

Mutation Analysis with Execution Taints

Rahul Gopinath
University of Sydney
Email: rahul.gopinath@sydney.edu.au

Philipp Görz
CISPA Helmholtz Center
for Information Security
Email: philipp.gorz@cispa.de

Abstract—Mutation analysis is one of the most effective, but costly means of assessing the ability of software test suites to prevent bugs. Traditional mutation analysis involves producing and evaluating syntactic variants of the original to check whether the test suite under evaluation is capable of distinguishing between the variant and the original in terms of behavior.

Evaluating each mutant separately means a large amount of redundant computation, both between the original program and mutants, and also between different mutants.

Previous work explored numerous means of removing redundancy. However, some amount of redundancy has remained especially in the post-mutation phase.

In this paper, we propose *execution taints* – A novel technique that repurposes *dynamic data-flow taints* for mutation analysis. Our technique is the only technique that can remove the redundancy in post-mutation phase, achieving better efficiency in mutation analysis. We further leverage memoization to eliminate redundant execution between program variants.

I. INTRODUCTION

Mutation analysis is the gold standard for evaluating the quality of software test suites. It is one of the very few techniques that can actually evaluate the quality of oracles provided by software test suites. Unfortunately, mutation analysis is also one of the most costly methods for test suite evaluation. The problem is that traditional mutation analysis requires generation and independent evaluation of each syntactic variant (mutant) by the test suite [1]. This means that one needs to execute the entire test suite as many times as the number of mutants at worst. This can be reduced to some extent by running each test case only on those mutants whose mutation site is covered by the test case [2]. However, this still leaves a large number of mutants to evaluate independently. For example, Fig. 1 includes four possible mutations: m_1 in Line 4, m_2 and m_3 in Line 7 and m_4 in Line 14. With traditional mutation analysis (Fig. 2a), this would require five executions including the execution of original to determine coverage of the test suite, and four from each of the four mutants ¹.

Numerous previous researchers have noticed that traditional mutation analysis is highly redundant, and significant execution cost savings can be achieved if one can eliminate some of these redundancies. Researchers have focused on eliminating these redundancies to make mutation analysis more efficient. Just and Fraser [3] showed that not all the mutants need to be executed independently. Some mutants result in the same

```
def partitioned_process(a: int) -> int:
1  i:int = 0
2  res: int = 0
3  a = a + 1 # m1: a << 1
4  counts = get_counts()
5  while i < counts:
6      a = a/2 # m2: a + 2 m3: a * 2
7      res += process(i)
8      i += 1
9  return res
10

def process(i: int):
13  if i < 0: # m4: i < 1
14      return 0
15  else:
16      return time_consuming(i)
17

def test_process():
20  assert partitioned_process(INPUT) == OUTPUT
21
```

Fig. 1: The `partitioned_process()` program

value, and hence the same infected state, and only some of these are propagated. Hence, one can *partition* states resulting from mutations, and only those resulting in unique propagated states need to be evaluated independently. For example, in Fig. 1, when `INPUT=1`, execution of m_1 results in the same state as the original. Hence, the *partitioned state* execution (Fig. 2b) skips the execution of M_1 .

In split-stream execution [4], [5], [6], a mutant is forked when the mutation is executed at runtime, which shares the execution path until the execution of the mutation. For example, when one executes the program (Fig. 1) with say `INPUT=1`, at each mutation, a new process is spawned. This results in a total of four new processes at the end (Fig. 2c), but with the initial execution until the mutation shared with the original.

The *equivalence-modulo state* approach [7] is the latest such technique, and it combines the advantages of state-partitioning and split-stream executions. The idea is to fork only if the mutation leads to a new unique state. This technique is even more efficient, skipping M_1 and sharing the execution path between original and also between mutants (Fig. 2d).

That is, the current state of the art [7] is very efficient in eliminating the causes of redundant execution until the point where mutations cause a divergence in state. However, the biggest cause of redundancy of execution is not the pre-divergence execution. There is no solution yet for avoiding

¹We use m_x to denote a mutation where x is the mutation id. The corresponding mutant is M_x . We refer to the original as M_0 .




Fig. 2: The execution flows in the considered mutation analysis algorithms. The numbers correspond to line numbers in Fig. 1. Horizontal lines represent split execution, and the loops represent operations within execution taints. M_0 is the original execution.

redundant execution in the post-divergence execution phase when a forked execution restarts following the execution of the original. For example, the *modulo-state* execution (Fig. 2d) forks a new mutant process from the original after executing Line 7 and this mutant process forks again in the second loop when M_3 and M_4 diverge. However, in each of these processes, the function `process(i)` is called with exactly the same arguments because `i` is never mutated in these mutants.

In this paper, we propose mutation analysis with execution taints as a way to achieve much lower redundancy than previously known methods. Our proposal is based on three observations:

1. The first observation is that many mutants do not produce a change in the control-flow from the original. For example, in Fig. 1, the line Line 7 is mutated in mutants M_2 and M_3 resulting in different values for a . Even though the value of a is different in the original and mutants, since a never influences the control-flow, the actual execution flow of the original and the mutant is exactly the same. That is, except for the values affected by the mutation, the other steps of execution are the same. Hence, one can reduce the cost of mutation analysis if such common execution steps can be shared between such mutants and the original program.
2. Our second observation is that for such mutations that does not change control flow, one can consider the mutation to have introduced a unique *taint* in the computation, and this taint can be propagated dynamically to any values using the results of the computation using standard taint propagation through

dynamic data-flow². Such taints can be propagated using standard techniques in most languages even if the language runtime does not have direct support for taint propagation [11], [12]. We do not simply propagate a taint flag. As long as there is no control-flow divergence, we propagate the results of computations involving mutations in the same taint. We call such taints *value taints* of corresponding values. The computations involving such value taints are called *execution taints* of the main computation.

