

Specification Mining for Smart Contracts with Trace Slicing and Predicate Abstraction

YE LIU, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

YI LI, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

CYRILLE ARTHO, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden

YIXUAN LIU, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Smart contracts are computer programs running on blockchains to implement Decentralized Applications. The absence of contract specifications hinders routine tasks, such as contract understanding and testing. In this work, we propose a specification mining approach to infer contract specifications from past transaction histories. Our approach derives high-level behavioral automata of function invocations, accompanied by program invariants statistically inferred from the transaction histories. We implemented our approach as tool `SmCon` and evaluated it on eleven well-studied Azure benchmark smart contracts and six popular real-world DApp smart contracts. The experiments show that `SmCon` mines reasonably accurate specifications that can be used to facilitate DApp understanding and development in terms of document maintenance and test suite improvement.

ACM Reference Format:

Ye Liu, Yi Li, Cyrille Artho, and Yixuan Liu. 2018. Specification Mining for Smart Contracts with Trace Slicing and Predicate Abstraction. 1, 1 (March 2018), 22 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

Blockchain technology has developed rapidly in recent years, since the introduction of Bitcoin [52] by Nakamoto in 2008. Blockchain itself is a distributed ledger maintained and shared by a peer-to-peer (P2P) network, and it evolved into a platform which supports the deployment and execution of smart contracts, popularized by Ethereum [61]. Smart contracts are self-executing computer programs used to implement Decentralized Applications (DApps). Users interact with smart contracts by executing transactions on the blockchain. The transaction data specifies inputs, such as the address of the sender, the smart contract function called, and parameter values. Ethereum, the most prominent smart contract platform, is empowering many DApps, spanning areas such as finance, health, governance, games, etc. [5]. As of May 2023, there are more than 50 million smart contracts deployed on Ethereum, and these smart contracts have supported 13,968 DApps [5, 6].

Despite the high stakes involved, smart contracts are often developed in an undisciplined way. The existence of bugs and vulnerabilities compromises the reliability and security of smart contracts and endangers the trust of users. For example, many smart contracts restrict user access to functionalities by implementing certain access control policies. Durieux et al. [25] reported that nearly 10% of the smart contracts may contain security vulnerabilities related to access controls. ERC-20 [1] is the most popular smart contract standard on Ethereum, yet 13% of the ERC-20 token

Authors' addresses: Ye Liu, ye.liu@ntu.edu.sg, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore; Yi Li, yi_li@ntu.edu.sg, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore; Cyrille Artho, artho@kth.se, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden; Yixuan Liu, LIUY0255@e.ntu.edu.sg, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore.

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 the author(s) 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.

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM XXXX-XXXX/2018/3-ART

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

contracts do not conform to the standard specification [19]. Moreover, Qin et al. [54] demonstrated how economic behavior models can be exploited to attack the DeFi ecosystem with flash loans. A major difficulty in validating the conformance of smart contracts, i.e., whether the contract implementation adheres to the expected behaviors, is the lack of documented formal specifications. Formal specifications capture the expected contract behaviors, in terms of formal languages, based on a formal model [31] with precise semantics. Specifications of a smart contract play a central role in describing, understanding, reasoning about contract behaviors, and detecting, through testing and verification, non-conformance issues such as functional bugs and security vulnerabilities.

Similar to traditional formal specifications, two forms of smart contract specifications have been studied in past work: (1) function-level program invariants [39], which are used in testing [58], verification [41, 53], and runtime validation [37] of smart contracts; and (2) contract-level behavioral specifications in the form of automata [46], which can be used to support contract synthesis [47], model-based testing [40], design verification [48], and workflow verification [60]. Specifically, Wang et al. [60] performed workflow verification via semantic conformance checking between state machine-based workflow specifications and smart contracts from the *Azure Blockchain Workbench*, an enterprise blockchain from Microsoft.

