PC}, B_{CC}, B_{*}$ . For each transformation  $T$  among IC, SC, FL, PC, and CC, batch  $B_T$

consists of 10 PUTs  $P_T^1, \dots, P_T^{10}$ . Each PUT  $P_T^m$  corresponds to the sequence of transformations

$$T(p_{1,1}, p_{1,2}, \dots, H_{1,1}, \dots) T(p_{2,1}, p_{2,2}, \dots, H_{2,1}, \dots) \dots T(p_{m,1}, p_{m,2}, \dots, \text{fail}(), \dots) \quad (3)$$

with  $m$  transformations, all equal to  $T$ . In other words,  $B_T$  consists of increasingly long sequences of the same transformation  $T$  repeated multiple times. Similarly, batch  $B_\star$  consists of 10 PUTs  $P_\star^1, \dots, P_\star^{10}$ ; each PUT  $P_\star^m$  corresponds to the sequence of transformations (2), with  $n = m$  transformations, each transformation randomly chosen (possibly with repetitions) among IC, SC, FL, PC, and CC.

**Bug categories** In principle, HyperPUT’s seeded bugs can match any kind of errors; in our experimental evaluation, however, all seeded bugs are simply assertion failure. This is consistent with our research questions and experimental protocol, which follow how benchmarks of bugs are normally employed: to assess the capabilities of bug-finding tools on challenging, diverse buggy programs and *reach* a bug’s triggering location, independently of the nature and origin of the bug.

### 4.3 Experimental Setup

We ran all experiments on an Intel® Core™ i5 machine with 2 cores and 8 GB of RAM running Ubuntu 18.04 Bionic, LLVM 6.0.1, AFL 2.68c, CBMC 5.10, and KLEE 2.1.

Every PUT generated by HyperPUT accepts command-line arguments as input for its `main` function. This is the only input that a testing tool controls when testing a PUT. For example, when running KLEE, the command line argument array `argv` is instrumented with `klee_make_symbolic`, and the rest of the PUT is unmodified.

Each experiment runs one of the tools in Table 3 on a PUT with a timeout of 1 hour. The outcome is success if the testing framework successfully generates command-line inputs that trigger the `fail()` injected bug in the PUT. To accommodate fluctuations due to the operating system’s nondeterministic scheduling, as well as in possible randomization used by the testing frameworks, we repeat each experiment four to ten times, and report the average wall-clock running time as the experiment’s duration. The outcome is success if at least one of the repeated runs is successful (i.e., it triggers the bug).

### 4.4 RQ1: Fairness

A collection of bugs is *fair* if state-of-the-art bug detection techniques, especially those that are widely used in practice, can discover the bugs with reasonable effort; and if it is not strongly biased in favor or against any one detection technique. For a PUT-generation system like HyperPUT, *fairness* means that it should be capable of generating bugs with a broad spectrum of “detection hardness”—from simple to very challenging to discover.

To demonstrate *fairness*, we ran each of the tools AFL, CBMC, and KLEE on all PUTs in  $B$ . We then analyzed which tools were successful in triggering the bugs in the PUTs within the timeout.

### 4.5 RQ2: Reproducibility

A bug is *reproducible* if there is a known input that consistently triggers the bug. For a PUT-generation system like HyperPUT, *reproducibility* also entails that the PUTs compile without errors and do not rely on any undefined behavior of the C language. All PUTs generated by HyperPUT come with an input that triggers their unique bug. To assess *reproducibility*, we ran each PUT generated in the experiments with the triggering input, and checked whether the bug was triggered as expected.

HyperPUT generates PUTs that should be syntactically and semantically correct. To confirm this, we compiled each PUT generated in the experiments using both GCC (with options `-O0 -Wall` and `-O1 -Wall`) and LLVM (with options `-O0 -Wall` and `-O1 -Wall`), and checked that: *i*) both compilations succeeded without errors; and *ii*) both compiled versions behaved in the same way—namely, they fail when executed

with the triggering input. To detect the potential presence of undefined behavior, we also checked every generated PUT using LLVM’s Undefined Behavior Sanitizer [5], a compiler instrumentation that can detect several instances of undefined behavior.

## 4.6 RQ3: Depth and Rarity

Depth and rarity are two different ways of assessing the “hardness” of a bug for bug-detection techniques.

### 4.6.1 Depth

A bug is *deep* if triggering it requires to follow a long sequence of statements and branches. For a PUT-generation system like HyperPUT, bug *depth* depends on the structure and complexity of the PUTs themselves. To determine whether HyperPUT’s bugs are *deep*, we measured the following on every PUT in batch  $B$  generated in the experiments:

- The cyclomatic complexity of the PUT.<sup>1</sup> Cyclomatic complexity [47] is a static measure of complexity of a program’s branching structure, which counts the number of distinct simple execution paths a program has.

In order to assess the complexity of HyperPUT’s PUTs compared to that of programs in other benchmarks, we compare the cyclomatic complexity of PUTs in  $B$  to that of programs in CGC [3] and LAVA-1 [29]. Note that the PUTs generated by HyperPUT consist of a single main function, but programs in other benchmarks usually consist of several different functions; thus, we measure the cyclomatic complexity of each function in the programs in isolation, and report statistics about their distribution in each benchmark. We only measure the cyclomatic complexity of functions in the actual PUTs, not in any external library that is used by the PUTs.

- The length (in number of instructions executed at runtime) of the execution path that goes from the PUT’s entry to the bug-triggering statement,<sup>2</sup> when the PUT is executed with a triggering input. Path length is a dynamic measure of how deep a bug is within a path that triggers it. Similarly to cyclomatic complexity, we compare the path length of bugs in  $B$  to that of bugs in benchmark LAVA-1.