3. Our third observation is that even when there is a control-flow divergence, it is possible to limit the impact of diverged control-flow to the function containing the mutation using *merge-back* of execution and judicious use of *memoization*.

Using these three observations, our technique (Fig. 2e) can perform extremely efficient mutation analysis limiting both pre and post mutation redundancies .

Contributions

- We propose a complete framework for avoiding redundancy in mutant execution including both pre-divergence and post-divergence stages.
- Our *execution taints* is a lightweight mechanism that repurposes dynamic data-flow taints for mutation analysis.
- We propose a novel memoization strategy for sharing computational results across mutants.
- We propose a comprehensive solution to the problem of sharing single-use resources by mutants during forking.

²We note that tainting values is a remarkably light weight operation in many languages. For example, many languages [8], [9], [10] already has runtime support for tainting, which can be repurposed for execution taints.

II. APPROACH

We now discuss our approach in detail. There are two cases that we need to discuss in detail. The first is when there is no control-flow divergence between the mutant and the original. The essential idea is that values resulting from mutated expressions are stored as *dynamic taints* of the resulting values.

A. Taint Schemata

Given a program and test suite that needs to be evaluated, we first transform the program to a meta-mutant containing all mutants. For example, below is the code fragment from Fig. 1.

```

while i < counts:
  a = a/2
  res += process(i)
  i += 1

```

This gets transformed into the following meta-mutant³

```

while i < counts:
  a = @T(<M0: a/2>, <M2: a+2>, <M3: a*2>)
  res += process(i)
  i += 1

```

where M_0 is the key for original value, M_2 is the key for second mutant, and M_3 is the key for the third mutant. During the execution of the meta-mutant, the function @T is called and passed the different possible variants of Line 7. The function @T collects the results of each, and these are stored in the dynamic taint of a as a key-value map.

B. Execution Taints and Transmission Rules

As we specified in Section I, We use m_x to denote a mutation where x is the mutation id. The corresponding mutant is M_x . We refer to the original as M_0 .

The single taint value corresponding to a single mutant is called an execution taint of that value for that mutant, and the list of taints from different mutations that is attached to a value (or equivalently, a variable at a point in execution) is called the *taint map* for that value. That is, after the execution of Line 7, if we started with a value $a = 2$, then the resulting a will have a value given by the taint map: $\{M_0 : 1, M_2 : 4, M_3 : 4\}$. Here, 4 is an execution taint corresponding to both M_2 and M_3 attached to the original value. 1 is the execution taint of the original (M_0) – i.e. the non-mutated value.

When two values are used in an operation, the following rules are used for taint propagation. We use the A , B , and C for indicating the variables involved in an expression. We further use \otimes to indicate an operation.

We use A^x to indicate the value taint of M_x stored in A . If A does not have a value taint of M_x , the original value, that is, the value taint of M_0 is returned instead.

If a variable is tainted, it annotated with its taint map. For example, $A_{\{M_0 : A^0, M_1 : A^1\}}$ means that A carries an execution taint of mutation M_1 . It is equivalent to $A_{\{M_1 : A^1\}}$ eliding the original M_0 value.

³The chevrons (<,>) indicate lambdas, which are also passed the mutation id.

That is, given $M^x \subset M$, $M^y \subset M$, and M_o is an operator mutation in M , where M is the set of mutants, after the execution of

$$A_{\{M_i:A^i \mid M_i \in M^x\}} \otimes_{M_o:\odot} B_{\{M_j:B^j \mid M_j \in M^y\}}$$

the result will be stored as

$$C_{\{M_i:(A^i \otimes B^i) \mid M_i \in (M^x \cup M^y)\} \cup \{M_o:A \odot B\}}$$

We discuss a few clarifications of this equation next. We elide the braces in the taint map when there is no ambiguity in the context.

- 1) If neither value has a taint, and the operation is not a mutation, then the resulting value will not have a mutation execution taint. That is, given the operation

$$A \otimes B$$

where the result is stored in C , C will not have a taint. The above equation is equivalent to

$$A_{M_0:A} \otimes B_{M_0:B}$$

with $C_{M_0:A \otimes B}$ as the result.

- 2) An operation can also be tainted when it itself is mutated. In that case, the operation will be associated with a single mutant. E.g. $\otimes_{M_x:\odot}$ indicates that \otimes was mutated by m_x changing \otimes to \odot .
- 3) If neither value has a taint, but the operation is a mutation, the resulting value will have the taint of the mutation as the single element in its taint map. That is, given the equation

$$A \otimes_{M_x:\odot} B$$

the result will be stored as $C_{M_x:A \odot B}$. For example, given $a + b$ as the original expression, with $a = 1$, $b = 1$, and we have mutation m_1 that mutates this expression to $a - b$, the resulting value will have $\{M_0:1, M_1:0\}$ as the taint map.

- 4) If both values have M_x in their taint map, and the operation is not mutated, then the operation will be performed between the values corresponding to M_x in both values' taint map. That is, given the equation

$$A_{M_x:A^x} \otimes B_{M_x:B^x}$$

the result will be stored as $C_{\{M_x : A^x \otimes B^x\}}$. For example, given $a_{\{M_0 : 1, M_1 : 2\}}$ and $b_{\{M_0 : 3, M_1 : 4\}}$, $c = a + b$ will result in $c_{\{M_0 : 4, M_1 : 6\}}$.

- 5) If both values have M_x in their taint map, and the operation is also mutated, then the mutated operation will be performed between the values corresponding to M_x in both values' taint map. That is, given the equation

$$A_{M_x:A^x} \otimes_{M_x:\odot} B_{M_x:B^x}$$

the result will be stored as $C_{\{M_x : A^x \odot B^x\}}$

- 6) If one of the values is missing the taint M_x in their taint map, and the other has M_x in their taint map, the value of M_0 will be used instead, and the resulting value will

be placed as execution taint corresponding to M_x in the taint map. That is, given the equation

$$A_{M_x:A^x} \otimes B$$

the result will be stored as $C_{\{M_x:A^x \otimes B^0\}}$.