In this paper, we focus on mining high-level automata-based specifications automatically for smart contracts. Many approaches have been proposed for this task on traditional program traces: for example, grammar inference techniques [13, 21, 23] and deep learning-based techniques [35] have been used to learn automata from a set of program execution traces. The k-tail algorithm and its variants [17, 32, 45] merge states if the same set of “tail” invocation sequences are observed.

However, the way smart contracts behave poses new challenges for mining automata-based behavioral models. As they are usually deployed on public blockchain networks, smart contracts handle multiple user interactions simultaneously. Therefore, the execution traces recorded in contract transaction histories consist of interleaving events triggered by different user interactions and may belong to different sessions. Since there does not exist a standard approach for managing user sessions, the execution traces cannot be easily separated for independent interactions. Moreover, predicate abstraction is crucial in deriving compact but accurate automata. Yet, the choice of predicates remains challenging and is often tightly tied with the specific analysis tasks. The predicate abstraction techniques used in computing state abstractions must be tailored to take into account the specific data structures and runtime environments of smart contracts.

To mine more accurate automata specification efficiently for smart contracts, we propose a specification mining algorithm powered by trace slicing and predicate abstraction [28]. The contract specification mining process is preceded by a slicing of the transaction histories. We perform trace slicing on the transaction histories via a parametric binding learned from the existing test suites. A slice of history is a sequence of inter-related transactions, e.g., all transactions related to one specific trade session. Smart contract transaction histories, being stored persistently on blockchain, record all past function executions since the contract deployment. To find suitable predicate candidates for state abstraction, we use a statistical inference technique [3, 39] to generate a set of dynamic invariants, based on the transaction histories. Then, we follow the counterexample-guided abstraction refinement (CEGAR) approach [21] to perform a lazy state abstraction, and introduce minimal existential abstraction to ensure the automata specification is accurate and simple. Finally, our automata specification subsumes all observed invocation sequences and at the same time preserves its generality.

In summary, we make the following contributions. First, we formalize the specification mining problem for smart contracts. Second, we propose a CEGAR-based specification mining algorithm, powered by trace slicing and predicate abstraction. Third, we implement our approach in tool *SMCON* and evaluate it on eleven well-studied Azure benchmark smart contracts and six popular real-world

DApp smart contracts. The experiments indicate that the mined specifications are precise and useful for DApp development. The benchmarks, raw results, and source code are available at: <https://sites.google.com/view/smcon/>.

Organization. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides the background. Section 3 illustrates our approach through an example. Section 4 introduces our specification mining algorithm, followed by the implementation and evaluation in Sect. 5. We compare with the related work in Sect. 6 and conclude the paper in Sect. 7.

2 BACKGROUND

We borrow terminology about (non-)parametric events and traces from [36].

DEFINITION 1 (NON-PARAMETRIC EVENTS AND TRACES). *Let ξ be a set of (non-parametric) events, called base events or simply events. An ξ -trace, or simply a (non-parametric) trace is any finite sequence of events in ξ , that is, an element in ξ^* . If event $e \in \xi$ appears in trace $w \in \xi^*$ then we write $e \in w$.*

DEFINITION 2 (PARAMETRIC EVENTS AND TRACES). *Let X be a set of parameters and let V be a set of corresponding parameter values. If ξ is a set of base events as in Definition 1, then let $\xi(X)$ be the set of corresponding parametric events $e(\theta)$, where e is a base event in ξ and θ is a partial function in $[X \rightarrow V]$. A parametric trace is a trace with events in $\xi(X)$, that is, a word in $\xi(X)^*$.*

From a user's perspective, a smart contract is a set of interface functions which can be invoked to execute contract code. Let these interface functions be represented as base events: ξ is the set of interface function names and $e \in \xi$ corresponds to a contract function. The execution of e accepts parameters (denoted as X), including the user-provided function inputs (X_1) and the contract state variables (X_2) stored on the blockchain. Let V be the corresponding values of X in parametric traces. Let D_X , D_{X_1} , and D_{X_2} be the corresponding domains. Finally, given a smart contract, let $\xi(X)$ be the set of all function executions, and any function invocation sequence can be represented as a parametric trace (word) in $\xi(X)^*$. The behaviors of a smart contract can be captured by a labeled transition system that accepts all its function invocation sequences.

