

IRFuzzer: Specialized Fuzzing for LLVM Backend Code Generation

YUYANG RONG, Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. and UC Davis, USA

ZHANGHAN YU, UC Davis, USA

ZHENKAI WENG, UC Davis, USA

STEPHEN NEUENDORFFER, Advanced Micro Devices, Inc., USA

HAO CHEN, UC Davis, USA

Modern compilers, such as LLVM, are complex pieces of software. Due to their complexity, manual testing is unlikely to suffice, yet formal verification is difficult to scale. End-to-end fuzzing can be used, but it has difficulties in achieving high coverage of some components of LLVM.

In this paper, we implement IRFuzzer to investigate the effectiveness of specialized fuzzing of the LLVM compiler backend. We focus on two approaches to improve the fuzzer: guaranteed input validity using constrained mutations and improved feedback quality. The mutator in IRFuzzer is capable of generating a wide range of LLVM IR inputs, including structured control flow, vector types, and function definitions. The system instruments coding patterns in the compiler to monitor the execution status of instruction selection. The instrumentation not only provides a new coverage feedback called matcher table coverage, but also provides an architecture specific guidance to the mutator.

We show that IRFuzzer is more effective than existing fuzzers by fuzzing on 29 mature LLVM backend targets. In the process, we reported 74 confirmed new bugs in LLVM upstream, out of which 49 have been fixed, five have been back ported to LLVM 15, showing that specialized fuzzing provides useful and actionable insights to LLVM developers.

CCS Concepts: • **Software and its engineering** → **Compilers**; • **Security and privacy** → **Software security engineering**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: fuzzing, LLVM, software analysis

ACM Reference Format:

Yuyang Rong, Zhanghan Yu, Zhenkai Weng, Stephen Neuendorffer, and Hao Chen. 2024. IRFuzzer: Specialized Fuzzing for LLVM Backend Code Generation. 1, 1 (February 2024), 23 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>.

1 INTRODUCTION

Modern compilers, such as LLVM [1], are complex software. For example, LLVM consists of over seven million lines of C/C++ code contributed by more than 2500 developers¹. Given the size of this codebase and its importance in the computing ecosystem, an effective and scalable verification method is critical. Despite extensive regression testing and wide usage, latent bugs remain and

¹<https://github.com/llvm/llvm-project>

Authors' addresses: Yuyang Rong, Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. and UC Davis, Davis, CA, USA, PeterRong96@gmail.com; Zhanghan Yu, UC Davis, Davis, CA, USA, hnryu@ucdavis.edu; Zhenkai Weng, UC Davis, Davis, CA, USA, zweng@ucdavis.edu; Stephen Neuendorffer, Advanced Micro Devices, Inc., San Jose, CA, USA, stephen.neuendorffer@amd.com; Hao Chen, UC Davis, Davis, CA, USA, chen@ucdavis.edu.

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

© 2024 Association for Computing Machinery.

XXXX-XXXX/2024/2-ART \$15.00

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

their impact on users can be quite significant given the widespread distribution and long lifetimes of compilers.

To reduce latent bugs, various techniques have been used to automate the verification of compilers, such as partial model checking [2], fuzzing [3–5], and differential testing [6, 7]. Although end-to-end formal verification of compilers has been applied [8, 9], these techniques have not yet scaled to practical compilers such as LLVM, which support a wide range of architectures, programming languages, and use models, including just-in-time compilation and link-time optimization.

In the specific case of LLVM, another factor making verification difficult is that the interface between the compiler optimization and machine code generation is widely used but not completely specified. As a result, it can be difficult for backend developers to understand whether they have completely implemented the wide range of possible inputs. In addition, backends often differ greatly in their relative code maturity, including some targets that are relatively mature and other targets for new devices that are in active development.

We find that the state-of-the-art fuzzers failed to find new bugs of a compiler backend for various reasons. General-purpose fuzzing techniques, such as AFL++ [10], often do not consider input validity and struggle to explore control paths in the compiler backend since most binary strings are invalid compiler inputs. In order to test the compiler backend more effectively, we aim to generate LLVM Intermediate Representation (LLVM IR) that complies with the language reference. LLVM includes `llvm-opt-fuzzer` and `llvm-isel-fuzzer` that generates valid IR for middle end and backend fuzzing, respectively [11]. Both of them are based on the library `FuzzMutate` [12] for valid IR mutation. However, `FuzzMutate` can't construct complex control flow, and it only generates a few instructions with scalar types. On the other hand, end-to-end fuzzing tools, such as `CSmith` [4] and `GrayC` [13], test the whole pipeline of the compiler, but they cannot to efficiently explore control paths in the compiler backend. `CSmith` does not take any feedback from the compiler, which contributes to its ineffectiveness. A more fundamental reason is that front-end parser and middle-end optimizations may limit the set of features seen by the compiler backend. High level languages like C may not exercise all backend features in LLVM. Therefore, even if `GrayC` used branch coverage feedback from `libFuzzer` [14], it missed many backend bugs introduced before LLVM 12, which were found by us. As a result, when a new language, such as Rust, is introduced, new backend bugs may still arise [15].

Generating valid IR is challenging with three major difficulties. In order to generate a complex control flow graph (CFG), we have to maintain all data dependencies to avoid use-before-definition situations. A valid CFG can be easily invalidated by a jump, as shown in [Figure 2](#). This challenge does not exist in C generation if one does not generate `goto` statements. Besides, modelling the instructions missing in `FuzzMutate` isn't trivial. We must make sure that the types of the operands in each IR instruction match, but enumerating the large numbers of natively supported vector types is infeasible. Finally, it is difficult to model intrinsic functions for all architectures, as intrinsics are often poorly documented and vary from architecture to architecture.

We also observe that AFL++'s feedback mechanism performed poorly when testing the backend. It uses branch coverage as feedback, which runs into severe branch collision problems when fuzzing large code bases such as LLVM. Naively increasing the branch counting table size introduces huge overhead [16]. A more fundamental reason is that much code generation logic in the LLVM backend is implemented using table-driven state machines. A matcher table encapsulates all possible states as a constant byte array, meaning that branch counting can't observe this logic during fuzzing. The fuzzer needs a better feedback on whether the seed is interesting or not. If the seed is not interesting, the feedback should also inform the mutator what type of input is more desired.

To address these issues, we design a specialized fuzzer, `IRFuzzer`, for fuzzing the LLVM compiler backend. [Figure 1](#) shows the overall structure of `IRFuzzer`. We first design a mutator that generates




Fig. 1. Overview of IRFuzzer. Green shaded components are the contributions of this paper, orange shaded components are AFL++, and blue shaded components are from LLVM. We first create a LLVM IR mutator that guarantees the correctness of the generated input (Section 3.1). We introduce a new coverage metric to keep track of the backend code generation while providing a mutation guide to the mutation module (Section 3.2).



Fig. 2. An example showing that naive mutation of CFG may break domination relations. Figure 2a shows the original CFG. If we randomly insert an edge shown in Figure 2b, BB2 won't dominate BB3 after mutation, and any value in BB3 referencing BB2 becomes invalid.

valid IR (Section 3.1). We maintain the correctness of CFG during mutation. We also use a descriptive language to list the requirements of each instruction type. This approach ensures that inputs to the compiler backend are always valid, increasing the efficiency of fuzzing. Our work expands the FuzzMutate to include aspects where compiler backends often have special handling, including multiple basic blocks with complex control flow, function calls, intrinsic functions, and vector types. Using IRFuzzer, we are able to generate a wider range of instructions and explore control paths in the compiler backends more efficiently.

Then, we introduce a new coverage metric (Section 3.2) by instrumenting the table-driven state machines in LLVM, enabling the design space to be more efficiently explored. New entries that are covered in the matcher table means new features are executed. Working together with branch coverage, they can provide a better feedback on whether a seed is interesting or not. Furthermore, the matcher table has all information about the instructions and intrinsics in one architecture. As a result, we use the matcher table to determine which instructions and intrinsics haven't been fuzzed. We design a feedback loop from the matcher table coverage to our mutator. IRFuzzer will periodically generate a coverage report containing the states that haven't been executed. The report will be sent to the mutator to guide future mutations, enabling IRFuzzer to test on different backends with no prior knowledge of the architecture.

We evaluate IRFuzzer on 29 mature backend architectures in LLVM (Section 5). Our results show that IRFuzzer is more effective than the state-of-the-art fuzzers such as AFL++ and GrayC. IRFuzzer generated inputs code with better edge coverage and matcher table coverage on 28 LLVM backends. Leveraging these techniques, we were able to find and report 74 confirmed, new bugs in LLVM, 49 of which have been fixed, five have been back ported to LLVM 15. This demonstrates the high impact on improving the correctness of LLVM backend targets.

This paper uses LLVM to demonstrate the importance of having a specialized fuzzer for the compiler backend. Since modern compilers have similar intermediate representations, we expect




Fig. 3. LLVM can be roughly partitioned into three components, frontend, middle end, and backend.




Fig. 4. AFL can be modelled as a four-stage loop that tests the executable repeatedly.

that our approach can be easily applied to other compilers without requiring heavy engineering efforts. We made the following contributions:

- We have designed and implemented IRFuzzer. To the best of our knowledge, IRFuzzer is the first backend fuzzer that uses coverage feedback to guide IR mutation.
- We compared IRFuzzer with other state-of-the-art fuzzers on LLVM upstream and found it to be the most effective on matcher table coverage metric.
- We carefully analyzed and categorized the bugs we found during our testing. In total, we discovered 74 confirmed new bugs in LLVM, 49 of them have already been fixed, five have been back ported to LLVM 15.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 LLVM

LLVM [1] is a mature compiler framework consisting of many components that can be targeted to different architectures. At its core lies the LLVM Intermediate Representation (LLVM IR), which serves as a target-independent abstraction separating the concerns of high-level programming languages from the low-level details of particular architectures. LLVM can be roughly partitioned into three layers as shown in Figure 3: A *frontend*, such as clang, translates programming languages to LLVM IR, including lexer, parser, AST transformation, etc. The *middle-end*, called opt, processes LLVM IR and performs common target-independent optimizations. The *backend*, called llc, converts LLVM IR to a target-specific machine code representation and eventually emits binary or assembly code for the target architecture. The LLVM backend supports multiple target architectures through a plug-in abstraction, and the code to support a target architecture typically involves the implementation of API functions to describe common aspects along with target specific code to implement more unusual concepts.