- 7) In the case of multiple execution taints, each taint is evaluated separately. That is, given the equation

$$A_{M_x:A^x, M_y:A^y} \otimes_{M_z:\odot} B_{M_x:B^x, M_y:B^y}$$

the result will be stored as $C_{\{M_x:A^x \otimes B^x, M_y:A^y \otimes B^y, M_z:A \odot B\}}$. Note that different mutants never interact. For example, given $a_{\{M_0:1, M_1:2\}}$ and $b_{\{M_0:3, M_2:5\}}$, $c = a + b$ will result in $c_{\{M_0:4, M_1:5, M_2:6\}}$.

For example, the `a` after Line 7 in the first iteration of `partitioned_process(1)` is annotated $a_{\{M_0:1, M_2:4, M_3:4\}}$. This corresponds to the value of $a = 1$ in the original and $a = 4$ in both M_2 and M_3 . That is, each mutant shares the execution as well as the state until the mutation is seen, after which it shares the execution and the variables not tainted in the mutation with the original.

Such taints are checked during test case assertions. Each single execution taint that correspond to a mutant is executed separately in each assertion. Any mutant that fail the assertion is marked as *killed*.

Propagating execution taints works well until the control-flow diverges. If a tainted value is involved in control-flow, and the control-flow diverges from the mainline⁴ the simple data-flow taint transmission is no longer sufficient for executing mutants that diverged. However, for conditionals, (assuming no `return` statements), the control-flow merges back to the mainline after the conditional branch finishes execution. Similarly, for loops, the control-flow merges back to the mainline execution path after all iterations finish. However, the presence of `return` statements can introduce additional complexity. Hence, we use the procedure boundaries as merge points of diverged execution.

In this case, we have two choices based on whether the platform has the ability to *fork* (and is efficient to do so)

C. Diverged Control-Flow When Fork is Available

Accounting for diverged control-flow when an efficient fork is available is accomplished as follows. We first wrap every function in the program with another function (In Python, this is accomplished using a decorator [13]). Next, we implement the split-stream execution within the wrapped function, but rather than splitting on encountering a mutation, we split on control-flow divergence to as many children as there are diverging mutant executions.

That is, as soon as one of the mutant control-flow paths diverge from the main, the process forks, with the parent continuing the mainline execution, and the children following the divergent control-flows. Given that this is a function call

⁴We call the execution path of the original program *mainline* execution path.

made from a wrapper function, the wrapped function returns in mainline as well as divergent processes to the wrapper function. Within the wrapper function, the parent process waits for, and gathers all global variable changes induced by the divergent processes as well as the return value from the wrapped function⁵. These are updated to the taint maps of variables in the mainline. The execution continues from the wrapper function returning the value with the updated taints.

D. Diverged Control-Flow When Fork is Unavailable

Accounting for diverged control-flow when fork is unavailable or is too inefficient to use either because the operating system fork is costly or the process of merge-back from external process is costly. As before, we start with a function wrapper for each functions.

Within such a wrapper, we first set the execution path to be followed to M_0 , that is the mainline. Any mutant that does not follow the execution path of M_0 is marked *wounded*.

Once the function finishes for the given execution path, it returns to the wrapper function. Within the wrapper, we look at the mutants that are newly marked as *wounded*, and those that are marked as *active*. We temporarily remove active mutants from consideration, choose one of the wounded mutants – say M_x . For any such mutant, we can determine if the wound happened due to a mutation within the function (or any child functions called from the function) or if the function and child functions were unmodified because for any active taints, we know the location where the taint was encountered.

Let us take the case when the function and child functions were unmodified. In this case, we execute the wrapped function using untainted parameters with values from execution taints from M_x . This gives us the return value from the mutant. The return value is merged back as execution taint of M_x on to the mainline. The taints of any globals modified by the function call are similarly updated. We mark M_x as no longer wounded. We pick the next wounded mutant, and continue the process until there are no more wounded mutants.

If on the other hand, the function or one of the child functions called from it contained the current mutation, we call the mutated function instead for that function, and collect taints. The remaining process is the same.

Thus at the end of the function call, we have successfully merged the diverged control-flows into the system state.

E. Memoization for Sharing Execution Across Mutants

At this point, we have shown that we can merge back executions from diverging control-flows at the function boundary where the diverging execution happened. However, this still leaves some redundancy. Consider the fragment in Fig. 3.

⁵We call this the *merge-back* of diverging executions both for forking and non-forking choices.

```

def my_fn(v: int) -> int:
    if v > 0: # ml: v > 1
        r = time_consuming_fn(v)
        return r
    else:
        r = time_consuming_fn(v)
        return -r

```

Fig. 3: Memoization Example

Here, the control-flow diverges at m_1 when `my_fn(1)` is executed. However, `time_consuming_fn(v)` is executed in both original as well as the mutant with exactly the same parameters. Hence we next see how to eliminate this redundancy.

The basic intuition here is that given that we already wrap each function, we can memoize the execution results of each function and specific parameter values. (This database of memoized function calls are stored externally for the forking version so that all processes can access it.)

An important constraint for memoization is that we should ensure that it does not grow out of bounds. Since concern here is ensuring a fast mutation analysis by sharing similar executions across mutants, we follow the simple expedient. The memoization cache is maintained only if there are unmerged mutants. We clear the current cache completely as soon as all mutants merge. The idea here is that a mutant can make use of the cache for avoiding redundant execution with the original or another mutant if and only if there are active unmerged mutants in the first place. We also ensure that the original process executes first, and the mutant processes start execution only when the original has returned from the function. Further, only one mutant process is executing at any time. (If parallel execution is more important than utilizing memoization, one can start the mutant-processes in parallel).