DEFINITION 3 (LABELED TRANSITION SYSTEM (LTS) [15]). *A smart contract is a labeled transition system (S, s_0, Σ, δ) where S is a set of possibly-infinite states, $S \subseteq D_{X_2}$, $s_0 \in S$ is an initial state, Σ is a possibly-infinite alphabet, $\Sigma \subseteq \xi(X)^*$, and $\delta \subseteq S \times \Sigma \times S$ is a set of transitions.*

An LTS can be represented more compactly by abstracting it into an EFSM.

DEFINITION 4 (EXTENDED FINITE STATE MACHINE (EFSM) [20]). *EFSM is defined as a 6-tuple $(Q, q_0, \Sigma', G, U, T)$ where,*

- Q is a finite set of symbolic states under a predicate abstraction $\alpha : S \rightarrow Q$,
- $q_0 \in Q$ is the initial symbolic state,
- Σ' is a finite alphabet defined, $\Sigma' \subseteq \xi^*$,
- G is a set of guarding function g_i such that $g_i: D_X \rightarrow \{\text{True}, \text{False}\}$,
- U is a set of update function u_i such that $u_i: D_X \rightarrow D_X$,
- T is a transition relation, $T : Q \times G \times \Sigma \rightarrow U \times Q$.

To compute state abstractions, predicate abstraction [21] is typically used, which is a function to create a partition of the domains of data types. For example, the widely used predicate abstraction for integer domain is $\{\text{neg}, \text{zero}, \text{pos}\}$ which represent negative, zero and positive numbers respectively. However, there could be many EFSM candidates that an LTS can be abstracted into. In this paper, we borrow the concept of *minimal existential abstraction* [18] and later use it to obtain a compact EFSM.




Fig. 1. Six game invocation sequences for GameChannel.

DEFINITION 5 (MINIMAL EXISTENTIAL ABSTRACTION [18]). $EFSM = (Q, q_0, \Sigma', G, U, T)$ is the minimal existential abstraction of $LTS = (S, s_0, \Sigma, \delta)$ with respect to $\alpha : S \rightarrow Q$ iff,

$$\exists s_0 \in S \cdot \alpha(s_0) = q \iff q = q_0 \quad (1)$$

$$\exists (s_0, e_0(\theta_0), s_1), \dots, (s_{n-1}, e_{n-1}(\theta_{n-1}), s_n) \in \delta \cdot$$

$$\alpha(s_0) = q_0 \wedge \alpha(s_1) = q_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha(s_{n-1}) = q_{n-1} \wedge \alpha(s_n) = q_n$$

$$\iff (q_0, g_i, e_0, u_i, q_1), \dots, (q_{n-1}, g_j, e_{n-1}, u_j, q_n) \in T \quad (2)$$

Intuitively, the minimal existential abstraction implies that: (1) the initial concrete state can be mapped to the initial symbolic state in the extended finite state machine, and vice versa; (2) every concrete path is preserved in the extended finite state machine, and every symbolic path in the extended finite state machine has at least a corresponding concrete path.

3 APPROACH AT A GLANCE

We illustrate our approach using the GameChannel contract from a DApp called Dicether. Dicether is a decentralized casino application on Ethereum, relying on a smart contract to provide an open, secure, and fair gaming experience. A new game is created by calling the contract function `createGame`. When approaching the end of a game, an admin user may invoke the `serverEndGame` function to close the game. More details can be found in its documentation [24].

Figure 1 overviews how we separate interleaving interactions from past transaction histories. A transaction history is a sequence of transactions, where each transaction can be decoded as a contract function invocation. We apply a slicing function, which is determined by interaction patterns observed in test suites, on the transaction history, to produce a set of independent invocation sequences. For GameChannel, there are six game interaction sequences, corresponding to six user sessions. For instance, $user_1 : A(\text{gameId}:1)$ indicates the invocation of `createGame` by $user_1$ for creating a game with index 1. For simplicity, we omit the values of the other function parameters and the transaction environment variables. A function invocation may change the values of state variables, thus updating contract states. In Fig. 1, the first game is created by $user_1$ and after a while ended by $user_2$. Three game states, s_0 , s_1 , and s_2 , are involved. The second game is created by $user_3$, and later canceled by $user_2$ and $user_3$ via `serverCancelActiveGame` and `userCancelActiveGame`, respectively.