The LLVM IR describes a static single-assignment (SSA) form [17], with a fixed set of instructions. Instructions are strongly typed, and the type of each value must match between its definition and all uses. A wide range of types are supported, including integers with arbitrary bit width up to 65 536, floating point values, pointers, vectors, and other aggregate types. As with most high-level languages, LLVM IR allows the definition of functions, and the control flow between functions is implemented using the `call` instruction. Architecture specific intrinsic have no corresponding IR instructions, but are represented as function calls at IR level.

Control flow within a function in LLVM IR is represented using basic blocks and branch instructions. Special PHI instructions allow instructions in a basic block to refer to values defined in other basic blocks. Therefore, PHI instructions must respect control flow constraints and may only refer to values defined in predecessor blocks. This *domination constraint* [18] means that techniques used in high-level language generation cannot be easily adapted to LLVM IR.

```

1 void SelectCodeCommon(SDNode *N, char *MatcherTable) {
2     bool Result;
3     while (true) {
4         switch (MatcherTable[Idx++){
5             case OPC_CheckOpcode: {
6                 uint16_t Opc = MatcherTable[Idx++];
7                 Opc |= (unsigned short) MatcherTable[Idx++] << 8;
8                 Result = (Opc == N->getOpcode()); }
9             case OPC_CheckPredicate: ...
10            ...
11        }
12    }
13 }

```

Listing 1. SelectionDAG in LLVM that consumes a matcher table to do instruction selection.

The process of *instruction selection* in the LLVM backend replaces target-independent LLVM IR instructions with target-specific machine code instructions. LLVM provides two different frameworks to implement instruction selection that may be leveraged by the target backend plug-in. SelectionDAG [19] is the more mature instruction selection framework and is leveraged by all targets. In SelectionDAG, the code in each basic block is converted into a directed acyclic graph (DAG) representing the data dependency between instructions, and instruction selection is performed on the DAG. Since SelectionDAG processes each basic block independently, it can miss opportunities for optimization across basic blocks. GlobalSsel [20] is a newer framework that is only leveraged by some targets. GlobalSsel preserves the basic block structure within a function during instruction selection, enabling more optimization opportunities.

Both frameworks use *patterns* to describe rewrite rules applied during instruction selection. Some patterns are relatively simple and replace a single LLVM IR instruction with a single machine instruction. More complicated patterns may replace multiple LLVM IR instructions, or generate multiple machine instructions. Patterns may also include complex predicates to limit their applicability only to specific situations. For example, a pattern may only apply when a particular operand is a constant, or a certain hardware feature is enabled.

Most patterns are described declaratively in an LLVM-specific language called TableGen [21]. In order to optimize the application of patterns, TableGen translates individual patterns into a state-machine representation implemented as a large byte array in C++ known as the *matcher table*. During compilation, the state machine in the matcher table is executed on each IR instruction and determines the correct pattern (if any) to apply. Listing 1 is a C++ code snippet used to evaluate the matcher table in SelectionDAG. `SDNode` is a data structure that represents an IR instruction. The while loop iteratively reads a command from the matcher table based on the current state, represented by the `Idx` variable, evaluates the command, and selects the next state that will be evaluated. For example, `OpC_CheckOpcode` will check if the opcode of a given `SDNode` representing an instruction in the SelectionDAG graph matches a particular opcode. The `Result` will be used in future iterations, depending on the next entry in the matcher table. Evaluation of the matcher table continues until a single pattern is selected, or a state is reached where no patterns can apply.

Note that all patterns are evaluated using the same set of conditional branches in the switch statement in Listing 1. As a result, control flow coverage in the code is a **poor** indicator of whether all patterns have been exercised.

2.2 Coverage guided fuzzing

American Fuzzy Lop (AFL) [22] is a widely used open source fuzzing framework that implements a form of coverage-guided fuzzing, Figure 4 shows an overview of AFL. Rather than simply generate arbitrary inputs to a program under test (PUT), AFL instruments the PUT with the ability to track control-flow coverage. When a particular program input results in increased code coverage, AFL

stores this input in a *seed cache* for future use. When generating new random program inputs, AFL prefers to select previous inputs from the seed cache and further mutate them, rather than generating completely random input. Using this strategy, AFL and coverage-guided fuzzing tools are able to more quickly explore all different control-flow paths of the PUT, when compared to black-box fuzzing techniques without instrumentation.

Many variations of coverage guided fuzzing have been developed, with the goal of finding bugs more efficiently by exploring a wider range of program behaviors with future executions of the PUT [23]. There are studies on the impact of different feedback algorithms [24–26]. Different methods are proposed to prioritize seeds to improve the performance of fuzzing. [27–29]. Some fuzzers also target on triggering specific bugs [30–32]. More advanced mutation strategies also show better fuzzing performance compared with random mutation [33–37]. Many improvements of have been implemented in AFL++ [10], making it a good framework for further development.

LLVM also introduces its own coverage guided fuzzing framework libFuzzer [14], coupled with FuzzMutate [12], it can be used to fuzz LLVM backend. However, FuzzMutate only generates a limited type of code and is not under active development. Still, the framework provides us with helpful insights into how should we mutate LLVM IR.

2.3 Challenges in Compiler Fuzzing

We believe that compilers represent a particularly challenging area to apply fuzzing, due to the size and complexity of the PUT involved. First, the input program has to be semantically meaningful. With program context, many structured fuzzing techniques [38, 39] based on context-free grammar cannot be directly applied. For example, generating an IR instruction depending on a value that hasn't been defined yet may cause the module verifier to abort. While high-level languages use notions like scope or lifetime to notate whether a value can be used, LLVM IR does not have that. We can only reason the lifetimes of values in basic blocks by static analysis. For two blocks A and B , only when A *must* be executed before B , or A dominates B , can B directly reference values in A . However, when changing control flows, it is very easy to break that domination relation. For example, in Figure 2b, by adding an edge to the CFG we may invalidate the whole module and be rejected. We have to carefully maintain the CFG so that if a A dominates B , the relation remains the same after the control flow mutation.

In addition, we have to make sure the input has the correct syntax. LLVM IR is a strongly typed language with numerous types, including vector types and struct types, making it infeasible to explicitly enumerate types of legal operations. This challenge doesn't exist in some high-level programming language generation tasks like C [4, 5] and JavaScript [39–42]. What's worse, each architecture can implement its customized LLVM IR instructions called intrinsic functions. The internal definition of intrinsic are often poorly documented, as the implementation details are often proprietary. These constraints make it hard to enumerate and model all of them without architecture specific knowledge.

LLVM IR implements an SSA representation of code, which only allows each variable to be assigned once. Consequently, it is very easy to reason if a variable is used at static time. If an IR instruction is not used, it is a dead code and the compiler erases it. Therefore, we wish our generated instructions to rely not only on constants but also other instructions.

Finally, machine instructions do not correlate with instruction selection's control flow, rendering traditional code coverage ineffective. When compiling LLVM IR to binary executable, both backend algorithms (SelectionDAG and GlobalIsel) use a table-driven method. Architecture developers will write code generation patterns in TableGen. These patterns will be compiled by LLVM into a static table known as a matcher table. The matcher table contains both data and control instructions for


```

1  define i64 @f(i32 %I, <4 x i32> %V) {
2  Entry:   %ret_p = alloc i64, 1
3          %ret = load i64, ptr %ret_p
4          ret i64 %ret
5  }

```

Listing (2) A piece of LLVM IR program generated by function generation(Section 3.1.1). The function returns a 64 bit integer, so we allocate a stack memory and load from it to return. We will fill the memory later.

```

1  define i64 @f(i32 %I, <4 x i32> %V) {
2  EntrySrc:
3      %ret_p = alloc i64, 1
4      switch i32 %I, label %sCFG_Default [
5          i32 1, label %sCFG_1
6          i32 42, label %sCFG_42
7      ]
8  sCFG_Default: br label %EntrySink
9  sCFG_1:       br label %EntrySink
10 sCFG_42:     br label %EntrySink
11 EntrySink:
12 %ret = load i64, ptr %ret_p
13 ret i64 %ret
14 }

```

Listing (3) The program after mutation from Listing 2. Line 4 to 10 are introduced by sCFG insertion(Section 3.1.2). We insert sCFG by splitting the Entry block into two and generate a switch instruction.

```

1  declare i64 @llvm.smax.i64(i64, i64)
2
3  define i64 @f(i32 %I, <4 x i32> %V) {
4  EntrySrc:
5      %ret_p = alloc i64, 1
6      switch i32 %I, label %sCFG_Default [
7          i32 1, label %sCFG_1
8          i32 42, label %sCFG_42
9      ]
10 sCFG_Default:
11 %I64 = zext i32 %I, i64
12 br label %EntrySink
13 sCFG_1:
14 %I1 = add i32 %I, 1
15 %J64 = call @f(i32 %I1, <4 x i32> %V)
16 br label %EntrySink
17 sCFG_42:
18 %M = call @llvm.smax.i64(i64 0, i64 1)
19 br label %EntrySink
20 EntrySink:
21 %PHI = phi i64 [%I64, %sCFG_Default],
22              [%J64, %sCFG_1],
23              [%M, %sCFG_42]
24 store i64 %PHI, %ret_p
25 %ret = load i64, ptr %ret_p
26 ret i64 %ret
27 }

```

Listing (4) The program after mutation from Listing 3. Instruction insertion(Section 3.1.3) generated line 11, 15, 18, and 21. The placeholder memory is also used by %PHI to avoid undefined behavior (Line 24).