### 4.6.2 Rarity

A bug is *rare* if it is only triggered by a small fraction of all possible program inputs.

To determine whether HyperPUT’s bugs are *rare*, we ran KLEE on each buggy PUT with a timeout of 1 hour and measure the following:

- The number  $f$  of test cases generated by KLEE before first triggering the bug.
- The number  $t$  of test cases, among those generated within the timeout, that trigger the bug.

These measures give an idea of how sparse the bug-triggering inputs are in the space of all inputs that are generated by a systematic strategy.

In order to be able to compare HyperPUT’s measures of rarity with those of other benchmarks’, we only considered PUTs in batch  $B_{\geq 6}$  for this experiment. Batch  $B_{\geq 6}$  consists of the 19 PUTs in  $B_{10}$  with 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 transformations that KLEE can discover within the 1-hour timeout. We exclude PUTs with a much smaller or much larger input space, where these metrics would be arguably less robust and

---

<sup>1</sup>Measured using CCCC [43] and PMCCABE [11] open source tools.

<sup>2</sup>Measured using the profiling tool Cachegrind [51].

BATCH	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
$B_1$	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	10.0%	1	90.0%	9	0.0%	0
$B_2$	0.0%	0	2.2%	1	0.0%	0	15.6%	7	17.8%	8	0.0%	0	64.4%	29
$B_{10}$	22.0%	44	12.0%	24	6.5%	13	4.0%	8	8.5%	17	0.5%	1	5.5%	11
$B_{100}$	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	100
$B_{1000}$	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	100
$B$	9.7%	44	5.5%	25	2.9%	13	3.3%	15	5.4%	25	0.4%	2	10.8%	49
$A$	●		○		○		●		●		○		●	
$C$	○		●		○		●		○		●		●	
$K$	○		○		●		○		●		●		●	

Table 6: For each combination of tools (those marked by ● in each column), for each BATCH of PUTs used in the experiments, the percentage % and the absolute number # of PUTs in the batch whose unique bugs were triggered exclusively by the tests generated by those tools. For example, the leftmost column indicates that tool  $A$  managed to find bugs in 44 PUTs in batch  $B$  (9.7% of all PUTs in  $B$ ), which no other tool could find.

less indicative of rarity. We also exclude PUTs whose bugs KLEE cannot uncover, as the measures  $f$  and  $t$  are essentially undefined in these cases.

We compare these metrics of rarity for HyperPUT to those reported by Roy et al. [56] for 41 manually seeded bugs in the TCAS benchmark [27], as well as 82 synthetic bugs seeded using their Apocalypse system in the same TCAS programs. More precisely, Table 4 in [56] reports the number of all bug-triggering tests generated by KLEE within 1 hour, which corresponds to measure  $t$ . Figure 5 in [56] plots the number of tests generated by KLEE before hitting a first bug, which corresponds to measure  $f$ . We directly compare these to the same measures on HyperPUT’s PUTs, without repeating [56]’s experiments. We only use KLEE to investigate rarity both because it is a standard choice for this kind of assessment [56], and because its systematic exploration of program paths provides a more robust measure than others (such as testing time) that are strongly affected by the sheer size and complexity of the PUT as a whole—as opposed to its bugs’ specifically.

#### 4.7 RQ4: Capabilities

To further demonstrate the flexibility of HyperPUT’s generation, we look more closely at how different bug-finding tools perform on different batches of PUTs generated by HyperPUT. Which PUTs are easier or harder to analyze suggests which capabilities of the bug-finding tools are more or less effective to analyze programs with certain features.

We ran each of the tools AFL, CBMC, and KLEE on the PUTs in  $B_{IC}$ ,  $B_{SC}$ ,  $B_{FL}$ ,  $B_{PC}$ ,  $B_{CC}$ , and  $B_{*}$ . Since these batches include multiple repetitions of the same transformation, they demonstrate the generation of PUTs with homogeneous characteristics. By observing how each tool’s bug-finding capabilities change in different batches, and within each batch as the same transformation is repeated multiple times, we can outline each tool’s strengths and weaknesses in comparison with the other tools’ and link them to the characteristics of the transformations.

## 5 Experimental Results

### 5.1 RQ1: Fairness

Table 6 reports, for each batch of PUTs in Table 4, which testing tools were able to generate inputs triggering the PUTs’ unique bugs in our experiments. Row  $B$  corresponds to all PUTs used in these experiments. At least one of the tools  $A$ ,  $C$ , and  $K$  managed to detect bugs in 67.8% of all PUTs with less than 100 transformations.<sup>3</sup> The distribution is not strongly biased in favor of any tool—even though  $A$  was noticeably more effective than  $K$  and  $C$ , as it was the only tool capable of detecting the bugs in 9.7% of all PUTs. On the other hand, every tool was somewhat effective, and all three of them detected 10.8% of the bugs.

Among the individual batches of PUTs,  $B_{10}$  is the “fairest”, in that it includes PUTs that are challenging for each individual testing tool. In contrast, the PUTs in batches  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  are generally simple to analyze for most of the tools; and the PUTs in batches  $B_{100}$  and  $B_{1000}$  are overly complex, so much that no testing tool could detect their bugs in the allotted time. These results are a consequence of the different parameters chosen to create the PUTs in these batches. Overall, these results suggests that HyperPUT can generate PUTs with bugs that are *fair*, as they are a mix of elusive (highly challenging) bugs and simpler bugs that most practical testing frameworks can discover.

### 5.2 RQ2: Reproducibility

As expected, all PUTs produced by HyperPUT for our experiments passed the reproducibility checks discussed in Section 4.5. Namely:

1. Running each PUT on HyperPUT’s generated input triggers the unique bug in the PUT.
2. The PUTs compile without errors or warnings.
3. The PUTs behave in the same way regardless of which compiler is used to compile them.
4. LLVM’s Undefined Behavior Sanitizer does not report any source of undefined behavior in the PUTs.