From these invocation sequences, we can construct an extended finite state machine annotated with function pre-/post-conditions, as a specification of the observed contract behaviors. Specifically, in GameChannel, each function pre-/post-condition consists of a set of predicates either relevant to game state variables or function input parameters. Figure 3 shows the data structure used in GameChannel, where `server`, `gameIdCntr`, and `gameIdGame` maintain information about the game manager, the number of created games, and all game state information, respectively. The game state

$$\begin{aligned}
P_1 &: \text{status} = 0 & P_2 &: \text{status} = 1 \\
P_3 &: \text{status} = 2 & P_4 &: \text{status} = 3 & P_5 &: \text{status} > 3 \\
P_6 &: \text{roundId} = 0 & P_7 &: \text{roundId} > 0 \\
P_8 &: \text{endInitiatedTime} = 0 & P_9 &: \text{endInitiatedTime} > 0 \\
P_{10} &: \text{stake} = 0 & P_{11} &: \text{stake} > 0
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 2. The 11 predicates that partition the game state.

Table 1. The function pre-/post-conditions of GameChannel.

Functions	Preconditions	Post-conditions
createGame	$P_1 \wedge P_6 \wedge P_8 \wedge P_{10}$	$P_2 \wedge P_6 \wedge P_8 \wedge P_{11} \wedge (\text{stake} = \text{msg.value})$
serverEndGameConflict	$(P_2 \vee P_3) \wedge (\text{roundId} > 0) \wedge (\text{caller} = \text{server})$	$P_1 \vee (P_4 \wedge P_7 \wedge P_9) \wedge (\text{roundId} = \text{roundId})$
serverCancelActiveGame	$(P_2 \vee (P_3 \wedge P_6)) \wedge (\text{caller} = \text{server})$	$P_1 \vee (P_4 \wedge P_9)$
serverEndGame	$P_2 \wedge (\text{caller} = \text{server})$	P_1
userCancelActiveGame	$P_2 \vee (P_4 \wedge P_6)$	$P_1 \vee (P_3 \wedge P_9)$
userEndGameConflict	$(P_2 \vee P_4) \wedge (\text{roundId} > 0)$	$P_1 \vee (P_3 \wedge P_7 \wedge P_9) \wedge (\text{roundId} = \text{roundId})$
serverForceGameEnd	$P_4 \wedge (\text{caller} = \text{server})$	P_1

variables include `status`, `roundId`, `endInitiatedTime`, and `stake`. The variable `status` being ENDED (0) indicates that a game either has not been created or has already been terminated; `roundId` is an unsigned integer used to record the current game round; `endInitiatedTime` records when a game is required to terminate itself as per users' requests; and `stake` keeps the amount of fund that a player deposits into the contract when creating a game. Since all parameter values, including contract state variables and user-provided function inputs, can be decoded from blockchain transactions, we can infer dynamic invariants to be candidates of predicates on function pre-/post-conditions. Figure 2 shows the 11 resulting predicates.

Assume that all contract state variables are initialized to zero, so s_0 can be represented by $P_1 \wedge P_6 \wedge P_8 \wedge P_{10}$. These predicates also form the pre- and post-conditions in Table 1, where some other parameter predicates in the pre- and post-conditions are over function input parameters, i. e., “`roundId`” and `caller` of the function, i. e., “`caller`”. The precondition of the `createGame` function is that all variable values, namely, `status`, `stake`, `roundId`, and `endInitiatedTime`, are zero; and its postcondition is that when `createGame` finishes, the variable `status` is set to ACTIVE (1) and the deposited stake is greater than zero and equals to the transferred fund, i. e., `msg.value`.¹

Figure 4 shows our mined automaton, of which we have confirmed the correctness using the ground truth specification of GameChannel. The mined automaton has seven symbolic states. Only `createGame` can be called at the initial state (q_0). Furthermore, when the caller is server, he/she is allowed to call `serverEndGame` to terminate the game and move towards the final state (q_6) where `status` changes to be ENDED (0). Such an automaton captures the common usages of GameChannel and its permission policies, thus being a *likely* contract specification.