Fig. 5. An example of how IRFuzzer mutates a module using different strategies.

the pattern. At runtime, a while loop will consume this table. Thus, different instructions may be generated using the same control flow with different data.

3 DESIGN

To overcome those challenges in Section 2.3, we design IRFuzzer with two new components. Figure 1 shows the new components of IRFuzzer. During mutation, we first generate a function if there isn't one (Section 3.1.1). Then we change the control flow graph (CFG) to create more control flows (Section 3.1.2). Finally, we generate new IR instructions and mutate them (Section 3.1.3). Figure 9 shows an example of the mutation process using these mutation strategies. After mutation, we create a new method to measure the coverage of the program (Section 3.2).

3.1 LLVM IR mutation

In order to generate a wide variety of input while avoiding invalid inputs, we adopt a mutation-based strategy. This strategy starts with small valid seed inputs and modifies the seed inputs in ways that should also generate valid inputs. By randomly selecting between a number of small, well-defined mutations, we expect to eventually generate a broad class of valid inputs while avoiding invalid inputs. Figure 9 shows an overview of our design. We first generate an empty function is non is present (Listing 2). Then, we mutate the control flow by sCFG insertion (Listing 3). Finally, we modify or insert instructions in basic blocks (Listing 4).




Fig. 6. Examples of a successful CFG mutations by sCFG insertion on Figure 2. We break BB2 into two halves. No matter how complicated sCFG is, the domination relations are unchanged.

3.1.1 Function generation. The LLVM backend has a significant amount of target-specific code related to function calls. As a result, it is important to generate a wide range of function definitions and function calls with different arguments and return types.

IRFuzzer implements a mutation strategy capable of generating new function definitions with arbitrary arguments and return types. One important constraint is that the return type of the function signature matches the type of each return instruction in the function definition. To ensure this, the function generation strategy also synthesizes a load instruction of an appropriate type as the operand for a return instruction. Although the value returned from the load may be uninitialized, later mutations may store values to the memory, validating the return value.

IRFuzzer also implements a mutation strategy to generate new call instructions which refer to specific function declarations. The mutator is free to select any declared function and will generate compatible arguments and return values for the call, as with any other primitive instruction. Intrinsic functions are target specific operations that correspond to complicated machine instructions, and generating them will increase the code we can test. Yet they are treated as functions at middle-end. In particular, this mutation strategy will also select intrinsic functions to call.

3.1.2 Control flow graph mutation. Another area where target-specific code in the LLVM backend differs relates to control flow. Many machine code optimizations, such as jump threading, restructure control flow. In addition, certain compiler optimizations may select specific jump instructions, but this optimization can only be performed after instruction selection when code size and alignment are known. For instance, a common compiler optimization is to first select jump instructions into a “short” form with a limited offset range and then only later replace the short form with a “long” jump instruction if a larger offset is required. Control flow optimization can also affect register lifetimes, exercising target-specific code for spilling and restoring values from the stack.

IRFuzzer implements a structured approach to generating control flow. Inserting and removing arbitrary branches in the code can greatly change dominator constraints between basic blocks. For example, in Figure 2b, mutated from Figure 2a, BB2 no longer dominates BB3 after mutation. If any value in BB3 refers BB2, the module is invalid after mutation. We implement an elegant approach that uses sub-control flow graph, or sCFG, shown in Figure 6. Instead of changing edges, we split a block and insert sCFG inside.

A sCFG is a CFG with a single *source* entry block and a single *sink* exit block that will be placed inside a larger CFG. Within the sCFG, we allow the synthesis of an arbitrary control flow graph. However, every control flow edge starting in the sCFG must be contained within the sCFG, except for *source* edges, *sink* edges, and return instructions. With this restriction, we can insert sCFG into a program without breaking the dominator constraint by randomly selecting a block and splitting it into two. The first part is *source* and the second *sink*. After block splitting, we generate random sCFG starting from *source* and ending with *sink*.

The sCFG can be constructed with three main control schemas: *branch*, *switch*, and *return*, corresponding to different terminators of the basic block. We start with only one basic block and randomly select the terminator of the block. If the return schema is selected and the function requires a return type, we pick any value available that matches the return type of the function. If

Table 1. Instruction modeling for IR instructions.

Operation type	Opcode	Argument descriptions
Unary operation	<code>fneg</code> :	<code>anyFloatPointOrVectorFloatPoint</code>
Binary operations	<code>add, sub, mul, (s u)(div rem)</code> :	<code>anyIntOrVecInt</code> <code>sameAsFirst</code>
	<code>fadd, fsub, fmul, fdiv, frem</code> :	<code>anyFPOrVecFP</code> <code>sameAsFirst</code>
Bitwise operations	<code>shl, lshr, ashr, and, or, xor</code> :	<code>anyIntOrVecInt</code> <code>sameAsFirst</code>
Vector operations	<code>extractelement</code> :	<code>anyVector</code> <code>anyInt</code>
	<code>insertelement</code> :	<code>anyVector</code> <code>matchScalarOfFirst</code> <code>anyInt</code>
	<code>shufflevector</code> :	<code>anyVector</code> <code>matchLengthOfFirst</code> <code>VecOfConstI32</code>
Aggregate operations	<code>extractvalue</code> :	<code>anyAggregateOrArray</code> <code>anyConstInt</code>
	<code>insertvalue</code> :	<code>anyAggregateOrArray</code> <code>matchScalarOfFirst</code> <code>anyConstInt</code>
Memory operation	<code>getelementptr</code> :	<code>anySized</code> <code>pointerOfFirst</code> <code>anyInt</code>
Casting operations	<code>trunc</code> :	<code>anyNonBoolIntOrVecInt</code> <code>anyIntOrVecIntWithLowerPrecision</code>
	<code>zext, sext</code> :	<code>anyIntOrVecInt</code> <code>anyIntOrVecIntWithHigherPrecision</code>
	<code>fptrunc</code> :	<code>anyNonHalfFPOrVecFP</code> <code>andFPOrVecFPWithHigherPrecision</code>
	<code>fptoui, fptosi</code> :	<code>anyFPOrVecFP</code> <code>matchLengthOfFirstWithInt</code>
	<code>uitofp, sitofp</code> :	<code>anyIntOrVecInt</code> <code>matchLengthOfFirstWithFP</code>
	<code>ptrtoint</code> :	<code>anyPtrOrVecPtr</code> <code>matchLengthOfFirstWithInt</code>
	<code>ptrtoint</code> :	<code>anyIntOrVecInt</code> <code>matchLengthOfFirstWithPtr</code>
	<code>bitcast</code> :	<code>anyType</code> <code>anyTypeWithSameBitWidth</code>
Other operations	<code>icmp</code> :	<code>anyIntOrVecInt</code> <code>sameAsFirst</code>
	<code>fcmp</code> :	<code>anyFPOrVecFP</code> <code>sameAsFirst</code>
	<code>select</code> :	<code>anyBoolOrVecBool</code> <code>matchLengthOfFirst</code> <code>sameAsSecond</code>

a branch or switch is selected as the terminator, we will find a previously generated non-constant value as a condition. If no such values can be found, we will allocate a stack memory as a placeholder. The branch can go to one of three places: *sink*, self-loop or return. If we generate a self-loop, we will also update all the PHI nodes in the block to include a new value.

Finally, all terminators will be generated when we are mutating CFG. Note that our instruction generation strategies will not mutate terminators in order to protect the integrity of the CFG.

3.1.3 Instruction modeling and generation. A key aspect of the LLVM backend is to convert the wide range of LLVM IR types to the (usually small) set of types natively implemented by each target architecture. Therefore, to exercise all features of code generation, it is necessary to generate IR instructions with as many data types as possible. However, many IR instructions only operate on a restricted set of data types, and FuzzMutate only modelled scalar types, which is trivial and limited. In order to model these restrictions for vector types, we categorize instructions as shown in Table 1. These definitions are reflected in the code as declarative declarations expressing both restrictions on the types of operands and constraints between the types of different operands. For example, the `anyIntOrVecInt` constraint restricts the valid types for a particular operand to be any integer type or vector of integer type. The `matchFirstOperand` constraint restricts the type of operand to be the same as the type of the first operand.

When generating a new instruction, we first randomly select an opcode and use the declarations to randomly select values that exist in the code with a compatible type. If no value exists with a compatible type, then the mutator will create a new operation with a compatible type. For numerical types, the new operation could generate a random constant, undef, or poison.

In addition, a small number of operations are not modeled declaratively. For instance, `store` and `load` memory operations are structured differently enough from other operations that modeling them is not necessary. Some other instructions have constraints which are too complex to be simply handled in the declarative framework, and we resort to custom generators. For instance, instructions representing PHI nodes must be created with a number of operands equal to the number of predecessor blocks and must occur at the start of their basic block. Similarly, `call` instructions

Table 2. Matcher table size in all architectures in LLVM on commit 860e439f. Since GlobalSel is a new CodeGen framework introduced in 2015, only eight architectures have implemented it.

Architecture	SelectionDAG	GlobalSel	Architecture	SelectionDAG	GlobalSel
AArch64	489 789	278 233	Mips	54 044	60 449
AMDGPU	493 556	338 444	NVPTX	186 134	-
ARC	1998	-	PowerPC	190 304	83 201
ARM	201 172	130 029	RISCV	2 191 899	190 009
AVR	2973	-	Sparc	6607	-
BPF	3586	-	SystemZ	53 271	-
CSKY	19 076	-	VE	71 577	-
Hexagon	178 277	-	WASM	25 991	-
Lanai	2337	-	X86	680 916	61 488
M68k	18 850	2388	XCore	3854	-
MSP430	9103	-			

are handled manually too, since we must select a function declaration and find values that exactly match the operand types of the declaration.