There are two cases to consider for updating the memoization cache. The first is when no mutation is encountered within the function call (or in one of the child functions called from that function), and the second when a mutation is encountered within the function call (or its child calls).

New processes update the cache if and only if the *mutation* was not encountered after forking. This is because we can't share the execution of a mutated function with any other mutant. To implement this, we maintain a stack of current function calls. That is, each entry in the stack is of the form `all:(function, parameter values)`.

Say we have a function call with a number of active execution taints in the parameters. We execute the mainline, and at the end of execution of the mainline, we have a subset of these execution taints in the return value. If any mutation was encountered (the execution of `taint_t()` call), we look at the call stack and we produce the following entry for current call and each parent call — `(mutant, call:(function, parameter values)) = mutated`. This is saved in a mutation cache.

Each execution taint in the return value of the mainline represents a possible new entry in the memoization cache. That is, we add a memoization entry with the key `call:(function,`

`parameter values)`, and the corresponding return value is stored with this key unless the mutation cache contains the just returned call for this particular execution taint. If it contains the just returned call, then the return value is not memoized.

For each child processes, before executing any functions, the memoization is first checked to see if the call was previously memoized, and the call is not present in the mutation cache. If so, the result is retrieved, and used. The memoization cache is updated with the result of a function if the entry did not previously exist, and the mutation cache does not contain the current (mutant, `call:(function, parameter values)`) tuple.

With this technique, we guarantee that any non-mutated function call (that is, function calls that do not encounter a mutation during the execution of the current function or its children) within the mainline or the mutants will be available by other mutants.

If the function call encountered a mutation, then obviously the function being computed is different, and it is not shareable by other mutants.

III. IMPLEMENTATION

We were motivated by a desire to place our ideas before the mutation analysis community at an early phase so that the community can build on our ideas, and we may gain valuable early feedback. Hence, we were motivated to quickly flush out our initial prototype demonstrating the proof of concept that our ideas can indeed work.

However, this also meant that we chose a number of techniques based on their simplicity rather than their efficiency. For example, our prototype is implemented in Python, and uses a library based taint mechanism.

We wanted to compare each of the previous approaches and identify how they improved over traditional mutation analysis, and previous state of the art. Hence, we implemented each of the approaches ourselves. These include the (1) simple traditional approach, (2) the split-stream approach, and (3) the equivalence modulo state approach. Further, we wanted to evaluate the effectiveness of the two different kinds of merge back: with forking and without forking both without and with memoization.

A. Implementation of Taints

As a prototype, our priority was on evaluating the realizability of our proposal quickly. Hence, the taint transfer is only implemented for the primitive types `int` and `float`, which were sufficient to completely implement mutation analysis for our subjects. However, as Conti [11] demonstrates, this approach can be extended to arbitrary data types in Python. The primitive types are wrapped by a proxy class, providing a proxy object that behaves like the original, but with the added capability to propagate taints. The taints are stored as a Python dictionary with the mutation id as the key and the value corresponding to the mutation as the value.

B. Mutation Operators

The following mutation operators are implemented in our mutation framework.

- **Comparison operators.** We mutate each of the following comparison operators `==, !=, <, <=, >, >=` to each other.
- **Arithmetic operators.** The following arithmetic operations are mutated into each other `+, -, *, %, <<, >>, |, &, //`.

C. Meta Mutant

For implementing our technique, we use AST transformation to embed the different mutations in the same source code. We show the transformation of the program in Fig. 1 in Fig. 4.

```

def partitioned_process(a: int) -> int:
    i:int = 0
    res: int = 0
    a = @T(<M0: a+1>, <M1: a<<1>)
    counts = $get_counts()
    while @C(i < counts):
        a = @T(<M0: a/2>, <M2: a+2>, <M3: a*2>)
        res += $process(i)
        i += 1
    return res
$partitioned_process = wrap(partitioned_process)

def process(i: int):
    if @C(@T(<M0: i<0>, <M4: i<1>)):
        return 0
    else:
        return $time_consuming(i)
$process = wrap(process)

def test_process():
    @assert $partitioned_process(INPUT) == OUTPUT

```

Fig. 4: The meta-mutant of the `partitioned_process()` program

Each mutation point is replaced by a `@T()` call with a dictionary as the parameter. The dictionary contains several key value pairs of the format `<Mi: expr>`. Here, the key for the dictionary is `Mi` which is the mutation id. The `expr` is the original or mutated expression wrapped in `lambda` that is evaluated in the context of `Mi`. Each `lambda` expression is evaluated to generate the corresponding execution taint. For the evaluation of a `lambda` corresponding to a particular mutation, the corresponding execution taints of that mutation is extracted from the expression. That is, `<M2: a+2>` indicates that we first extract the execution taint `M2` in the variable `a` (if not found, we extract the execution taint `M0` (the original value) from `a`), and use it for computing the expression `a+2`. This is then stored under the key `M2` the execution taints of the resulting expression. Any uncaught exception during the evaluation of such a `lambda` function is counted as a strong kill of that mutant.

D. Implementation of Forking

Forking is performed in the `@C(expr)` call when evaluating the expression `expr` results in different values for

| Subject | LOC | Mutants |
|-----------------|-----|---------|
| CaesarCypber.py | 42 | 55 |
| Entropy.py | 19 | 46 |
| Euler.py | 19 | 35 |
| Newton.py | 15 | 39 |
| Prime.py | 24 | 58 |

TABLE I: Subjects

the mainline and some execution taint corresponding to a mutant. After forking, the mainline and mutants that follow the mainline continues in the parent process while the mutants that diverged continue in the forked child. The forked process (and the parent) can fork again if the mutants in that process diverge from each other again.