These checks confirm that HyperPUT produces PUTs with reproducible seeded bugs, since they are well-formed and behave consistently as expected.

### 5.3 RQ3: Depth and Rarity

#### 5.3.1 Depth


Figure 3 summarizes the distribution of *cyclomatic complexity* measures for the functions in the PUTs generated by HyperPUT (batch  $B$ ), and compares it to the functions featuring in the benchmarks CGC and LAVA-1. HyperPUT can generate very complex PUTs according to this metric: even though some of CGC’s programs are an order of magnitude more complex, HyperPUT’s PUTs cover a broad range of cyclomatic complexities, and are those with the highest average complexity. This is a consequence of the way we configured HyperPUT to generate also large and complex PUTs in batches  $B_{100}$  and  $B_{1000}$  (as described in Section 4.2). It suggests that HyperPUT is capable of generating simple as well as complex PUTs, and hence can generate a diverse collection of synthetic buggy programs.

Cyclomatic complexity measures the branching complexity of programs, which is only a proxy for the complexity of the *bugs* that appear in the programs. In principle, a very complex program may have very shallow bugs if they occur in the first few lines of executable code. Path length—the number of

---

<sup>3</sup>Corresponding to batch  $B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_{10}$ .

instructions executed from program entry until the bug is triggered—better assesses the depth of the synthetic bugs in HyperPUT’s generated PUTs. Figure 4 summarizes the distribution of *path length* for each bug in the PUTs generated by HyperPUT (batch  $B$ ), and compares it to the path length of synthetic bugs in the benchmark LAVA-1.




(a) Box plots of the distributions of cyclomatic complexity per function. The vertical axis uses a logarithmic scale.

	HYPERPUT	CGC	LAVA-1
Mean	444	14	12
Median	18	13	4
Stddev	727	144	20
Min	3	1	1
Max	1902	16386	179
Functions	455	22893	18906

(b) Statistics about the distributions of cyclomatic complexity per function.

Figure 3: Distributions of cyclomatic complexity per function in three collections of buggy programs: the PUTs in batch  $B$  generated by HyperPUT, and benchmarks CGC [3] and LAVA-1 [29].



(a) Box plots of the distributions of path length per bug. The vertical axis uses a logarithmic scale.

	HYPERPUT	LAVA-1
Mean	4 858 702	4 108 228
Median	486 500	3 339 297
Stddev	7 710 406	1 644 766
Min	210 260	2 728 637
Max	22 936 332	8 775 398
Bugs	455	69

(b) Statistics about the distributions of path length per injected bug.

Figure 4: Distributions of the length of the execution path on a bug-triggering input in two collections of buggy programs: the PUTs in batch  $B$  generated by HyperPUT, and benchmark LAVA-1 [29].



	[56, Fig. 5]		
	HYPERPUT	TCAS	APOCALYPSE
Mean	7 888	23	345
Median	3 575	17	165
Stddev	12 240	22	569
Min	29	8	7
Max	53 389	152	4 366
Bugs	20	41	82

(a) Statistics about the number  $f$  of all test inputs generated by KLEE per bug before triggering the bug in: HyperPUT’s batch  $B_{\geq 6}$ , manually seeded bugs in TCAS, and synthetic bugs seeded with APOCALYPSE; the latter two are after [56, Fig. 5].

	[56, Tab. 4]		
	HYPERPUT	TCAS	APOCALYPSE
Mean	7 655 (409)	363	13
Median	2 518 (64)	213	1
Stddev	10 782 (541)	431	51
Min	1 (1)	24	1
Max	40 708 (1 402)	1805	341
Bugs	20	41	82

(b) Statistics about the number  $t$  of bug-triggering test inputs per bug generated by KLEE: HyperPUT’s batch  $B_{\geq 6}$ , manually seeded bugs in TCAS, and synthetic bugs seeded with APOCALYPSE; the latter two are after [56, Tab. 4].

Table 7: Number of KLEE-generated inputs as a measure of bug rarity.

HyperPUT’s synthetic bugs are deeper on average (mean), but LAVA-1’s bugs are not that far behind, and have a much higher median. In fact, HyperPUT’s have a higher standard deviation, as the batch  $B$  includes both small PUTs with shallow short-path bugs and large PUTs with bugs that are deeply nested.

As for other measures, this variety is a direct consequence of the way we configured HyperPUT (as described in Section 4.2). Overall, HyperPUT can generate shallow as well as deep bugs, including several that exhibit metrics similar to those of organic bugs.

### 5.3.2 Rarity


Table 7 shows statistics about the rarity of bugs in HyperPUT’s PUTs in  $B_{\geq 6}$ , and compares them to the analogous measures reported in Figure 5 and Table 4 of Roy et al. [56] about: *i*) bugs in the TCAS benchmark, which consist of manually seeded bugs in several variants of an organic program; *ii*) bugs seeded using the Apocalypse system (introduced in [56]) in the same programs of the TCAS benchmark.

As it can be seen, the average number of test cases is significantly higher for HyperPUT. Consequently, the corresponding PUTs require considerably more queries before being correctly analyzed by the testing framework.


In principle, our generator also allows to always inject bugs with exactly a single triggering input, but for the purpose of achieving more variety in the process, several additional transformations with small parameters have been included. In addition, some transformations (such as the ones of type FL) allow the testing framework to easily generate new triggering inputs by randomly modifying the corresponding command-line argument  $argv[i]$ . For this reason the values in parenthesis were introduced. They refer to the number of triggering test cases for PUTs in Batch  $B_{\geq 6}$  with non-negligible parameter size ( $n > 3$  for transformation  $PC$  and  $e \geq 90$  for transformation FL).