To ensure that values are defined before they are used, the mutator searches for values defined in the following locations: global variable, function argument, values in dominators, and values defined by previous instructions in the same basic block. If no value with a compatible type exists, the mutator will attempt to generate a load from a compatible pointer, if one exists. Lastly, if a value with a compatible pointer type exists, the mutator will fall back to either creating a new global variable, a new constant value, or a load from a stack memory location.

In some cases, the mutator may create IR instructions that define values which are never used. Since such dead code is likely to be removed by the compiler before instruction selection, the mutator will attempt to create a use for such values. One possibility is to store dead values to stack memory or a global variable. Alternatively, if there are instructions after the definition, or the current block dominates other blocks, the mutator may select an instruction with a compatible operand to replace.

When generating instructions, it is possible that the mutator allocated new stack memory as placeholders. In order to avoid undefined behavior, the mutator will again attempt to replace loads from these placeholders with other values of compatible type. If no such value exists, then the mutator will store a value into the placeholder location.

We don't model intrinsic functions, as they vary from architecture to architecture, potentially consuming a lot of time with little outcome. Instead, we rely on the feedback from matcher table coverage (Section 3.2.2). Matcher table coverage report contains a list of intrinsics that haven't been generated in the form of function definitions. Then, the mutator will randomly generate *call* instructions to intrinsic from this report.

3.2 Matcher table feedback

3.2.1 Matcher table instrumentation. Machine instruction generation does not correspond to compiler control flow. Different instructions can be generated by the same control flow due to the matcher table. Consequently, many patterns may not be generated yet even if edge coverage is high. To overcome this, we track the usage of the matcher table.

Similar to edge coverage, we allocate a table when the compiler starts in order to track the coverage of the matcher table. Every time an entry in the matcher table is accessed, we will record that access in our table as well.

Natively tracking the number of accesses like edge coverage is a huge memory overhead. The second and fifth column of [Table 2](#) show the size of the matcher table in different architectures. The matcher tables for mainstream architectures like X86 and AArch64 have several hundred thousand entries, RISC-V even has about two million entries. Natively assigning a counter to each entry like AFL++ will cost hundreds of KB of runtime memory, which will lower the fuzzing throughput [24].

Unlike control flow where the edge’s execution count represents different program semantics, a matcher table entry being accessed multiple times only means the same pattern is triggered multiple times. Therefore, we only track whether an entry is accessed or not, i.e., we use a boolean to track each entry. During instrumentation, we pack eight booleans into a byte to save space. If the table size is not a multiple of eight, we pad extra booleans.

During fuzzing, to access an entry in the matcher table, the fuzzer can calculate the offset of the entry’s corresponding boolean using its index. After execution, the instrumented compiler will report a matcher table coverage back to the fuzzer. The fuzzer will use edge coverage *and* matcher table coverage together. If either table shows new coverage, we will consider the input as new.

3.2.2 IR mutation feedback. While the matcher table can help filter out not interesting seeds, it also contains knowledge whether an instruction or intrinsic is generated or not. We wish to pass that feedback to the mutator, so it can generate more diverse inputs. However, decoding the meaning of each entry in the matcher table is non-trivial, as LLVM hides this information when preparing the matcher table.

We first modify TableGen to dump a look-up table specifying the correspondence of matcher table entries and machine instruction patterns. The pattern reveals the condition on a specific instruction or intrinsic being generated.

Prior to fuzzing, we dump this look-up table for each architecture. During fuzzing, we will decode the matcher table coverage using the look-up table to determine which instructions haven’t been generated yet. For instructions that haven’t been generated, we model the condition of it; for intrinsic, we model the intrinsic as an LLVM IR function definition. Finally, we compile this information into a report and send back to the mutator to increase the chance of them being generated. This feedback is done every ten minutes, so we can provide a meaningful feedback while minimizing the runtime overhead.

4 IMPLEMENTATION

Our implementation is based on prior work FuzzMutate[12] and AFL++ [10]. FuzzMutate introduced a naive mutator with around 1000 lines of code. We add more mutation strategies for function calls, control flow graph mutation, and arbitrary data types. The mutator described in [Section 3.1](#) consists of approximately 2000 new lines of C++ code, which has been contributed to the upstream LLVM’s repository, augmenting the existing mutator strategies.

We implement our matcher table coverage described in [Section 3.2.1](#). The implementation combines a compiler plugin to measure the size of each matcher table and insert appropriate instrumentation, along with a small runtime library to allocate and track the coverage information. It is implemented in around 1000 lines of C and C++.

We modify TableGen to dump a look-up table for each matcher table described in [Section 3.2.2](#). Our decode and feedback report code is implemented in around 1000 line of C++. IRFuzzer is anonymously published [43], and we plan to open-source IRFuzzer once the paper is accepted.

5 EVALUATION

In order to understand how IRFuzzer helps to test LLVM code generation, we implement IRFuzzer and evaluate it. In the rest of this section, we will fuzz LLVM with different settings and tools to gain some insights to these research questions.

- **RQ1:** How does IRFuzzer compare with state-of-the-art backend fuzzers?
- **RQ2:** How does IRFuzzer compare with end-to-end fuzzers like CSmith and GrayC?
- **RQ3:** Does mutator and feedback individually contribute to IRFuzzer?
- **RQ4:** Can IRFuzzer help find new bugs in LLVM?
- **RQ5:** What are the insights we can gain from the bugs we found?

The upstream LLVM repository (commit 860e439f) currently supports 21 architectures listed in Table 2, excluding experimental ones. We only test on mature architectures that have a matcher table size larger than 25 000. In addition, each architecture may provide different features that can be enabled on different hardware. For simplicity, we select the backend of some popular microchips, which has a predefined set of features. These backends are widely used from user product to server applications, justifying the variety of our choice. All architectures we tested are under active development. As a result, we select 29 target CPUs² across 12 architectures.

We use two baseline fuzzers: AFL++ with no modification and AFL++ whose mutation module replaced with FuzzMutate. We will refer to it as FuzzMutate thereafter. All fuzzers used AFL++’s default scheduling. For fairness, we collect the seeds generated by each fuzzer and measure their branch table coverage and matcher table coverage. Branch coverage is reported by AFL++ using classical instrumentation and a default 64 KB table. Matcher table coverage is calculated as the entries accessed divided by matcher table size listed in Table 2.

We prepare two versions of IRFuzzer. The one labelled IRF has all designs described in Section 3. On the other hand, we strip all the feedback mechanism described in Section 3.2 and label it IRF_{bare}. When comparing with FuzzMutate, IRF_{bare}’s performance will tell us how our mutator is doing, while comparing with IRF can reveal the contribution of the feedback mechanism.

Each fuzzer process was dedicated to a single processor core on an x86_64 server with two 20-core CPUs and 692 GB of memory. Each fuzzing process lasted for one day to allow adequate exploration [44]. In addition, each experiment was repeated five times and the results were averaged to reduce random effects. To demonstrate IRFuzzer’s ability to mutate IR modules and to provide a fair comparison with AFL++, each fuzzer process was initialized with 92 seed. The seeds are randomly selected from LLVM’s unit testing, and they are smaller than 256 bytes to increase the throughput. The seeds are anonymously published in the artifact [43].

5.1 Baseline comparison

To evaluate our strategy, we compare with two baseline implementations: AFL++ and the upstream LLVM implementation of FuzzMutate. Unmodified AFL++ lacks an LLVM IR-aware mutator, and hence we expect it to often generate invalid inputs that fail to meet the syntactic and semantic constraints of LLVM IR. On the other hand, FuzzMutate has a limited LLVM IR-aware mutator.

The result can be found in Table 3. The 3rd and 8th column shows the coverage brought by initial seeds. **Bold** numbers are the best statistical significance ($p < 0.05$) when compared with other baseline fuzzers using Mann Whitney U Test.

Overall, we see AFL++ performed poorly for the purpose of testing LLVM compiler backends. In most backends, it cannot increase much matcher table coverage due to its lack of support for structured input; IRFuzzer covered more branches than AFL++ on 28 target CPUs. The output

²“Target CPU” is used in LLVM to label a backend corresponding to a microchip. It can also refer to GPU or other DSP.

Table 3. Branch table coverage and matcher table coverage on 29 target CPUs across 12 targets in SelectionDAG. Statistics are the arithmetic mean over five trials. Bold entries are the best among baseline fuzzers. FM means AFL++ coupled with FuzzMutate, IRF means IRFuzzer