Each function is wrapped in a wrapper function (the wrapped functions are indicated by a `$` in their name) that detects a control-flow divergence within the function. When there is a control-flow divergence (and hence a forking) the parent process starts executing (the child processes are immediately suspended) and finishes first, returning to the wrapper function. The wrapper then starts the child processes one at a time. Each child process exits when it reaches the wrapper function after communicating the result of the function call to the parent process. The wrapper function in the parent process receives these results, updates the taint of the function return and continues.

IV. EVALUATION

For evaluation, we chose the following subjects: (1) CaesarCypber.py, (2) Entropy.py, (3) Euler.py, (4) Newton.py, (5) Prime.py. The details are given in Table I. As our technique is in the prototype stage, the subjects were chosen for the limited data types, and Python features that they used. Our subjects are also somewhat small, implementing just a simple algorithm in each case. Hence, this our evaluation is not a general empirical validation, but rather a proof of concept that this technique can work.

We evaluate the following mutation testing optimization approaches:

- **Traditional.** The traditional mutation analysis method. Each mutants is generated, and executed separately with no sharing.
- **Split-stream.** The split-stream execution is an improvement over the traditional mutation execution. Each mutant shares the execution path with the original until the mutation is first executed. We use the *topsy-turvy* [5] implementation.
- **Modulo-equivalent.** This is an implementation of the *equivalence modulo states* approach [7]. This approach is similar to split-stream, with the difference that, rather than forking as soon as a mutation is executed, the forking is performed when the mutation leads to a unique state. This also means that child processes themselves fork again when two mutants that initially produced the same state separate at a later point.

| Program | Traditional | Split-Stream | Modulo-State | Exec-Taints-Nf-Nm | Exec-Taints-Nf | Exec-Taints-Nm | Exec-Taints |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|
| CaesarCypher.py | 30725 | 31517 | 22803 | 2830 | 2830 | 988 | 988 |
| Entropy.py | 4974 | 4453 | 4106 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 |
| Euler.py | 3786 | 3469 | 2510 | 1192 | 1192 | 140 | 140 |
| Newton.py | 2095 | 1737 | 1239 | 511 | 511 | 103 | 103 |
| Prime.py | 5057 | 4533 | 3059 | 2740 | 2020 | 931 | 931 |
| Mean $T \times$ | 1 | 0.89 | 0.68 | 0.25 | 0.23 | 0.07 | 0.06 |

TABLE II: The number of lines of code from the program that is executed by various mutation analysis techniques.

| Program | Traditional | Split-Stream | Modulo-State | Exec-Taints-Nf-Nm | Exec-Taints-Nf | Exec-Taints-Nm | Exec-Taints |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|
| CaesarCypher.py | 0 | 519532 | 1102095 | 4283465 | 7698959 | 2346929 | 3562687 |
| Entropy.py | 0 | 131935 | 313604 | 255611 | 264010 | 248328 | 256665 |
| Euler.py | 0 | 86980 | 165647 | 1999129 | 2142995 | 216044 | 233252 |
| Newton.py | 0 | 420113 | 783796 | 4954838 | 5002992 | 752975 | 759959 |
| Prime.py | 0 | 149927 | 272727 | 2166888 | 1600531 | 688069 | 715081 |

TABLE III: The infrastructure code executed to support each technique per program. We note that the infrastructure code is very large due to the prototype nature of our implementation. This can be optimized heavily.

| Program | Traditional | Split-Stream | Modulo-State | Exec-Taints-Nf-Nm | Exec-Taints-Nf | Exec-Taints-Nm | Exec-Taints |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|
| CaesarCypher.py | 3.38 | 11.50 | 15.75 | 104.73 | 77.06 | 103.06 | 113.75 |
| Entropy.py | 2.63 | 5.56 | 8.83 | 3.30 | 3.26 | 3.29 | 3.32 |
| Euler.py | 1.93 | 3.98 | 3.58 | 19.02 | 20.53 | 2.63 | 2.99 |
| Newton.py | 2.21 | 9.49 | 10.21 | 113.75 | 114.02 | 8.67 | 8.84 |
| Prime.py | 3.22 | 7.26 | 5.17 | 25.38 | 18.91 | 8.42 | 8.75 |

TABLE IV: The wallclock runtime (seconds) for each technique per program.

- **Execution-taints** The execution taints approach that we introduced in this paper. When a control-flow divergence is detected, the diverged mutants fork and continue in a child process. Any function calls within the mutants are looked up in the memoization cache so that redundancy of execution is limited to the function where the mutants diverge.
- **Execution-taints-Nf-Nm.** The execution taints approach that we introduced in this paper, but without the memoization, and without forking. That is, when a control-flow divergence is detected, the mainline is allowed to proceed, and the function is re-executed with the divergent mutant as the mainline after the original returns. Further, the function calls are not cached by mainline, which means no sharing of child functions by mutants after control-flow divergence.
- **Execution-taints-Nf** The execution taints approach, but incorporating memoization of function calls.
- **Execution-taints-Nm** The execution taints approach, incorporating forking but not memoization of function calls.

Given that our implementation is a prototype, a number of implementation decisions we made are simple costly. For example, using a library based taint approach imposes a rather large overhead on execution. Similarly, wrapping expressions in a `lambda` for evaluation also imposes large overheads. These techniques are external to the actual utility of our research. However, they have an impact on the computational expenditure of the prototype. That is, it is not informative to compare the actual wall-clock execution time. Hence, for evaluation, we instead focus on the actual number of statements executed by the Python virtual machine. That is, we track the lines executed by hooking into the python execution using

`pdb.settrace()`. We then tabulate the lines executed by the mutants and the lines executed by the infrastructure separately.