## 5.4 RQ4: Capabilities


The previous research questions demonstrated that HyperPUT is capable of producing PUTs with bugs with a broad range of characteristics, some comparable to those present in commonly used benchmarks for bug-finding tools. In particular, Section 5.1 suggests that different PUTs are more or less challenging




(a) PUTs in batch  $B_{IC}$ .




(b) PUTs in batch  $B_{SC}$ .




(c) PUTs in batch  $B_{FL}$ .



(d) PUTs in batch  $B_{PC}$ .



(e) PUTs in batch  $B_{CC}$ .



(f) PUTs in batch  $B_{*}$ .

Figure 5: Running time to discover the bug in each PUT in batches  $B_{IC}$ ,  $B_{SC}$ ,  $B_{FL}$ ,  $B_{PC}$ ,  $B_{CC}$ ,  $B_{*}$ . The horizontal axis enumerates the 10 PUTs in each batch in order of size (number of transformations). The vertical axis measures the running time (in seconds) until the tool terminates or times out (as in all other experiments, we report the average of 4 repeated runs). A colored filled disc indicates that the tool terminated successfully (it discovered the bug); a grayed out circle indicates that the tool terminated or timed out without discovering the bug. Data about AFL are in color blue, about CBMC are in color black, about KLEE are in color yellow.

for different bug-finding tools. In this section, we demonstrate how the variety of PUTs generated by HyperPUT can be used to exercise different capabilities of bug-finding tools.

To this end, we generated new batches of PUTs  $B_{IC}, B_{SC}, B_{FL}, B_{PC}, B_{CC}, B_{*}$ . As described in Section 4.7, PUTs in each batch  $B_T$  only use the same transformation  $T$ , and differ only in their size—measured as the number of repetitions of  $T$ . This way, we can understand how the characteristics of each transformation challenge a tool’s bug-finding capabilities. Figure 5 plots the running time of the considered testing frameworks when searching for bugs in these PUTs. Unsurprisingly, the performance of a tool clearly depends on the transformations that make up a PUT. Let’s look into each tool’s performance on the different batches.

CBMC is very effective on PUTs using transformations IC, SC, and FL, where it scales effortlessly. PUTs using transformations IC and SC have no loops, and hence CBMC can easily build an exhaustive finite-state abstraction. PUTs using transformations FL do have loops, but in this case CBMC manages to find a suitable loop unrolling bound that makes the analysis exhaustive without blowing up the search space. In contrast, CBMC’s performance suddenly blows up for the largest PUTs using 10 transformations PC and CC; in these case, loops whose exit condition depends on an input string become hard to summarize with a fixed, small unrolling bound past a certain size. Similarly, CBMC’s performance on batch  $B_{*}$  depends on how many and which transformations are used; in particular, as soon as the randomly generated PUTs include several nested loops with transformations PC or CC, CBMC runs out of resources and terminates in about 40 minutes without detecting the bugs.

KLEE is as effective as CBMC on PUTs using transformation SC. It outperforms CBMC on PUTs using transformations PC and CC, where it scales graciously to the largest PUTs thanks to its symbolic reasoning capabilities. On PUTs using transformation FL, KLEE is always effective, but its running times fluctuate somewhat unpredictably—albeit remaining reasonably low in absolute value. This is probably a result of running KLEE with randomized search (see Table 3), a feature that can speed up the search for bugs but also introduces random fluctuations from run to run. In contrast, KLEE struggles to scale on PUTs using transformation IC (both in batch  $B_{IC}$  and in batch  $B_{*}$ ). The problem here is not the transformation per se, but rather how it is instantiated in the PUTs generated for the experiments. As we explain in Section 4.2, parameter  $v_1$  in transformation IC is instantiated with `atoi(argv[1])`, which interprets a string command-line argument as an integer; since KLEE does not have access to the source code of library function `atoi`, it treats it as a black box, and hence its constraint solving capabilities are of little use to find efficiently a suitable string argument that `atoi` converts to the integer  $v_2$  (the transformation’s second parameter, instantiated with a random integer). This also explains the difference in performance with transformation SC, where there is no black-box function involved, and hence KLEE can easily find a suitable input string from the transformation’s condition itself.

AFL remains reasonably effective largely independent of which transformations are used; however, its running time tends to grow with the size of the analyzed PUT. This behavior—complementary to KLEE’s and CBMC’s—is a result of AFL being a gray box tool. In a nutshell, this means that AFL does not have direct access to the source code of the analyzed functions; thus, it cannot extract path constraints from it but has to “guess” them indirectly by trial and error. AFL’s gray-box strategy, combined with its many heuristics and optimizations, achieves a different trade off than white-box tools like KLEE and CBMC: AFL is an overall more flexible tool (in that it is less dependent on the characteristics of the analyzed software), but usually requires more time and has more random fluctuations in its behavior. Another difference is in scalability: AFL’s analysis time necessarily grows with the size of the inputs; in contrast, symbolic techniques like KLEE are much more insensitive to input size, as long as the complexity of the symbolic constraints does not vary.

Overall, these results demonstrate how HyperPUT can be used to generate PUTs with heterogeneous characteristics and sizes, which challenge different capabilities of diverse bug-finding techniques.

## 5.5 Limitations and Threats to Validity

We discuss the main limitations of HyperPUT’s technique, its current implementation, and other threats to the validity of the experiments described in this section, as well as how we mitigated them.