Arch	Target CPU	Branch coverage					Matcher table coverage				
		Seeds	AFL++	FM	IRF	IRF _{bare}	Seeds	AFL++	FM	IRF	IRF _{bare}
AArch64	apple-a16	59.8%	87.1%	82.9%	94.7%	93.9%	0.7%	1.6%	2.6%	8.2%	7.3%
	apple-m2	59.8%	86.9%	83.3%	94.8%	93.6%	0.7%	1.6%	2.6%	8.2%	7.2%
	cortex-a715	60.0%	87.7%	83.2%	94.0%	93.6%	0.7%	1.7%	2.6%	9.4%	7.2%
	cortex-r82	60.1%	87.0%	82.9%	93.9%	93.6%	0.7%	1.6%	2.6%	7.6%	7.2%
	cortex-x3	60.0%	93.3%	85.2%	94.1%	<u>94.5%</u>	0.7%	7.1%	2.7%	9.1%	7.6%
	exynos-m5	60.3%	87.4%	83.2%	93.9%	<u>94.5%</u>	0.7%	1.7%	2.6%	7.8%	7.5%
	tsv110	60.0%	87.3%	82.9%	93.2%	<u>94.1%</u>	0.7%	1.6%	2.6%	7.5%	7.3%
AMDGPU	gfx1036	70.8%	90.0%	89.1%	96.9%	96.7%	0.9%	2.1%	2.7%	4.9%	4.5%
	gfx1100	71.2%	89.7%	89.9%	97.0%	96.3%	1.0%	2.1%	2.9%	4.9%	4.5%
ARM	generic	55.5%	87.9%	82.5%	88.6%	88.4%	1.7%	4.3%	4.3%	5.2%	5.1%
Hexagon	hexagonv71t	64.8%	88.0%	86.0%	93.6%	93.2%	1.7%	6.6%	17.0%	30.6%	21.0%
	hexagonv73	64.9%	89.5%	85.7%	94.4%	93.4%	1.7%	7.3%	17.4%	32.2%	21.1%
Mips	mips64r6	52.5%	81.0%	72.7%	85.9%	84.5%	3.8%	10.0%	15.3%	17.8%	16.6%
NVPTX	sm_90	46.6%	77.5%	77.5%	87.0%	84.5%	1.7%	3.1%	4.7%	26.5%	6.2%
PowerPC	pwr9	60.3%	87.3%	86.9%	94.5%	94.1%	1.2%	3.6%	7.1%	19.6%	15.9%
RISCV	rocket-rv64	53.7%	83.0%	76.6%	86.4%	<u>87.4%</u>	1.2% _{oo}	2.0% _{oo}	2.2% _{oo}	2.2%_{oo}	<u>2.3%_{oo}</u>
	sifive-u74	54.5%	83.1%	75.9%	86.7%	86.6%	1.4% _{oo}	2.4% _{oo}	2.9% _{oo}	3.0%_{oo}	3.0% _{oo}
	sifive-x280	55.0%	84.1%	75.7%	88.6%	<u>89.7%</u>	1.4% _{oo}	2.7% _{oo}	3.1% _{oo}	30.6%_{oo}	<u>31.5%_{oo}</u>
SystemZ	z15	55.3%	84.0%	81.5%	89.9%	<u>91.0%</u>	5.2%	13.7%	27.1%	43.8%	38.7%
	z16	55.3%	83.7%	81.8%	89.8%	89.7%	5.2%	14.1%	26.5%	43.9%	37.6%
VE	generic	49.0%	80.4%	70.2%	84.4%	83.1%	3.5%	8.1%	11.4%	14.0%	12.6%
WASM	bleeding-edge	46.8%	84.7%	70.5%	82.9%	<u>83.2%</u>	4.1%	36.9%	10.9%	37.6%	35.9%
	generic	46.6%	80.2%	69.7%	80.6%	<u>81.9%</u>	4.1%	11.8%	10.6%	11.7%	<u>11.8%</u>
X86	alderlake	61.2%	88.0%	84.6%	94.7%	93.7%	0.7%	1.8%	3.1%	8.0%	6.2%
	emeraldrapids	60.5%	93.4%	84.4%	93.7%	93.5%	0.6%	12.5%	3.2%	13.9%	12.4%
	raptorlake	61.2%	93.5%	85.8%	94.5%	93.7%	0.7%	6.2%	3.3%	8.0%	6.2%
	sapphirerapids	60.5%	88.4%	85.4%	93.7%	93.2%	0.6%	1.8%	3.3%	14.0%	12.2%
	znver3	61.8%	86.6%	84.0%	93.8%	<u>94.3%</u>	0.7%	1.6%	3.0%	7.7%	6.5%
	znver4	61.0%	87.6%	84.0%	93.7%	<u>94.2%</u>	0.7%	1.8%	3.2%	13.2%	12.6%

generated by AFL++ did not provide significant coverage of instruction selection patterns, as measured by the low matcher table coverage.

Both FuzzMutate and IRFuzzer reached high code coverages. FuzzMutate reached more than 75% except for generic-la64, mips64r6, generic VE, and generic WebAssembly. On the other hand, IRFuzzer performed better, achieving over 80% branch coverage for all target CPUs.

It is not sufficient to only compare branch coverage [16]. More significantly, IRFuzzer reached number one in matcher table coverage on all CPUs, indicating significantly better coverage of instruction selection patterns.

We observe that in generic WebAssembly, IRFuzzer shows no significance compared with other fuzzers. After investigation, we find that generic WebAssembly disabled many features, limiting the maximum reachable matcher table to 11.8%. This does not show that IRFuzzer is less effective on WebAssembly, as we can see that IRFuzzer still rank number one in the bleeding-edge version.

In summary, IRFuzzer achieved higher branch coverage and matcher table coverage on 28 out of 29 target CPUs. To answer **RQ1**, IRFuzzer is better at coverage when fuzzing LLVM code generation compared with state-of-the-art fuzzers.

Table 4. Average branch table coverage and matcher table coverage of CSmith (CS), GrayC, and IRFuzzer (IRF). O2 to O3 stands for different optimization levels. Bold entries are the winners.

(a) O2							(b) O3						
Arch	Branch table coverage			Matcher table coverage			Arch	Branch table coverage			Matcher table coverage		
	CS	GrayC	IRF	CS	GrayC	IRF		CS	GrayC	IRF	CS	GrayC	IRF
AArch64	94.8%	96.1%	93.3%	5.2%	6.9%	7.9%	AArch64	95.3%	96.2%	92.6%	5.4%	6.9%	7.7%
ARM	90.7%	92.3%	87.2%	4.5%	4.5%	5.1%	ARM	91.1%	92.5%	86.1%	4.5%	4.5%	4.9%
X86	94.8%	96.1%	91.9%	3.5%	4.2%	4.7%	X86	94.9%	96.2%	91.5%	3.5%	4.2%	4.6%

5.2 Comparison with end-to-end fuzzers

In order to better understand the benefits of targeted fuzzing compared to end-to-end fuzzing, we also compare IRFuzzer with CSmith [4] and GrayC [13]. Unlike IRFuzzer, end-to-end fuzzers generate C code, which must be processed by the compiler frontend and middle-end before reaching the backend. As a result, they exercise the entire compilation pipeline, rather than focusing on just the backend. Note that although CSmith generates random, syntactically correct C code, it does not implement any instrumentation and lacks feedback from executions to guide the generation process. While GrayC relies on branch coverage feedback, it does not have feedback that is customized for backends of the compilers. Besides, to test end-to-end fuzzers, we have to cross compile C to different architectures. Cross compilation itself is difficult, as we have to set up the proper tool chain for it. Therefore, we test on three most widely used architectures using generic backend.

CSmith generates C files with no initial seed. To make comparison fair, we also run IRFuzzer with **no** initial seed, since IRFuzzer is capable of generating LLVM IR from scratch. GrayC relies on deprecated APIs in LLVM 12 and can't instrument the latest LLVM, thus we download the artifact provided by GrayC [45]. The artifact consists of 715 147 C programs across ten trials. We run CSmith for 24 hours and repeat eight times, generating a total of 506 971 C programs.

We cross compile these C programs to different architectures. After compilation, we measure the resulting control-flow and matcher table coverage in the compiler backend, using the same instrumentation as IRFuzzer. 11c default optimization to O2, therefore we only test O2 and O3, as O0 and O1 are often subsets of O2. The results are shown in Table 4.

IRFuzzer achieved higher matcher table coverage on all architectures and all optimizations. Even with branch coverage feedback, GrayC is not able to generate C inputs with more matcher table coverage, further demonstrating the necessity for specialized backend fuzzing. We looked into the code generated by end-to-end fuzzers and found the reason for the coverage differences. The inferiority of matcher table coverage of end-to-end fuzzers was largely related to a lack of coverage of vector data types. Vector instructions can only be generated when the frontend and middle-end decide a vector instruction will speed up a particular piece of code, which turns out to be rather unlikely for random C programs. However, since IRFuzzer operates on IR instructions, it can generate vector operations without relying on the frontend or middle-end of the compiler.

On the other hand, CSmith and GrayC achieved higher branch coverage. After investigation, we find that the size of generated files contributed to the difference. IRFuzzer generates bit code less than 10 KB to achieve higher throughput. Seeds generated by CSmith average to more than 40 KB after we compiled them to bit code. This means that many backend edges are executed more times, which would increase branch coverage in AFL's design. This does not show IRFuzzer's inferiority. IRFuzzer can reach fair coverage in much smaller inputs, showing the efficiency of specialized backend fuzzing.

Our evaluation answers **RQ2**, IRFuzzer achieved higher matcher table coverage than state-of-the-art end-to-end fuzzers. This shows that backend testing should not solely rely on end-to-end fuzzing, and that specialized fuzzing can improve matcher table coverage significantly.

5.3 Individual contributions

We are interested to know how each component helps IRFuzzer. Therefore, we strip all feedbacks in IRFuzzer to get IRFuzzer_{bare}. Comparison of fuzzing results can be found in [Table 3](#).

Comparing IRFuzzer_{bare} with FuzzMutate, we find that IRFuzzer_{bare} **always** reach higher branch coverage and matcher table coverage. This means that our mutator is able to generate more diverse input than FuzzMutate. Although FuzzMutate is also a structured mutator, it lacks many advanced features we designed in [Section 3.1](#). Sifive-x280 best demonstrates this improvement: on sifive-x280, IRFuzzer_{bare} can cover 31.5% of the matcher table, while FuzzMutate only reached 3.1%.

On the other hand, when comparing the last two columns of [Table 3](#), we find that IRFuzzer is able to cover more matcher table in 26 out of 29 target CPUs compared with IRFuzzer_{bare}. IRFuzzer didn't show superiority on three target CPUs (rocket-rv64, sifive-x280, generic WebAssembly) mainly because both fuzzers reached coverage ceilings allowed by that target CPU. However, we find that sometimes IRFuzzer has less branch coverage. We find the contribution of feedback mechanism is double-sided. The newly introduced matcher table coverage and feedback to mutator lowered the throughput, affecting the overall branch coverage. On the other hand, the feedback is valuable in generating more diverse inputs, contributing to higher matcher table coverage. For example, in NVPTX, IRFuzzer achieved 26.5% matcher table thanks to our feedback when IRFuzzer_{bare} only covered 6.2%. Since our end goal is to test the code generation part of the backend, we believe this tradeoff is acceptable. We can answer **RQ3** confidently that both mutator and feedback design contributed to improve the matcher table coverage.