The different mutation analysis techniques are evaluated and presented in Table II. The infrastructure support required is given in Table III.

V. DISCUSSION

Mutation analysis is the gold standard in evaluating the oracle quality of a test suite. However, with the advent of automatic test generators such as fuzzers, the mind share of mutation analysis as the premier tool has steadily decreased. This is because fuzzers typically generate millions inputs, and evaluating the fuzzer quality by independently evaluating each input in a mutant can be impractical. Hence, for making mutation analysis practical for the emerging world, we need better ways of evaluating mutants.

The interesting fact is that while mutation analysis contains many opportunities for optimization by eliminating the redundancy in execution, it has remained rather difficult to achieve it. While recent advances in mutation analysis [7] manages to eliminate most redundancies in the pre-divergence phase, it is not yet complete. Indeed, as we show, the mutants can still share the execution until the control-flow of the mutants diverge.

We note that no previous work has attempted to merge back the mutation execution when a diverged mutation execution starts following the original program execution again. Our technique is the first to achieve this merge-back.

As our results in Table II show, we can cut down on the redundant execution by merging back the execution of mutants at the function boundary. Our technique achieves an average reduction of $16.7\times$ less execution ($T \times 0.06$) when using

traditional execution as a baseline (T). In comparison, the state of the art Modulo-equivalent approach achieves only $1.47\times$ less execution ($T \times 0.68$) than traditional.

Considering the impact of individual pieces, memoization seems to have an impact only on Prime.py. However, we note that this is an artifact of the small programs we use which do not call other functions from the mutated function. However, this is not the case in larger programs where most functions call other functions for various parts of the functionality. Hence we expect the memoization to make more difference in the real world.

As Table III shows, each advancement over mutation analysis is supported by more complex infrastructure code. For example, for CaesarCypher.py, traditional mutation analysis requires no infrastructure support during the mutation runtime (the program mutants can simply be executed), while the execution-taints variants requires the largest support (we note that in most cases, the infrastructure support required by execution-taints is comparable to the state-of-the-art modulo-equivalent technique). One thing to keep in mind here is that the infrastructure code in our implementation is not optimized, and can likely be optimized heavily in a full-fledged implementation. For example, both tainting and memoization can have language-runtime support, which can alleviate their execution cost.

A. Relaxing Forking Constraints

One of the problems with fork based sharing is that one-shot external resources cause havoc. To illustrate, consider the following code.

```
res = create_external_resource(my_resource) 1
# fork here. 2
if x > 0: # ml: x > 1 3
    use_resource(res) 4
delete_external_resource(res) 5
```

Here, forking happens after the external resource is acquired, and hence both parent as well as child process uses the resource, and at the end, deletes the resource. The problem here is that if `my_resource` can only be used once per creation, either the parent or the child process will fail for forking but not for traditional execution.

With our ability to merge the execution back, we can already ensure that the resource is released only once. Further `use_resource(res)` is memoized by the main program, which means that the actual external resource is only used once by the main.

However, there is a subtlety here. External resources hold their own state, and can respond differently based on their state. The program has no way to access the internal state of the external resource. We instead use a different technique. The idea is to rely on the sequence of calls from the original as indicating the internal state. We associate a counter to the external resource such that each operation to the external resource takes the counter as one of the inputs to the memoization, and the counter is incremented for each call. Hence, when retrieving the memoized result, we use the corresponding counter value,

along with the rest of the parameters, which gives us back the right result.

If the counter value + parameters is not present in the memoization cache, then we mark the mutant as wounded. That is, the mutant needs to be run independently to verify that it has failed.

For dealing with objects, a similar method is useful. The problem with objects is that the `self` parameter to any object call contains not just the object id, but also the entirety of the object state.

```
obj = MyClass() 1
# these two are different calls. 2
obj.add(2) 3
obj.add(2) 4
```

When an object contains a large number of members, this can become expensive. Hence, we may associate a counter to each object that increments when the object is updated, which can be used as a cheap proxy for the object state.

Further, in this research, we provide several novel ideas, each of which are discussed below.

B. Repurposing Taints for Mutation Analysis

Many languages such as Perl [8] Ruby [14], JVM and .NET runtime [9], [10] either provide the ability to track dynamic data-flow taints, or make it easy and efficient to implement it. Even if the language in question does not directly support dynamic taint tracking, one can retrofit it as a library [11], [12]. Our research is the first to identify that the dynamic taints can be repurposed for mutation analysis by making mutations induce taints in the expressions they operate on. This allows us to avoid redundant computation in mutants that follow the same control-flow path as the mainline. Indeed, simply by keeping the mutation results as execution taints can allow us to go beyond the state of the art (Equivalence Modulo State) by forking only when the mutants diverge in control-flow rather than when they lead to a new state.

C. Merge Post-Divergence Execution

While previous researchers investigated techniques to share pre-divergence computation, our technique is the first to allow sharing of post-mutation computation. This shared execution can remove a significant amount of redundant execution from mutation analysis, making it feasible for advanced test generators such as fuzzers to use mutation analysis.

D. Memoization

While memoization to alleviate expensive computations is a well known technique, our technique shows how to utilize it effectively for mutation analysis. Using memoization, we are able to effectively limit redundant computation to intra-function control-flow.

We note that memoization allows us to relax the constraints that were associated with split-stream and other forking techniques. The main issue can be demonstrated by considering a test case which involves creating and deleting a file. Assume that a mutation occurred after creating the file, but before the

deletion. In such case, any forking implementations that fork on the mutation will fail because a file is created only once, but attempt is made to delete it twice.

With our technique, there are two reasons this can succeed. In the first place, if the merge back happens before the file deletion, the file will be deleted only once. Even if the file is deleted before the merge back, the file deletion call will be memoized, and will be executed only once.