**Construct validity** depends on whether the measurements taken in the experiments reflect the features that are being evaluated. In our experiments, we mainly collected standard measures, such as running time, whether a bug-finding tool managed to trigger a bug, and static (cyclomatic complexity) and dynamic (path length) measures of complexity. For the experiments to answer RQ3, we also counted the number of triggering test cases and generated test cases for each bug—the same measures used by Roy et al. [56] to assess bug rarity. Using standard measures reduces the risk of threats to construct validity, and helps ensure that our results are meaningfully comparable with those in related work.

Our experiments to answer RQ4 were limited by the transformations currently supported by HyperPUT, and by how we combined them. These restrictions are still consistent with RQ4’s aim, which is to explore HyperPUT’s capabilities to exercise different testing techniques with PUTs of different characteristics.

**Internal validity** depends on whether the experiments adequately control for possible confounding factors. One obvious threat follows from possible bugs in our implementation of HyperPUT. As usual, we mitigated this threat with standard software development practices, such as (manual) regression testing, code reviews, and periodic revisions and refactoring.

To account for fluctuations due to the nondeterministic/randomized behavior of some testing tools, we followed standard practices by repeating each experiment multiple times, and reporting the average values (see Section 4.3). We usually observed only a limited variance in the experiments, which indicates that the practical impact of randomness was usually limited.

Our experiments ran with a timeout of one hour per analyzed bug; it is possible that some experiments would have resulted in success if they had been allowed a longer running time. We chose this timeout as it is standard in such experiments [56], and compatible with running a good number of meaningful experiments in a reasonable time. Our experiments showed a considerable variety of behavior, which suggests that the testing tools we used can be successful within this timeout.

A related threat is in how we configured the testing tools (see Table 3). AFL, CBMC, and KLEE are highly-configurable tools, and their performance can vary greatly depending on which options are selected. Our goal was not an exhaustive exploration of all capabilities of these tools, but rather a demonstration of their “average” behavior. Correspondingly, we mitigated this threat by: *i*) running each tool with two configurations; *ii*) including the default configuration (with no overriding of default options); *iii*) using common, widely used options.

To answer RQ3 in Section 4.6.2, we compared some measures taken on PUTs generated by HyperPUT with the same measures reported by Roy et al. [56]. Since we did not repeat [56]’s experiments in the same environment where we ran HyperPUT, we cannot make strong, quantitative claims about the results of this comparison. This limitation does not, however, significantly threaten our overall answer to RQ3, which is that HyperPUT can generate bugs whose rarity is realistic. [56]’s experiments are used as a reference for what “realistic” means, whereas our work’s aims are largely complementary.

**External validity** depends on whether the experimental results generalize, and to what extent.

HyperPUT currently generates PUTs with a trivial modular structure, consisting of a single function that only uses a handful of standard C libraries. On the other hand, each function can be structurally quite intricate, with bugs nested deep in the function’s control-flow structure. This is partly a limitation of the current implementation, but also an attempt to focus on generating PUTs that are *complementary* to organic bug-seeded programs. Detecting “deep” bugs is a relevant open challenge in test

automation [16], and synthetic buggy programs may be interesting subjects to demonstrate progress in addressing the challenge.

HyperPUT generates programs in C since this is a widely popular target for the research on automated testing and fuzzing. The ideas behind HyperPUT can certainly be applied to other programming languages, possibly with different results.

Similarly, the choice of transformations currently supported by HyperPUT obviously limits its broader applicability. HyperPUT’s implementation is extensible with new transformations; deciding which ones to add depends on the goal of the experiments one would like to make.

## 6 Conclusions

In this paper, we presented HyperPUT, a technique and tool to generate PUTs (Program Under Tests) with seeded bugs automatically, according to desired characteristics. The PUTs generated by HyperPUT can be useful as experimental subjects to assess the capabilities of bug-finding tools, and how they change according to the characteristics of the analyzed PUT. To demonstrate this, we generated hundreds of PUTs using HyperPUT, and ran the popular bug-finding tools AFL, CBMC, and KLEE on them. Our experiments suggest that HyperPUT can generate heterogeneous collections of PUTs, with several characteristics that resemble those of “ecologically valid” bugs [56].

The implementation of HyperPUT is extensible, so that users can easily add transformations and parameters to configure the generation of bugs according to the intended usage. As future work, we plan to further extend the flexibility of HyperPUT, so that it can also generate programs consisting of multiple functions and files, or it can extend an existing program with new functions and seeded bugs.

## Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

## Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Swiss National Science Foundation for the project (SNF Grant Number 200020-188613).

## Version of Record

This preprint has not undergone peer review or any post-submission improvements or corrections. The Version of Record of this article is published in Empirical Software Engineering, and is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-023-10430-8>.

## References

- [1] Busybox. <https://www.busybox.net/>. Accessed: 2022-05-13.
- [2] Cmplog instrumentation. <https://github.com/AFLplusplus/AFLplusplus/blob/stable/instrumentation/README.cmplog.md>. Accessed: 2022-06-01.
- [3] DARPA CGC 2018. <https://github.com/CyberGrandChallenge/>. Accessed: 2022-02-09.