5.4 Bug categories and analysis


We collect all crashes found in [Section 5.1](#) and [Section 5.2](#). We also fuzzed other architectures with no features to extend our scope. Since GlobalIsel also uses matcher table design, we can apply IRFuzzer on it with little modification. We also fuzzed GlobalIsel for AArch64, Mips, and X86.

In the process, we found hundreds of crashes in the LLVM compiler. Even though these crashes all have unique stack traces, it doesn't necessarily mean they are different bugs. Some crashes have different paths but have the same root cause. Therefore, we manually analyzed all of them and report the ones we believe are bugs. In this section, we only report the bugs that have been *confirmed*. In total, IRFuzzer found 74 confirmed bugs. We manually verified that these bugs are found by IRFuzzer only and published the details anonymously [43].

These bugs are distributed in different places in LLVM codebase. [Figure 7a](#) shows the distribution of these bugs across LLVM. CodeGen is the library shared between architectures, meaning that a bug in CodeGen may affect all architectures. We are surprised to find that CodeGen and some widely adopted architectures have more bugs than we expected. This indicates that LLVM backend still needs more specialized fuzzing to be more fail-safe.

To better study these bugs, we categorize them into six categories: hang, memory errors, assertion failures, logic errors, missing patterns, and other bugs. Hang, memory errors and assertion failures are the most severe ones as they have a direct impact on end users. Missing patterns means a certain machine instruction is permitted by the hardware specification, but no matching instruction selection pattern exists. Logic error and missing patterns won't immediately affect the user, but may generate ineffective or even wrong machine instructions. [Figure 7b](#) shows the number of bugs in each category. Most bugs are assertion errors or missing patterns. They arise from developers' false assumption that some properties holds true during compilation, while our fuzzer proved otherwise.


We are working closely with the LLVM community to fix the bugs. 49 have been fixed, five of which are back ported to LLVM 15 as security patches. It's surprising that, despite heavy fuzzing, **all** fixed bugs are introduced before LLVM 15, which is released more than a year before paper



(a) Bugs categorized by **locations**. CodeGen refers to the code shared by all architectures, thus bugs in it can potentially affect all architectures.

(b) Bugs categorized by **causes**. Most of the severe bugs are compiler hangs, memory errors, and assertion failures.

Fig. 7. Distributions of bugs found by IRFuzzer. IRFuzzer has found 74 new bugs, 49 have been fixed.



(a) Original CFG

(b) Optimized CFG

Fig. 8. A piece of code we generated, simplified to CFG only. Two optimization passes are involved in this compiler hang. `TurnSwitchRangeIntoICmp` will transform Figure 8a into Figure 8b. `FoldValueComparisonIntoPredecessors` will undo the transformation, causing an infinite loop.

submission. This demonstrates that specialized fuzzing for compiler backend is necessary, and it provides actionable insight to developers.

We can answer **RQ4** now. We found six compiler hangs, nine memory errors, and 22 assertion failures. We also found 13 logic errors and 20 missing patterns in the matcher table. In total, we found 74 new bugs, 49 have been fixed, five have been back ported to LLVM 15 as security patches.

5.5 Bugs case study

5.5.1 Compiler hang. LLVM may execute multiple optimizations repeatedly until a fixed point is reached. However, this strategy can result in an infinite loop if not applied carefully, such as when one optimization undoes the effects of a previous optimization. Four of six hangs we found are caused by this problem.

For example, Figure 8 shows a simplified CFG corresponding to the code generated by IRFuzzer. This CFG will cause a compiler hang due to the interaction between two optimization passes. BB2 in Figure 8a consists of a `switch` statement with two self loop edges. The `TurnSwitchRangeIntoICmp` optimization attempts to rewrite the condition as a branch predicate because $x == 2 || x == 3$ can be optimized using bit operations, rewriting Figure 8a into Figure 8b. However, the `FoldValueComparisonIntoPredecessors` optimization converts this code back into a `switch` statement to reduce the number of comparison operations, turning the CFG back to Figure 8a. As a result, a fixed point is never reached, creating an infinite loop.

This bug is hard to trigger since the bug can only be triggered when the `switch` in Figure 8b has exactly two destinations (BB2 and BB3), and the switch conditions are consecutive, enabling the `TurnSwitchRangeIntoICmp` optimization. This combination is unlikely to be created during manual testing, and can only happen through the interaction of two largely unrelated pieces of code. Yet, we are

```

1 bool CombinerHelper::
2   matchCombineInsertVecElts(...) {
3   while (...) {
4 +   if (IntImm >= NumElts || IntImm < 0)
4 -   if (IntImm >= NumElts)
5     return false;
6   if (!MatchInfo[IntImm])
7     MatchInfo[IntImm] = TmpReg;
8   CurrInst = TmpInst;
9   ...
10  }
11 }

```

Listing (5) A snippet of code in AArch64 where the index (`IntImm`) is not sanitized before usage. This diff is our patch to fix this bug.

```

1 bool IRTranslator::translateExtractElement(
2   const User &U,
3   MachineIRBuilder &MIRBuilder) {
4   Register Idx;
5   const LLT VecIdxTy = LLT::scalar(
6     PreferredVecIdxWidth);
7   Idx = MIRBuilder
8 -   .buildSExtOrTrunc(VecIdxTy, Idx)
8 +   .buildZExtOrTrunc(VecIdxTy, Idx)
9   .getReg(0);
10  ...
11 }

```

Listing (6) A snippet of code in LLVM where index of a vector is treated as signed value. This diff is our patch to fix this bug.

Fig. 9. Two bugs we found in LLVM code base. Both of them will lead to compiler crash and have been fixed.

able to discover this catastrophic combination through our CFG mutation strategy in a time frame amenable to run fuzzing on every nightly build with little human intervention.

In this case, we answer **RQ5** by advising the developers to carefully read code that may modify the same location before they push out a new optimization that changes the code.

5.5.2 Memory error. LLVM often hides memory management from the developers so they don't have to manually manage it. Still, we found five memory errors: one null pointer dereference, two double frees and two out of bounds (OOB) accesses. After inspection, we determined that both double free bugs were indirectly caused by OOB accesses, which didn't result in crash immediately. All four OOB accesses are caused by developers using constants from the program under compilation without validation. In these cases, an OOB access or undefined behavior in the program being compiled were able to crash the compiler itself.

As an example, we consider a case involving vector types, shown in Listing 5. LLVM natively supports to enable SIMD optimizations. The `insertelement` IR instruction inserts a value into a vector at a specified index. If the given index is out of the bounds, the behavior is undefined. The compiler can leverage this to remove the `insertelement` instruction.

In most cases, LLVM's module verifier checks for invalid indices, and will reject any negative indices before compilation. As a result, developers may implicitly assume that indices in this code are *always* non-negative. However, the module verifier does allow `undef` as a valid index. `Undef` in LLVM represents a value it can be anything, and is represented as an index `IntImm` of `-1` at this point in the code, resulting in an OOB access at line 7.

This example shows that our IR instruction mutation method is better than high-level language generation, since `undef` is not a primitive high-level language construct and will only be introduced through other optimizations. By generating LLVM IR directly, we have more control over instruction operands and can directly generate values like `undef`. To answer **RQ5**, we recommend developers to be careful about uncommon values like `undef` and `poison`, which may appear during compilation.

5.5.3 Logic error. Logic error usually starts with unclear documentation or undocumented assumptions. Middle-end and backend are developed by different programmers, who may interpret ambiguous documentations differently.

For example, Listing 6 shows a bug we found in the LLVM backend. When translating the IR instruction `extractelement`, the index is extended as a signed integer. The code translates constants like `char 255` into `-1`. This bug generates incorrect machine instructions and affects the LLVM backend for seven architectures.

The bug was introduced in LLVM nine years ago and was never noticed for several reasons. First, it is less common for compiler frontends to generate vector operations, as we have seen in [Section 5.2](#), and even more rare to use an index that is large enough to wrap around to a negative integer. However, more importantly, we discovered that the documentation was ambiguous with respect to the desired behavior. The documentations indicated that “The index may be a variable of any integer type” without giving more details on how it should be interpreted. Therefore, when this bug was introduced nine years ago, it was actually compliant with the incomplete documentation at the time. This exemplifies how complex software interfaces can be incompletely specified, which further justifies our specialized fuzzing. In this case, we have fixed the bug and updated the documentation to reflect the intended interpretation of the index as an unsigned integer. To answer **RQ5**, we encourage developers of LLVM to communicate more on the documentations. Review and update documentations with the development of the code would be a good practice.

6 RELATED WORK

Prior work has focused on compiler testing [46–48]. One popular approach is to generate inputs for compilers to compile. Purdom[49] generates program based on context free grammar. Superion[38] and Nautilus[39] also relies on context free grammar for fuzzing. However, context free grammar based methods cannot generate semantically meaningful programs. These efforts are effective in testing frontend parsers, but cannot reach the backends effectively.

While many fuzzers are testing the frontend of the compiler using grammar based method [50], some work also tests the correctness of middle-end [2, 51–53]. To the best of our knowledge, IRFuzzer is the first one to verify the compiler backend using an architecture independent method.

Some work does end-to-end tests using high-level programming languages. CSmith[4], YARP-Gen[5], and Grayc [13] generate C and C++ programs. AI has also been used for program generate for the purpose of compiler testing [54–56]. However, end-to-end testing implies that there is a need to create a generator for every language, like JavaScript [40, 41], Rust [57], and Java [58–60]. POLYGLOT[61] introduced a language-free IR and mutator based on it. Most fuzzers have no feedback from the compiler. Even though Grayc [13] introduced branch coverage feedback, it was unable to trigger backend bugs due to language limitations and compiler optimizations discussed in [Section 5.5.3](#). Instead of directly generating a program, Equivalence Modulo Inputs [6, 62] mutates an existing C program to preserve its semantics. Therefore, the program before and after mutation should have the same behavior. Combining CSmith and EMI, Lidbury et al. mutate program to test OpenCL compiler [63]. However, the language limits these work, since the generator cannot help when the language frontend cannot exercise a feature in the compiler.