As for automata construction, SMCON uses a CEGAR-like approach, which will be detailed in Sect. 4. Briefly, we perform a lazy abstraction, i. e., we do not refine predicate abstraction unless we have to. To obtain an extended finite state machine, SMCON takes the sliced independent invocation sequences and the inferred function pre-/post-conditions as input. Initially, we construct an automaton containing only two states and then revisit the automaton to recognize the spurious symbolic paths that have no support, i. e., a corresponding concrete invocation sequence in the past

¹In Solidity smart contracts, `msg.value` refers to the amount of transferred native cryptocurrency, e.g., ETH on Ethereum, during contract function execution.

```

1 contract GameChannel{
2   enum GameState {
3     ENDED, ACTIVE, USER_INITIATED_END,
4     ↪ SERVER_INITIATED_END
5   }
6   struct Game {
7     GameState status;
8     uint128 stake;
9     uint32 roundId;
10    uint endInitiatedTime;
11  }
12  // @dev Game id counter.
13  uint public gameIdCtr = 0;
14  address public server;
15  mapping (uint => Game) public gameIdGame;
16  // functions ...
17 }

```

Fig. 3. State variables of GameChannel.




Fig. 4. The mined automaton of GameChannel.

observations. Then we refine the automaton to eliminate the spurious paths via either splitting larger states or removing unreachable transitions. We repeat this process until no spurious path is included in the resulting automaton.

4 CONTRACT SPECIFICATION MINING

In this section, we introduce the specification mining problem for smart contracts and present our proposed algorithm.

Smart Contract Specification Mining. Given a contract's transaction histories, where all the past contract behaviors are captured by LTS_n , the *specification mining problem* is to mine an *EFSM* as the likely specification of the smart contract. To solve the specification mining problem, we first perform a *trace slicing* on the input transaction histories, to obtain multiple independent invocation traces. Next, we find predicates that belong to preconditions or post-conditions of the smart contract's functions. Finally, we implement a counterexample-guided abstraction refinement loop to produce an extended finite state machine, satisfying the minimal existential abstraction property (see Definition 5).

4.1 Trace Slicing

Smart contracts are public-facing, and, by their nature, simultaneously accept inputs from multiple users. Contract executions in such a setting result in a linear transaction history, which consists of interleaving execution traces triggered through multiple user interactions/sessions. To record data owned by different users, most smart contracts supporting DApps, maintain a collection of custom data objects, indexed by user(session)-specific parameters. For example, the `GameChannel` contract maintains many concurrent game instances as state variables. To interact with a particular game instance, a user needs to specify the value of its `gameId`, through input parameters of the transaction (see Fig. 1). To mine meaningful contract specifications from transaction histories with mixed interactions, one has to slice them into independent traces for each game instance.

DEFINITION 6 (TRACE SLICING [36]). Given a parametric trace $\tau \in \xi(X)^*$ and a parametric binding θ in $[X \rightarrow V]$, let the θ -trace slice $\tau \upharpoonright_{\theta} \in \xi^*$ be the non-parametric trace defined as:

- $\epsilon \upharpoonright_{\theta} = \epsilon$, where ϵ is the empty trace/word, and
- $(\tau e(\theta')) \upharpoonright_{\theta} = \begin{cases} (\tau \upharpoonright_{\theta}) e, & \text{if } \theta' \sqsubseteq \theta \\ \tau \upharpoonright_{\theta}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

where we say that θ' is less informative than θ , written $\theta' \sqsubseteq \theta$ iff for any $x \in X$, if $\theta'(x)$ is defined then $\theta(x)$ is also defined and $\theta'(x) = \theta(x)$.