- [4] HyperPUT (2022). github. <https://github.com/user28134zx2734/HyperPUT>. Accessed: 2023-02-10.
- [5] Undefined behavior sanitizer (ubsan). <https://clang.llvm.org/docs/UndefinedBehaviorSanitizer.html>. Accessed: 2023-02-20.
- [6] Circumventing fuzzing roadblocks with compiler transformations. <https://iafintel.wordpress.com/>, 2016. Accessed: 2022-06-01.
- [7] Paul Ammann and Jeff Offutt. *Introduction to Software Testing*. Cambridge University Press, 2nd edition, 2007.
- [8] Cornelius Aschermann, Sergej Schumilo, Tim Blazytko, Robert Gawlik, and Thorsten Holz. REDQUEEN: Fuzzing with Input-to-State Correspondence. In *26th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium, NDSS 2019, San Diego, California, USA, February 24-27, 2019*. The Internet Society, 2019.
- [9] Domagoj Babic, Stefan Bucur, Yaohui Chen, Franjo Ivancic, Tim King, Markus Kusano, Caroline Lemieux, László Szekeres, and Wei Wang. FUDGE: fuzz driver generation at scale. In Marlon Dumas, Dietmar Pfahl, Sven Apel, and Alessandra Russo, editors, *Proceedings of the ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/SIGSOFT FSE 2019, Tallinn, Estonia, August 26-30, 2019*, pages 975–985. ACM, 2019.
- [10] Roberto Baldoni, Emilio Coppa, Daniele Cono D’Elia, Camil Demetrescu, and Irene Finocchi. A Survey of Symbolic Execution Techniques. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 51(3):50:1–50:39, 2018.
- [11] Paul Bame. McCabe cyclomatic complexity for C and Cpp. <https://manpages.ubuntu.com/manpages/trusty/man1/pmccabe.1.html/>. Accessed: 2022-06-01.
- [12] Fabrice Bellard. QEMU, a Fast and Portable Dynamic Translator. In *Proceedings of the FREENIX Track: 2005 USENIX Annual Technical Conference, April 10-15, 2005, Anaheim, CA, USA*, pages 41–46. USENIX, 2005.
- [13] Dirk Beyer. Software Verification: 10th Comparative Evaluation (SV-COMP 2021). In Jan Friso Groote and Kim Guldstrand Larsen, editors, *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems - 27th International Conference, TACAS 2021, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2021, Luxembourg City, Luxembourg, March 27 - April 1, 2021, Proceedings, Part II*, volume 12652 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 401–422. Springer, 2021.
- [14] Dirk Beyer. Status Report on Software Testing: Test-Comp 2021. In Esther Guerra and Marille Stoelinga, editors, *Fundamental Approaches to Software Engineering - 24th International Conference, FASE 2021, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2021, Luxembourg City, Luxembourg, March 27 - April 1, 2021, Proceedings*, volume 12649 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 341–357. Springer, 2021.
- [15] Stephen M. Blackburn, Robin Garner, Chris Hoffmann, Asjad M. Khan, Kathryn S. McKinley, Rotem Bentzur, Amer Diwan, Daniel Feinberg, Daniel Frampton, Samuel Z. Guyer, Martin Hirzel, Antony L. Hosking, Maria Jump, Han Bok Lee, J. Eliot B. Moss, Aashish Phansalkar, Darko Stefanovic, Thomas VanDrunen, Daniel von Dincklage, and Ben Wiedermann. The DaCapo benchmarks: java benchmarking development and analysis. In Peri L. Tarr and William R. Cook, editors, *Proceedings of the 21th Annual ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Object-Oriented Programming, Systems, Languages, and Applications, OOPSLA 2006, October 22-26, 2006, Portland, Oregon, USA*, pages 169–190. ACM, 2006.

- [16] Marcel Böhme, Cristian Cadar, and Abhik Roychoudhury. Fuzzing: Challenges and Reflections. *IEEE Softw.*, 38(3):79–86, 2021.
- [17] Marcel Böhme, Van-Thuan Pham, and Abhik Roychoudhury. Coverage-based Greybox Fuzzing as Markov Chain. In Edgar R. Weippl, Stefan Katzenbeisser, Christopher Kruegel, Andrew C. Myers, and Shai Halevi, editors, *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, Vienna, Austria, October 24-28, 2016*, pages 1032–1043. ACM, 2016.
- [18] James Bornholt and Emina Torlak. Finding code that explodes under symbolic evaluation. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 2(OOPSLA):149:1–149:26, 2018.
- [19] David Bowes, Tracy Hall, Mark Harman, Yue Jia, Federica Sarro, and Fan Wu. Mutation-aware fault prediction. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis, ISSA 2016, Saarbrücken, Germany, July 18-20, 2016*, pages 330–341. ACM, 2016.
- [20] Cristian Cadar, Daniel Dunbar, and Dawson R. Engler. KLEE: Unassisted and Automatic Generation of High-Coverage Tests for Complex Systems Programs. In Richard Draves and Robbert van Renesse, editors, *8th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation, OSDI 2008, December 8-10, 2008, San Diego, California, USA, Proceedings*, pages 209–224. USENIX Association, 2008.
- [21] Cristian Cadar, Vijay Ganesh, Peter M. Pawlowski, David L. Dill, and Dawson R. Engler. EXE: Automatically Generating Inputs of Death. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst. Secur.*, 12(2):10:1–10:38, 2008.
- [22] Cristian Cadar and Koushik Sen. Symbolic execution for software testing: three decades later. *Commun. ACM*, 56(2):82–90, 2013.
- [23] George Candea and Patrice Godefroid. Automated Software Test Generation: Some Challenges, Solutions, and Recent Advances. In Bernhard Steffen and Gerhard J. Woeginger, editors, *Computing and Software Science - State of the Art and Perspectives*, volume 10000 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 505–531. Springer, 2019.
- [24] Vitaly Chipounov, Volodymyr Kuznetsov, and George Candea. The S2E Platform: Design, Implementation, and Applications. *ACM Trans. Comput. Syst.*, 30(1):2:1–2:49, 2012.
- [25] Edmund M. Clarke, E. Allen Emerson, and A. Prasad Sistla. Automatic Verification of Finite-State Concurrent Systems Using Temporal Logic Specifications. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 8(2):244–263, 1986.
- [26] Edmund M. Clarke, Daniel Kroening, and Flavio Lerda. A Tool for Checking ANSI-C Programs. In Kurt Jensen and Andreas Podelski, editors, *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems, 10th International Conference, TACAS 2004, Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2004, Barcelona, Spain, March 29 - April 2, 2004, Proceedings*, volume 2988 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 168–176. Springer, 2004.
- [27] Hyunsook Do, Sebastian G. Elbaum, and Gregg Rothermel. Supporting Controlled Experimentation with Testing Techniques: An Infrastructure and its Potential Impact. *Empir. Softw. Eng.*, 10(4):405–435, 2005.
- [28] Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, Josh Hodosh, Patrick Hulin, Tim Leek, and Ryan Whelan. Repeatable Reverse Engineering with PANDA. In Jeffrey Todd McDonald, Mila Dalla Preda, and Natalia Stakhanova, editors, *Proceedings of the 5th Program Protection and Reverse Engineering Workshop, PPREW@ACSAC, Los Angeles, CA, USA, December 8, 2015*, pages 4:1–4:11. ACM, 2015.