VI. RELATED WORK

With the advent of automatic test generators, it has become important to ensure that the test suites generated are actually effective in revealing and preventing bugs. Mutation analysis is of course the premier tool for that purpose [15]. Mutation analysis involves generating syntactic variants of the program, which are then evaluated against a test suite. If the test suite successfully induces a failure in the mutant, but no failure in the original, we consider the mutant to have been killed. The number of such mutants killed is called the mutation score of the test suite, and is considered to be a reliable proxy for the effectiveness of the test suite in revealing faults in the program. Further, the undetected mutants in a program for a given test suite is considered a reasonable proxy for the residual defects in the program.

The error model in mutation analysis is that errors are caused during transcription of the mental model of the programmer to code [16]. This leads to the two axioms of mutation analysis. The *competent programmer hypothesis* and the *coupling effect*. The *competent programmer hypothesis* states that programmers tend to create near-correct versions of programs, and the *coupling effect* states that complex faults are coupled to simple faults such that test cases capable of detecting the simple faults are also capable of detecting most complex faults.

Combining these pieces, to be effective, mutation analysis needs to exhaustively generate all possible simple faults, and evaluate them. If the test suite is able to capture all such simple faults, we can have high confidence that it will be able to detect all complex faults in the program.

Unfortunately, exhaustively generating and evaluating all simple faults is costly. Compared to coverage measures, which can be obtained in a single run of a test suite, mutation analysis (at worst) requires as many runs of the test suite as there are mutants (because each mutant needs to be independently evaluated).

Numerous techniques exist to reduce the computational expenditure involved in traditional mutation analysis [17], [18]. These can broadly be classified into approaches that try to approximate the traditional mutation score (weak and firm mutation [19], [20], [21], [22], [23], checked coverage [24]), and those that try to improve the efficiency or speed of traditional mutation score.

This research focuses on improving the efficiency of evaluation. Hence, we will take a closer look in this area. Some of the work in this area involves parallelization of mutation

analysis using MIMD [25] and SIMD [26] machines, in HPC systems [27], and using Hadoop [28].

Two algorithms try to reduce the number of mutants to be evaluated by identifying which tests test which mutants. The first called lazy mutation analysis by Fleishgacker [29] which uses weak mutation kills to identify which tests to run on which mutants. A less stringent approach is to use code coverage for the same purpose [2].

Mutant schemata [30] is a technique that encodes all mutations into a meta mutant. The particular mutant to be executed is passed to the meta mutant as a command line argument or an environment variable. Just et al. [3] show that not all mutations result in a unique state, and many mutants can be represented by a single execution. Split-stream execution [4], [5], [6] is another technique that tries to reduce the redundancy in mutation executions. In this technique, the mutants are forked off from the execution only after encountering the particular mutation in the original. The equivalence modulo states approach [7] combines partitioning states with execution forking to further reduce the redundancy in pre-divergence execution.

VII. THREATS TO VALIDITY

A. Threats to External Validity

Threats to external validity are factors that may reduce the generalizability of our findings. Our approach is implemented only as a prototype. Further, the subjects were chosen such that they were small, contained operations only on primitive data types such as `int` and `float`. Hence, the results from our evaluation is not a proof of generality of our technique, rather that the technique is a promising direction. Indeed, we accept that any number of uncontrolled parameters such as the subject type, test suites, the mutation operators used, all can have an impact on the amount of execution saving accomplished. We propose to study these in detail in future work.

B. Threats to Internal Validity

Threats to internal validity are factors concerning the judgment of cause and effect relationships. We have used the number of statements executed by the Python runtime as an indication of the effectiveness of the technique. However, this assumes that the supporting infrastructure code can be optimized such that the actual program execution forms the largest chunk. While we believe that this is a reasonable assumption, it is possible that the infrastructure code can't be optimized as heavily as we expect, and this may lead to a loss in efficiency. This is a threat to validity that we acknowledge. Further, software bugs are a fact of life, and it is possible that we may have bugs in our implementation leading to faulty measurements. This is also another threat that we acknowledge. The mitigation of these threats will also form our future work.

VIII. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Our implementation is only a prototype. Hence it is subject to a large number of constraints.

A. Theory

- When control-flow divergence is detected, only mutants in the current execution path continue. This means that the computations carried out in execution taints of the wounded mutants are discarded.
- In a function, after the control-flow divergence, we only merge the execution at the function return. However, there could be other parts especially after the diverged control-flow structure finishes where the execution may be shared. This execution path is not currently shared. (This limitation is true only about the execution path within the function. As soon as a function call is made from the control-flow with the same parameters, the computation is shared across mutants.) Even if one merges the execution flow immediately after the control-flow structure finishes, there may be parts of control-flow where different branches are similar, but do not share the execution.
- Shared with split stream and equivalence modulo state: Flow that requires single-shot initialization can't be handled.

B. Prototype

- Only a limited number of mutation primitives are implemented.
- Only integers and floats are implemented.
- We do not consider globals.
- Multi-threaded programs, programs using fork
- Programs using IPC.