Formal verification is another valuable part of compiler verification [64]. Verasco [8] is a formally verified C analyzer. CompCert [65] is a compiler for a subset of C that is formally verified. There is work that verifies other languages, like Rust [66] and Lustre [9]. However, formal verification cannot scale to large compilers like LLVM, therefore it has a limited impact in the community.

There is also work on intermediate representation generation. FuzzMutate directly generates LLVM IR[12]. However, FuzzMutate has no feedback unless combined with fuzzers like AFL++[10] or libFuzzer[14]. Some work focus on testing of a specific compiler [67, 68]. Tzer focuses on IR mutation in the context of a tensor compiler [68]. However, Tzer relies on LLVM’s Coverage Sanitizer that only tracks code coverage. Similar to IRFuzzer’s approach, ClassMing directly mutates on Java byte code[69]. Neither Tzer nor ClassMing designed a feedback method that can apply to LLVM’s scenarios.

7 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose IRFuzzer, a fuzzer specializing in fuzzing LLVM instruction selection. To generate inputs that are semantically and syntactically correct, we first identify the challenges in IR generation that don't exist in high-level language generation. We create a mutator that maintains semantic correctness by splitting a block and inserting a sCFG in between. Then, we make sure that the IR instruction we inserted is syntactically correct using a descriptive language to model all IR instructions. Therefore, the IR program we generated can always be compiled by the backend. We also propose a new coverage metric to better monitor the fuzzing status to keep track of the program behavior. IRFuzzer also decodes this coverage table for mutation guidance.

Our evaluation shows that IRFuzzer outperforms existing backend and end-to-end state-of-the-art fuzzers. IRFuzzer achieved higher matcher table coverage in all LLVM backend architectures. Specialized fuzzing is required for specialized tools, and IRFuzzer is efficient enough to be used within the context of a regular development process.

Using IRFuzzer, we have identified 74 bugs in upstream LLVM code that have been confirmed by developers. 49 of these bugs have been fixed, showing that these bugs provide useful insight to LLVM developers. These findings indicate that there are fertile opportunities for specialized fuzzing despite popular end-to-end compiler testing. We demonstrated that IRFuzzer is effective in finding bugs in LLVM backend.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Lattner and V. Adve. "LLVM: a compilation framework for lifelong program analysis & transformation". In: *International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization, 2004. CGO 2004*. 2004, pp. 75–86. DOI: [10.1109/CGO.2004.1281665](https://doi.org/10.1109/CGO.2004.1281665).
- [2] Nuno P. Lopes et al. "Alive2: Bounded Translation Validation for LLVM". In: *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. PLDI 2021. Virtual, Canada: Association for Computing Machinery, 2021, pp. 65–79. DOI: [10.1145/3453483.3454030](https://doi.org/10.1145/3453483.3454030).
- [3] Andrea Fioraldi et al. "LibAFL: A Framework to Build Modular and Reusable Fuzzers". In: *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. CCS '22. Los Angeles, CA, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, pp. 1051–1065. DOI: [10.1145/3548606.3560602](https://doi.org/10.1145/3548606.3560602).
- [4] Xuejun Yang et al. "Finding and Understanding Bugs in C Compilers". In: *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. PLDI '11. San Jose, California, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2011, pp. 283–294. DOI: [10.1145/1993498.1993532](https://doi.org/10.1145/1993498.1993532). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1993498.1993532>.
- [5] Vsevolod Livinskii, Dmitry Babokin, and John Regehr. "Random Testing for C and C++ Compilers with YARPGen". In: *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 4.OOPSLA (Nov. 2020). DOI: [10.1145/3428264](https://doi.org/10.1145/3428264). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3428264>.
- [6] Vu Le, Mehrdad Afshari, and Zhendong Su. "Compiler Validation via Equivalence modulo Inputs". In: *Proceedings of the 35th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. PLDI '14. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: Association for Computing Machinery, 2014, pp. 216–226. DOI: [10.1145/2594291.2594334](https://doi.org/10.1145/2594291.2594334).
- [7] Qirun Zhang, Chengnian Sun, and Zhendong Su. "Skeletal Program Enumeration for Rigorous Compiler Testing". In: *Proceedings of the 38th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. PLDI 2017. Barcelona, Spain: Association for Computing Machinery, 2017, pp. 347–361. DOI: [10.1145/3062341.3062379](https://doi.org/10.1145/3062341.3062379).

- [8] Jacques-Henri Jourdan et al. “A Formally-Verified C Static Analyzer”. In: *POPL 2015: 42nd symposium Principles of Programming Languages*. ACM Press, 2015, pp. 247–259. URL: <http://xavierleroy.org/publi/verasco-popl2015.pdf>.
- [9] Timothy Bourke et al. “A formally verified compiler for Lustre”. In: *PLDI 2017: Programming Language Design and Implementation*. ACM Press, 2017, pp. 586–601. URL: <http://xavierleroy.org/publi/velus-pldi17.pdf>.
- [10] Andrea Fioraldi et al. “AFL++ : Combining Incremental Steps of Fuzzing Research”. In: *14th USENIX Workshop on Offensive Technologies (WOOT 20)*. USENIX Association, Aug. 2020. URL: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/woot20/presentation/fioraldi>.
- [11] *Fuzzing LLVM libraries and tools*. <https://llvm.org/docs/FuzzingLLVM.html>. Accessed: 2023-09-22.
- [12] Justin Bogner. *Adventures in Fuzzing Instruction Selection*. https://llvm.org/devmtg/2017-03/assets/slides/adventures_in_fuzzing_instruction_selection.pdf. Mar. 2017.
- [13] Karine Even-Mendoza et al. “GrayC: Greybox Fuzzing of Compilers and Analysers for C”. In: *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. ISSTA 2023. Seattle, WA, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023, pp. 1219–1231. DOI: [10.1145/3597926.3598130](https://doi.org/10.1145/3597926.3598130). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3597926.3598130>.
- [14] Kosta Serebryany. “Continuous fuzzing with libfuzzer and addresssanitizer”. In: *2016 IEEE Cybersecurity Development (SecDev)*. IEEE. 2016, pp. 157–157.
- [15] Seo Sanghyeon. *Rust triggers LLVM ARM backend bug*. <https://github.com/rust-lang/rust/issues/9117>. [Online; accessed 21-Mar-2023]. 2013.
- [16] Shuitao Gan et al. “CollAFL: Path Sensitive Fuzzing”. In: *2018 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. 2018, pp. 679–696. DOI: [10.1109/SP.2018.00040](https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2018.00040).
- [17] B. K. Rosen, M. N. Wegman, and F. K. Zadeck. “Global Value Numbers and Redundant Computations”. In: *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*. POPL ’88. San Diego, California, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 1988, pp. 12–27. DOI: [10.1145/73560.73562](https://doi.org/10.1145/73560.73562).
- [18] Reese T Prosser. “Applications of boolean matrices to the analysis of flow diagrams”. In: *Papers presented at the December 1-3, 1959, eastern joint IRE-AIEE-ACM computer conference*. 1959, pp. 133–138.
- [19] *The LLVM Target-Independent Code Generator*. <https://llvm.org/docs/CodeGenerator.html>. Accessed: 2023-09-22.
- [20] *GlobalSel*. <https://llvm.org/docs/GlobalSel/index.html>. Accessed: 2023-09-22.
- [21] *TableGen Overview*. <https://llvm.org/docs/TableGen/>. Accessed: 2023-09-22.
- [22] *American fuzzy lop*. URL: <http://lcamtuf.coredump.cx/afl/>.
- [23] Xiaogang Zhu et al. “Fuzzing: A Survey for Roadmap”. In: *ACM Comput. Surv.* 54.11s (Sept. 2022). DOI: [10.1145/3512345](https://doi.org/10.1145/3512345). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3512345>.
- [24] Jinghan Wang et al. “Be Sensitive and Collaborative: Analyzing Impact of Coverage Metrics in Greybox Fuzzing”. In: *22nd International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses (RAID 2019)*. USENIX Association, Sept. 2019, pp. 1–15. URL: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/raid2019/presentation/wang>.
- [25] Jinghan Wang, Chengyu Song, and Heng Yin. “Reinforcement Learning-based Hierarchical Seed Scheduling for Greybox Fuzzing”. In: *2021 Network and Distributed System Security Symposium ()*. DOI: [10.14722/ndss.2021.24486](https://doi.org/10.14722/ndss.2021.24486). URL: <https://par.nsf.gov/biblio/10313742>.
- [26] Cornelius Aschermann et al. “Ijon: Exploring Deep State Spaces via Fuzzing”. In: *2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. 2020, pp. 1597–1612. DOI: [10.1109/SP40000.2020.00117](https://doi.org/10.1109/SP40000.2020.00117).