A transaction history of smart contract can be seen as a parametric trace, and *trace slicing* slices the history into a set of independent invocation sequences via certain parametric bindings (e.g., θ) [36]. A trace slice $\tau \upharpoonright_{\theta}$ first filters out all the parametric events that are irrelevant to the parameter instance θ . A trace slice also forgets the parameter bindings of parametric events. As a result, a trace slice is non-parametric and merely a list of base events. To find parametric bindings, we should first ascertain the relation between different events, or say function invocations in smart contracts. Such parametric bindings can be inferred from the existing DApp test suites, which demonstrate typical usage scenarios and user interaction patterns. Specifically, we may observe a group of related functions and what parameter values they share in a unit test. For example, the test suites for `GameChannel` contain many well-written test cases where game objects are explicitly specified by the "gameId" variable in each contract function. Therefore, we can use such relations as a configuration to instruct how to automatically slice the transaction history according to the corresponding values of "gameId" to generate a set of independent game invocation sequences.

4.2 Predicate Discovery from Dynamic Invariants

The choice of predicates is crucial for computing good state abstractions. In this paper, we use *likely* pre- and post-conditions of contract functions as candidates. Because of the blockchain transparency, we may decode the values of contract state variables and user-provided function inputs, before and after each function invocation. Then we statistically infer dynamic invariants for each function, which hold for all observed invocations in the past transaction histories. But

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\perp}{\langle q_0 \leftarrow \bigwedge_{x \in X_1} x = 0, Q \leftarrow \{q_0, \neg q_0\}, \Sigma, G \leftarrow \{g_m\}_m, U \leftarrow \{u_m\}_m, T \leftarrow \emptyset \rangle} \text{INIT} \\
\frac{\langle q_0, Q, \Sigma, G, U, T \rangle \quad \exists q_i, q_j \in Q \cdot (q_i \wedge g_m) \wedge (q_j \wedge u_m) \quad \nexists t \cdot (q_i, g_m, e_m, u_m, q_j) \in T}{\langle q_0, Q, \Sigma, G, U, T \leftarrow T \cup \{t\} \rangle} \text{CONSTRUCT} \\
\frac{\text{EFSM: } \langle q_0, Q, \Sigma, G, U, T \rangle \quad \begin{array}{l} \exists \pi_n : q_0 t_1 t_2 \cdots t_n q_n \in \text{EFSM} \exists \text{concretize}(\pi_n) \in \text{LTS}_h \\ \exists \pi_{n+1} : \pi_n \oplus t_{n+1} q_{n+1} \in \text{EFSM} \nexists \text{concretize}(\pi_{n+1}) \in \text{LTS}_h \end{array}}{\text{EFSM} \leftarrow \text{SPLITREMOVE}(q_n, t_{n+1}, \text{EFSM})} \text{RMPATH}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 5. Specification mining rules.

since the transaction history may be limited, the inferred pre- and post-conditions are *likely* to hold, which is good enough to serve as predicate candidates.

More specifically, we define a *predicate template* as “ $x \bowtie y$ ”, where $x \in X$ is a parameter, and $y \in X \cup K$ is either a parameter or constant, and \bowtie is an operator from the set $\{=, !=, >, <, <=, >=\}$. The template is instantiated on all successful transactions, which are not reverted during executions, and the instances which always hold are kept as predicate candidates for either function pre- or post-conditions. The predicates defined over state variables are used in constructing the symbolic states Q in EFSM.

The inference process is similar to how dynamic invariants are detected in Daikon-like systems [3, 39] through a set of predefined invariant templates. However, smart contracts are usually writing in Turing-complete programming languages such as Solidity, supporting complex data structures including array, mapping and custom struct. Therefore, we extended our previous invariant detection work [39] and built a new tool called InvCon+ [12, 42] to perform our invariant inference. InvCon+ presents two distinct advantages. Firstly, it excels in the efficient processing of online execution traces extracted directly from contract transactions, avoiding the need to dump all execution traces for offline invariant detection. This not only results in significant storage savings but also renders the method highly adaptable to evolving transaction histories. Secondly, InvCon+ leverages established smart contract analysis tools like Slither [26] to filter out irrelevant invariants through rigorous program dependency analysis. This strategic integration with existing tools contributes to the method’s precision and efficiency by focusing on pertinent invariants, thereby optimizing the overall performance of InvCon+ in smart contract analysis.