IX. CONCLUSION

Mutation analysis is an effective but costly method for evaluating test suite quality. The main problem is that independent evaluation of individual mutants involve a large amount of redundancy due to similar pre-divergence and post-mutation executions. Previous work explored methods to reduce the pre-divergence execution. However, post-mutation execution has remained unsolved. We describe a novel method based on execution taints that can merge post-mutation execution, and hence avoid post-mutation execution redundancy.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Gopinath, "On the limits of mutation analysis," dissertation, Oregon State University, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://rahul.gopinath.org/resources/icse2016/gopinath2016on.pdf>
- [2] D. Schuler and A. Zeller, "Javalanche: Efficient mutation testing for java," in *Proceedings of the 7th joint meeting of the European software engineering conference and the ACM SIGSOFT symposium on The foundations of software engineering*, 2009, pp. 297–298.
- [3] R. Just, M. D. Ernst, and G. Fraser, "Efficient mutation analysis by propagating and partitioning infected execution states," in *Proceedings of the 2014 International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. ACM, 2014, pp. 315–326.
- [4] K. N. King and A. J. Offutt, "A fortran language system for mutation-based software testing," *Software: Practice and Experience*, vol. 21, no. 7, pp. 685–718, 1991.
- [5] R. Gopinath, C. Jensen, and A. Groce, "Topsy-turvy: a smarter and faster parallelization of mutation analysis," in *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Software Engineering Companion*, 2016, pp. 740–743.
- [6] S. Tokumoto, H. Yoshida, K. Sakamoto, and S. Honiden, "Muvm: Higher order mutation analysis virtual machine for c," in *2016 IEEE International Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation (ICST)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 320–329.
- [7] B. Wang, Y. Xiong, Y. Shi, L. Zhang, and D. Hao, "Faster mutation analysis via equivalence modulo states," in *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*, 2017, pp. 295–306.
- [8] J. Allen, "Perl version 5.8. 8 documentation-perlsec," <http://perldoc.perl.org/perlsec.pdf>, 2006, accessed: 2018-07-30.
- [9] B. Livshits, "Dynamic taint tracking in managed runtimes," <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/tr-6.pdf>, Microsoft Research Technical Report, Tech. Rep. MSR-TR-2012-114, 2012.
- [10] V. Haldar, D. Chandra, and M. Franz, "Dynamic taint propagation for java," in *21st Annual Computer Security Applications Conference (ACSAC'05)*. IEEE, 2005, pp. 9–pp.
- [11] J. J. Conti and A. Russo, "A taint mode for python via a library," in *Nordic Conference on Secure IT Systems*. Springer, 2010, pp. 210–222.
- [12] A. Zeller, R. Gopinath, M. Böhme, G. Fraser, and C. Holler, "Tracking information flow," in *The Fuzzing Book*. CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, 2021, retrieved 2021-11-13 17:58:11+01:00. [Online]. Available: <https://www.fuzzingbook.org/html/InformationFlow.html>
- [13] J. Hunt, "Python properties," in *A Beginners Guide to Python 3 Programming*. Springer, 2019, pp. 253–261.
- [14] D. Flanagan and Y. Matsumoto, *The Ruby Programming Language: Everything You Need to Know*. O'Reilly Media, Inc., 2008.
- [15] R. DeMillo, G. I. O. T. A. S. O. INFORMATION, and C. SCIENCE., *Mutation Analysis as a Tool for Software Quality Assurance*, ser. GIT-ICS. School of Information and Computer Science, Georgia Institute of Technology, 1980. [Online]. Available: <https://books.google.de/books?id=gw9kGwAACAAJ>
- [16] R. A. DeMillo, R. J. Lipton, and F. G. Sayward, "Hints on test data selection: Help for the practicing programmer," *Computer*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 34–41, 1978.
- [17] M. Papadakis, M. Kintis, J. Zhang, Y. Jia, Y. Le Traon, and M. Harman, "Mutation testing advances: an analysis and survey," in *Advances in Computers*. Elsevier, 2019, vol. 112, pp. 275–378.
- [18] A. V. Pizzoleto, F. C. Ferrari, J. Offutt, L. Fernandes, and M. Ribeiro, "A systematic literature review of techniques and metrics to reduce the cost of mutation testing," *Journal of Systems and Software*, vol. 157, p. 110388, 2019.
- [19] A. J. Offutt, G. Rothmel, and C. Zapf, "An experimental evaluation of selective mutation," in *Proceedings of 1993 15th international conference on software engineering*. IEEE, 1993, pp. 100–107.
- [20] W. E. Howden, "Weak mutation testing and completeness of test sets," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, no. 4, pp. 371–379, 1982.
- [21] A. J. Offutt and S. D. Lee, "How strong is weak mutation?" in *Proceedings of the symposium on Testing, analysis, and verification*, 1991, pp. 200–213.
- [22] —, "An empirical evaluation of weak mutation," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 337–344, 1994.
- [23] V. H. Durelli, J. Offutt, and M. E. Delamaro, "Toward harnessing high-level language virtual machines for further speeding up weak mutation testing," in *2012 IEEE Fifth International Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 681–690.
- [24] D. Schuler and A. Zeller, "Checked coverage: an indicator for oracle quality," *Software testing, verification and reliability*, vol. 23, no. 7, pp. 531–551, 2013.
- [25] A. J. Offutt, R. P. Pargas, S. V. Fichter, and P. K. Khambekar, "Mutation testing of software using mimd computer," in *ICPP (2)*. Citeseer, 1992, pp. 257–266.
- [26] E. W. Krauser, A. P. Mathur, and V. J. Rego, "High performance software testing on simd machines," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 17, no. 5, p. 403, 1991.
- [27] P. C. Cañizares, M. G. Merayo, and A. Núñez, "Eminent: Embarrassingly parallel mutation testing," *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 80, pp. 63–73, 2016.
- [28] I. Saleh and K. Nagi, "Hadoopmutator: A cloud-based mutation testing framework," in *International Conference on Software Reuse*. Springer, 2015, pp. 172–187.

- [29] V. N. Fleyshgakker and S. N. Weiss, "Efficient mutation analysis: A new approach," in *Proceedings of the 1994 ACM SIGSOFT international symposium on Software testing and analysis*, 1994, pp. 185–195.
- [30] R. H. Untch, A. J. Offutt, and M. J. Harrold, "Mutation analysis using mutant schemata," in *Proceedings of the 1993 ACM SIGSOFT international symposium on Software testing and analysis*, 1993, pp. 139–148.