- [27] M. Böhme, V. Pham, and A. Roychoudhury. “Coverage-Based Greybox Fuzzing as Markov Chain”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 45.5 (2019), pp. 489–506. DOI: [10.1109/TSE.2017.2785841](https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2017.2785841).
- [28] Chenyang Lyu et al. “MOPT: Optimized Mutation Scheduling for Fuzzers”. In: *28th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 19)*. USENIX Association, Aug. 2019, pp. 1949–1966. URL: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity19/presentation/lyu>.
- [29] Dongdong She, Abhishek Shah, and Suman Jana. “Effective Seed Scheduling for Fuzzing with Graph Centrality Analysis”. In: *43rd IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2022, San Francisco, CA, USA, May 22-26, 2022*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 2194–2211. DOI: [10.1109/SP46214.2022.9833761](https://doi.org/10.1109/SP46214.2022.9833761).
- [30] Sebastian Österlund et al. “ParmeSan: Sanitizer-guided Greybox Fuzzing”. In: *29th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 20)*. USENIX Association, Aug. 2020, pp. 2289–2306. URL: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity20/presentation/osterlund>.
- [31] Yuyang Rong, Peng Chen, and Hao Chen. “Int egrity: Finding Integer Errors by Targeted Fuzzing”. In: *Security and Privacy in Communication Networks: 16th EAI International Conference, SecureComm 2020, Washington, DC, USA, October 21-23, 2020, Proceedings, Part I 16*. Springer, 2020, pp. 360–380.
- [32] Dae R. Jeong et al. “Razzer: Finding Kernel Race Bugs through Fuzzing”. In: *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. 2019, pp. 754–768. DOI: [10.1109/SP.2019.00017](https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2019.00017).
- [33] Cornelius Aschermann et al. “REDQUEEN: Fuzzing with Input-to-State Correspondence.” In: *NDSS*. Vol. 19. 2019, pp. 1–15.
- [34] Dongdong She et al. “NEUZZ: Efficient fuzzing with neural program smoothing”. In: *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 803–817.
- [35] Peng Chen and Hao Chen. “Angora: Efficient Fuzzing by Principled Search”. In: *2018 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. 2018, pp. 711–725. DOI: [10.1109/SP.2018.00046](https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2018.00046).
- [36] Mingyuan Wu et al. “One Fuzzing Strategy to Rule Them All”. In: *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*. ICSE ’22. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, pp. 1634–1645. DOI: [10.1145/3510003.3510174](https://doi.org/10.1145/3510003.3510174).
- [37] Yuyang Rong et al. “Valkyrie: Improving Fuzzing Performance Through Deterministic Techniques”. In: *22nd IEEE International Conference on Software Quality, Reliability and Security, QRS 2022, Guangzhou, China, December 5-9, 2022*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 628–639. DOI: [10.1109/QRS57517.2022.00069](https://doi.org/10.1109/QRS57517.2022.00069). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/QRS57517.2022.00069>.
- [38] Junjie Wang et al. “Superion: Grammar-Aware Greybox Fuzzing”. In: *2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. 2019, pp. 724–735. DOI: [10.1109/ICSE.2019.00081](https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE.2019.00081).
- [39] Cornelius Aschermann et al. “NAUTILUS: Fishing for Deep Bugs with Grammars.” In: *NDSS*. 2019.
- [40] Soyeon Park et al. “Fuzzing JavaScript Engines with Aspect-preserving Mutation”. In: *2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. 2020, pp. 1629–1642. DOI: [10.1109/SP40000.2020.00067](https://doi.org/10.1109/SP40000.2020.00067).
- [41] Samuel Groß. “Fuzzil: Coverage guided fuzzing for javascript engines”. In: *Department of Informatics, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology* (2018).
- [42] Junjie Wang et al. “FuzzJIT: Oracle-Enhanced Fuzzing for JavaScript Engine JIT Compiler”. In: *32nd USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2023, Anaheim, CA, USA, August 9-11, 2023*. Ed. by Joseph A. Calandrino and Carmela Troncoso. USENIX Association, 2023. URL: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity23/presentation/wang-junjie>.
- [43] Anonymous. *IRFuzzer artifacts*. Zenodo, Sept. 2023. DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.8388301](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8388301).

- [44] George Klees et al. “Evaluating Fuzz Testing”. In: *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. CCS ’18. Toronto, Canada: Association for Computing Machinery, 2018, pp. 2123–2138. DOI: [10.1145/3243734.3243804](https://doi.org/10.1145/3243734.3243804).
- [45] Karine Even-Mendoza et al. *Artifact of GrayC: Greybox Fuzzing of Compilers and Analysers for C*. Version GrayC-ISSTA-2023-V1.0. GitHub Repository of GrayC: <https://github.com/srg-imperial/GrayC/tree/main/ISSTA-2023-AE>. July 2023. DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.7978251](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7978251).
- [46] Junjie Chen et al. “A Survey of Compiler Testing”. In: *ACM Comput. Surv.* 53.1 (Feb. 2020). DOI: [10.1145/3363562](https://doi.org/10.1145/3363562). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3363562>.
- [47] Haoyang Ma. *A Survey of Modern Compiler Fuzzing*. 2023. arXiv: [2306.06884](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.06884) [cs . SE].
- [48] Michaël Marcozzi et al. “Compiler Fuzzing: How Much Does It Matter?” In: *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 3.OOPSLA (Oct. 2019). DOI: [10.1145/3360581](https://doi.org/10.1145/3360581).
- [49] Paul Purdom. “A sentence generator for testing parsers”. In: *BIT Numerical Mathematics* 12.3 (1972), pp. 366–375.
- [50] Andreas Zeller et al. *The fuzzing book*. 2019.
- [51] William Mansky and Elsa Gunter. “A framework for formal verification of compiler optimizations”. In: *Interactive Theorem Proving: First International Conference, ITP 2010, Edinburgh, UK, July 11-14, 2010. Proceedings 1*. Springer, 2010, pp. 371–386.
- [52] Vsevolod Livinskii, Dmitry Babokin, and John Regehr. “Fuzzing Loop Optimizations in Compilers for C++ and Data-Parallel Languages”. In: *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 7.PLDI (June 2023). DOI: [10.1145/3591295](https://doi.org/10.1145/3591295). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3591295>.
- [53] Nuno P. Lopes et al. “Practical Verification of Peephole Optimizations with Alive”. In: *Commun. ACM* 61.2 (Jan. 2018), pp. 84–91. DOI: [10.1145/3166064](https://doi.org/10.1145/3166064).
- [54] Xiao Liu et al. “DeepFuzz: Automatic Generation of Syntax Valid C Programs for Fuzz Testing”. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 33.01 (July 2019), pp. 1044–1051. DOI: [10.1609/aaai.v33i01.33011044](https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v33i01.33011044).
- [55] Yinlin Deng et al. “Large Language Models are Zero-Shot Fuzzers: Fuzzing Deep-Learning Libraries via Large Language Models”. In: *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. 2023, pp. 423–435.
- [56] Chunqiu Steven Xia et al. *Universal Fuzzing via Large Language Models*. 2023. arXiv: [2308.04748](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.04748) [cs . SE].
- [57] Kyle Dewey, Jared Roesch, and Ben Hardekopf. “Fuzzing the Rust Typechecker Using CLP (T)”. In: *2015 30th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. 2015, pp. 482–493. DOI: [10.1109/ASE.2015.65](https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE.2015.65).
- [58] Yuting Chen et al. “Coverage-Directed Differential Testing of JVM Implementations”. In: *Proceedings of the 37th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. PLDI ’16. Santa Barbara, CA, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2016, pp. 85–99. DOI: [10.1145/2908080.2908095](https://doi.org/10.1145/2908080.2908095). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2908080.2908095>.
- [59] Emin Gün Sirer and Brian N. Bershad. “Using Production Grammars in Software Testing”. In: *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on Domain-Specific Languages*. DSL ’99. Austin, Texas, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2000, pp. 1–13. DOI: [10.1145/331960.331965](https://doi.org/10.1145/331960.331965).
- [60] Mingyuan Wu et al. “JITfuzz: Coverage-Guided Fuzzing for JVM Just-in-Time Compilers”. In: *Proceedings of the 45th International Conference on Software Engineering*. ICSE ’23. Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: IEEE Press, 2023, pp. 56–68. DOI: [10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00017](https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00017).
- [61] Yongheng Chen et al. “One Engine to Fuzz ’em All: Generic Language Processor Testing with Semantic Validation”. In: *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. 2021, pp. 642–658. DOI: [10.1109/SP40001.2021.00071](https://doi.org/10.1109/SP40001.2021.00071).

- [62] Vu Le, Chengnian Sun, and Zhendong Su. “Finding Deep Compiler Bugs via Guided Stochastic Program Mutation”. In: *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Object-Oriented Programming, Systems, Languages, and Applications*. OOPSLA 2015. Pittsburgh, PA, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2015, pp. 386–399. DOI: [10.1145/2814270.2814319](https://doi.org/10.1145/2814270.2814319). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2814270.2814319>.
- [63] Christopher Lidbury et al. “Many-Core Compiler Fuzzing”. In: *Proceedings of the 36th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. PLDI ’15. Portland, OR, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2015, pp. 65–76. DOI: [10.1145/2737924.2737986](https://doi.org/10.1145/2737924.2737986). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2737924.2737986>.
- [64] Maulik A. Dave. “Compiler Verification: A Bibliography”. In: *SIGSOFT Softw. Eng. Notes* 28.6 (Nov. 2003), p. 2. DOI: [10.1145/966221.966235](https://doi.org/10.1145/966221.966235). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/966221.966235>.
- [65] Xavier Leroy. “Formal Verification of a Realistic Compiler”. In: *Commun. ACM* 52.7 (July 2009), pp. 107–115. DOI: [10.1145/1538788.1538814](https://doi.org/10.1145/1538788.1538814). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1538788.1538814>.
- [66] Vytautas Astrauskas et al. “Leveraging Rust Types for Modular Specification and Verification”. In: *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 3.OOPSLA (Oct. 2019). DOI: [10.1145/3360573](https://doi.org/10.1145/3360573).
- [67] Haoyang Ma et al. “Fuzzing Deep Learning Compilers with HirGen”. In: *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. ISSTA 2023. Seattle, WA, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023, pp. 248–260. DOI: [10.1145/3597926.3598053](https://doi.org/10.1145/3597926.3598053). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3597926.3598053>.
- [68] Jiawei Liu et al. “Coverage-Guided Tensor Compiler Fuzzing with Joint IR-Pass Mutation”. In: *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 6.OOPSLA1 (Apr. 2022). DOI: [10.1145/3527317](https://doi.org/10.1145/3527317).
- [69] Yuting Chen, Ting Su, and Zhendong Su. “Deep Differential Testing of JVM Implementations”. In: *2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. 2019, pp. 1257–1268. DOI: [10.1109/ICSE.2019.00127](https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE.2019.00127).