4.3 Automata Construction

The over-generalization of the inferred function pre-/post-conditions is the main difficulty for their direct use in mining high-level automata specifications. To address this problem, we use a CEGAR-like approach to mine automata specifications with predicate abstraction.

Counterexample-guided abstraction refinement. To mine a precise specification, the key is to compute a precise state abstraction α , which partitions the contract state. The abstraction function α is implicitly computed following the paradigm of counterexample-guided abstraction refinement [21]. We define our specification mining algorithm by the three rules in Fig. 5. Our algorithm takes as input past observations of concrete invocation sequences and inferred function pre-/post-conditions. When the algorithm terminates, it produces an EFSM containing no spurious states and transitions.

The INIT rule initializes a preliminary extended finite state machine containing two states: q_0 , referring to $\bigwedge_{x \in X_1} x = 0$ that all state variables are valued zero, and $\neg q_0$ for the remaining cases. The guard function G and update function U are directly instantiated by the inferred function pre- and

Algorithm 1 SPLITREMOVE($q_n, t_{n+1}, EFSM$)

-
- 1: Let $\langle q_0, Q, \Sigma, G, U, T \rangle = EFSM$
 - 2: Let $t_{n+1} = (q_n, g_m, e_m, u_m, q_{n+1}) \in T$ \triangleright a transition from state q_n to q_{n+1} by the invocation of function e_m where g_m, u_m are its precondition and post-condition, respectively.
 - 3: $\hat{q}_1 = q_n \wedge g_m$
 - 4: $\hat{q}_2 = q_n \wedge \neg g_m$
 - 5: **if** SAT(\hat{q}_1) \wedge SAT(\hat{q}_2) **then** $\triangleright q_n$ is splittable with g_m .
 - 6: $Q \leftarrow (Q \setminus q_n) \cup \{\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2\}$ \triangleright replace q_n with two new states.
 - 7: Removes transitions starting or ending with q_n in T
 - 8: **else**
 - 9: **if** $\nexists \pi'_n \cdot \pi'_n \in EFSM \wedge \text{concretize}(\pi'_n \oplus t_{n+1}) \in LTS_h$ **then** \triangleright remove unreachable transition t_{n+1}
 - 10: $T \leftarrow T \setminus t_{n+1}$
 - 11: **else**
 - 12: Let $S_{q_n|\pi'_n}$ be the set of all the concrete states of q_n in the history LTS_h , which are visited by the observed invocation sequences of π'_n .
 - 13: $Q \leftarrow (Q \setminus \{q_n\}) \cup \{\text{Pred}(S_{q_n|\pi'_n}), q_n \wedge \neg \text{Pred}(S_{q_n|\pi'_n})\}$
 - 14: Removes transitions starting or ending with q_n in T
 - 15: **return** $\langle q_0, Q, \Sigma, G, U, T \rangle$ \triangleright return the resulting automaton
-




Fig. 6. The illustration of automata mining process.

postconditions, respectively. Also, the transition relation set T is initialized to be empty. Then, we apply the CONSTRUCT rule to add theoretically feasible state transitions to the automaton. A state transition is theoretically feasible if and only if it satisfies the logical conjunction of symbolic states and function preconditions or post-conditions. The resulting automaton could be over-generalized such that it includes spurious state transition paths. Therefore, we need to apply the RMPATH rule, following Algorithm 1 to eliminate those spurious state transition paths that are not supported in the concrete observations. Algorithm 1 rules out spurious paths by either state splitting or transition removal that will be detailed in Sect. 4.4. These rules would be applied many times according to a fair scheduling which will be discussed in Sect. 4.5. When the algorithm terminates, it produces an extended finite state machine, containing no spurious states or transitions.