- [29] Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, Patrick Hulin, Engin Kirda, Tim Leek, Andrea Mambretti, William K. Robertson, Frederick Ulrich, and Ryan Whelan. LAVA: Large-Scale Automated Vulnerability Addition. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2016, San Jose, CA, USA, May 22-26, 2016*, pages 110–121. IEEE Computer Society, 2016.
- [30] Karine Even-Mendoza, Cristian Cadar, and Alastair F. Donaldson. Closer to the Edge: Testing Compilers More Thoroughly by Being Less Conservative About Undefined Behaviour. In *35th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2020, Melbourne, Australia, September 21-25, 2020*, pages 1219–1223. IEEE, 2020.
- [31] Javier Ferrer, Francisco Chicano, and Enrique Alba. Benchmark Generator for Software Testers. In Lazaros S. Iliadis, Ilias Maglogiannis, and Harris Papadopoulos, editors, *Artificial Intelligence Applications and Innovations - 12th INNS EANN-SIG International Conference, EANN 2011 and 7th IFIP WG 12.5 International Conference, AIAI 2011, Corfu, Greece, September 15-18, 2011, Proceedings, Part II*, volume 364 of *IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology*, pages 378–388. Springer, 2011.
- [32] Andrea Fioraldi, Dominik Maier, Heiko Eißfeldt, and Marc Heuse. AFL++ : Combining Incremental Steps of Fuzzing Research. In Yuval Yarom and Sarah Zennou, editors, *14th USENIX Workshop on Offensive Technologies, WOOT 2020, August 11, 2020*. USENIX Association, 2020.
- [33] Gordon Fraser and Andreas Zeller. Mutation-Driven Generation of Unit Tests and Oracles. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, 38(2):278–292, 2012.
- [34] Patrice Godefroid, Nils Klarlund, and Koushik Sen. DART: directed automated random testing. In Vivek Sarkar and Mary W. Hall, editors, *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 2005 Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, Chicago, IL, USA, June 12-15, 2005*, pages 213–223. ACM, 2005.
- [35] Patrice Godefroid, Michael Y. Levin, and David A. Molnar. SAGE: whitebox fuzzing for security testing. *Commun. ACM*, 55(3):40–44, 2012.
- [36] Ahmad Hazimeh, Adrian Herrera, and Mathias Payer. Magma: A Ground-Truth Fuzzing Benchmark. In Longbo Huang, Anshul Gandhi, Negar Kiyavash, and Jia Wang, editors, *SIGMETRICS '21: ACM SIGMETRICS / International Conference on Measurement and Modeling of Computer Systems, Virtual Event, China, June 14-18, 2021*, pages 81–82. ACM, 2021.
- [37] Rene Just, Darioush Jalali, and Michael Ernst. Defects4J: a database of existing faults to enable controlled testing studies for Java programs. July 2014.
- [38] Timotej Kapus and Cristian Cadar. Automatic testing of symbolic execution engines via program generation and differential testing. In Grigore Rosu, Massimiliano Di Penta, and Tien N. Nguyen, editors, *Proceedings of the 32nd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2017, Urbana, IL, USA, October 30 - November 03, 2017*, pages 590–600. IEEE Computer Society, 2017.
- [39] George Klees, Andrew Ruef, Benji Cooper, Shiyi Wei, and Michael Hicks. Evaluating Fuzz Testing. In David Lie, Mohammad Mannan, Michael Backes, and XiaoFeng Wang, editors, *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS 2018, Toronto, ON, Canada, October 15-19, 2018*, pages 2123–2138. ACM, 2018.
- [40] Karam Al Kontar, Freddy Naji, Salma Demiane, and Ramzi Haraty. A Survey on Mutation Testing Approaches. In *2019 IEEE CHILEAN Conference on Electrical, Electronics Engineering, Information and Communication Technologies (CHILECON)*, pages 1–7, 2019.



- [41] Markus Kusano and Chao Wang. CCmutator: A mutation generator for concurrency constructs in multithreaded C/C++ applications. In Ewen Denney, Tefvik Bultan, and Andreas Zeller, editors, *2013 28th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2013, Silicon Valley, CA, USA, November 11-15, 2013*, pages 722–725. IEEE, 2013.
- [42] Chris Lattner and Vikram S. Adve. LLVM: A Compilation Framework for Lifelong Program Analysis & Transformation. In *2nd IEEE / ACM International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (CGO 2004), 20-24 March 2004, San Jose, CA, USA*, pages 75–88. IEEE Computer Society, 2004.
- [43] Tim Littlefair. C and Cpp Code Counter. <http://cccc.sourceforge.net/>, 2005. Accessed: 2022-02-09.
- [44] Chenyang Lyu, Shouling Ji, Chao Zhang, Yuwei Li, Wei-Han Lee, Yu Song, and Raheem Beyah. MOPT: Optimized Mutation Scheduling for Fuzzers. In Nadia Heninger and Patrick Traynor, editors, *28th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2019, Santa Clara, CA, USA, August 14-16, 2019*, pages 1949–1966. USENIX Association, 2019.
- [45] Valentin J. M. Manès, HyungSeok Han, Choongwoo Han, Sang Kil Cha, Manuel Egele, Edward J. Schwartz, and Maverick Woo. The Art, Science, and Engineering of Fuzzing: A Survey. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, 47(11):2312–2331, 2021.
- [46] Michaël Marcozzi, Qiyi Tang, Alastair F. Donaldson, and Cristian Cadar. Compiler fuzzing: how much does it matter? *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 3(OOPSLA):155:1–155:29, 2019.
- [47] Thomas J. McCabe. A Complexity Measure. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, 2(4):308–320, 1976.
- [48] William M. McKeeman. Differential Testing for Software. *Digit. Tech. J.*, 10(1):100–107, 1998.
- [49] Jonathan Metzman, László Szekeres, Laurent Simon, Read Sprabery, and Abhishek Arya. FuzzBench: an open fuzzer benchmarking platform and service. In Diomidis Spinellis, Georgios Gousios, Marsha Chechik, and Massimiliano Di Penta, editors, *ESEC/FSE '21: 29th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, Athens, Greece, August 23-28, 2021*, pages 1393–1403. ACM, 2021.
- [50] Leonardo Mendonça De Moura and Nikolaj Bjørner. Z3: An Efficient SMT Solver. In C. R. Ramakrishnan and Jakob Rehof, editors, *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems, 14th International Conference, TACAS 2008, Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2008, Budapest, Hungary, March 29-April 6, 2008. Proceedings*, volume 4963 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 337–340. Springer, 2008.
- [51] Nicholas Nethercote. *Dynamic binary analysis and instrumentation: or building tools is easy*. PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, UK, 2004.
- [52] Mike Papadakis, Yue Jia, Mark Harman, and Yves Le Traon. Trivial Compiler Equivalence: A Large Scale Empirical Study of a Simple, Fast and Effective Equivalent Mutant Detection Technique. In *37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2015, Florence, Italy, May 16-24, 2015, Volume 1*, pages 936–946. IEEE Computer Society, 2015.
- [53] Mike Papadakis and Yves Le Traon. Metallaxis-FL: mutation-based fault localization. *Software Testing, Verification and Reliability*, 25(5-7):605–628, 2015.
- [54] Hui Peng, Yan Shoshitaishvili, and Mathias Payer. T-Fuzz: Fuzzing by Program Transformation. In *2018 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2018, Proceedings, 21-23 May 2018, San Francisco, California, USA*, pages 697–710. IEEE Computer Society, 2018.

- [55] Mauro Pezzè and Michal Young. *Software testing and analysis. Process, principles and techniques*. Wiley, 2007.
- [56] Subhajt Roy, Awanish Pandey, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, and Yu Hu. Bug synthesis: challenging bug-finding tools with deep faults. In Gary T. Leavens, Alessandro Garcia, and Corina S. Pasareanu, editors, *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/SIGSOFT FSE 2018, Lake Buena Vista, FL, USA, November 04-09, 2018*, pages 224–234. ACM, 2018.
- [57] David Schuler and Andreas Zeller. Covering and Uncovering Equivalent Mutants. *Softw. Test. Verification Reliab.*, 23(5):353–374, 2013.
- [58] Yan Shoshitaishvili, Ruoyu Wang, Christopher Salls, Nick Stephens, Mario Polino, Andrew Dutcher, John Grosen, Siji Feng, Christophe Hauser, Christopher Krügel, and Giovanni Vigna. SOK: (State of) The Art of War: Offensive Techniques in Binary Analysis. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2016, San Jose, CA, USA, May 22-26, 2016*, pages 138–157. IEEE Computer Society, 2016.
- [59] Richard Stallman and the GCC Developer Community. Using the GNU Compiler Collection (GCC). GCC version 10.2.0. <https://gcc.gnu.org/onlinedocs/gcc/>. Accessed: 2022-02-09.
- [60] Nick Stephens, John Grosen, Christopher Salls, Andrew Dutcher, Ruoyu Wang, Jacopo Corbetta, Yan Shoshitaishvili, Christopher Kruegel, and Giovanni Vigna. Driller: Augmenting Fuzzing Through Selective Symbolic Execution. In *23rd Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium, NDSS 2016, San Diego, California, USA, February 21-24, 2016*. The Internet Society, 2016.
- [61] Andrew S. Tanenbaum, Raja Appuswamy, Herbert Bos, Lorenzo Cavallaro, Cristiano Giuffrida, Tomás Hrubý, Jorrit N. Herder, Erik van der Kouwe, and David C. van Moolenbroek. MINIX 3: Status Report and Current Research. *Login Usenix Mag.*, 35(3), 2010.
- [62] Xuejun Yang, Yang Chen, Eric Eide, and John Regehr. Finding and understanding bugs in C compilers. In Mary W. Hall and David A. Padua, editors, *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI 2011, San Jose, CA, USA, June 4-8, 2011*, pages 283–294. ACM, 2011.
- [63] Xiangjuan Yao, Mark Harman, and Yue Jia. A study of equivalent and stubborn mutation operators using human analysis of equivalence. In *36th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE '14, Hyderabad, India - May 31 - June 07, 2014*, pages 919–930. ACM, 2014.
- [64] Michal Zalewski. American Fuzzing Lop (AFL). <http://lcamtuf.coredump.cx/afl/>, 2016. Accessed: 2022-02-09.