Loop transitions. The resulting automaton does not allow loop transitions according to the RMPATH rule. However, this kind of automaton may not be precise and useful contract specifications. Because many smart contracts have behavior cycles, it is preferred to have loop transitions in the resulting automaton. Therefore, we limit the range of path selection when applying RMPATH, i. e., a loop transition can only be covered once in any selected path. For example, a state transition path $q - \text{Event}_a - q - \text{Event}_a - q$ is not under our consideration when allowing loop transitions. With this minor modification to the RMPATH rule, the resulting automaton allows loop transitions so that it may express cycles.

4.4 Illustrations

We use `GameChannel` as an example. Initially, rule `INIT` is applied. As shown in Fig. 6a, the resulting automaton has two states: q_0 and q_1 . For the initial state q_0 , all state variables are valued zero, namely $P_1 \wedge P_6 \wedge P_8 \wedge P_{10}$, while q_1 covers all the remaining values of the state variables, namely $\neg(P_1 \wedge P_6 \wedge P_8 \wedge P_{10})$. For each function m , its precondition g_m is added as the guard function set G , and the post-condition u_m is added to the update function set U , which we elide in these diagrams for simplicity.

Rule `CONSTRUCT` adds all possible transitions to the automaton. It is easy to see in Fig. 6a that the resulting automaton contains all the observed concrete function invocation sequences. However, spurious behaviors may have been allowed in the automaton. For example, the symbolic path $q_0 - A - q_1 - D - q_1 - C - q_1$ is spurious, as it has no supported concrete invocation sequence within the observations. Therefore, we need to apply rule `RMPATH` to eliminate such spurious paths. In rule `RMPATH`, we use the function concretize on a symbolic path to represent one of its possible concrete invocation sequences. For the spurious path $q_0 - A - q_1 - D - q_1 - C - q_1$, the automaton needs to refine itself by either splitting the state q_1 (q_n in Line 6) or removing the transition $q_1 - C - q_1$ (t_{n+1} in Line 10) using Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 shows our approach to remove a spurious path via state splitting or transition removal. For the state q_1 and the transition $q_1 - C - q_1$ in Fig. 6a, we first attempt to split q_1 with the precondition of function C , namely $P_2 \vee (P_3 \wedge P_6)$ of `serverCancelActiveGame`. We use a decision procedure SAT (Line 5) to decide if a symbolic state is feasible. Due to the fact that the two newly created states (Lines 3–4) for q_1 are feasible, we replace q_1 with the new states (Line 6) and remove the outdated transitions starting or ending with q_1 (Line 7). The modified automata structure will be returned (Line 15) and when applying rule `CONSTRUCT` again, we can obtain such new automaton in Fig. 6b that has three states. In Algorithm 1, it is possible that q_n is not splittable with the function precondition (Lines 8–14). When t_{n+1} has never been visited by replaying all the concrete invocation sequences on the automaton (Line 9), we safely remove t_{n+1} to eliminate the spurious path. Otherwise, we will split q_n with an equivalent predicate representing a partial set of the visited concrete states (such as s_0 to s_{17} of Fig. 1) along a symbolic path π' (Lines 12–13) and also remove the outdated transitions relevant to q_n (Line 14).

Figure 6b also contains spurious paths, e. g., $q_0 - A - q_{11} - E - q_{11} - E - q_{12}$, which have to be eliminated. By applying the aforementioned rules many times, finally we are able to mine an automaton as shown in Fig. 6c, which has the exact automata structure as Fig. 4 except the guard condition that we elide for simplicity. Apart from the common usage scenarios, we can also understand the root semantics of each state in the automaton. Note that each symbolic state is represented by a set of predicates. As described before, q_0 is represented by $P_1 \wedge P_6 \wedge P_8 \wedge P_{10}$. In the automaton, q'_{11} is represented by P_2 that says `status` is `ACTIVE`, q'_{12} is represented by $P_4 \wedge P_6$ that says `status` is `SERVER_INITIATED_END` and `roundId` is zero, q_3 is represented by $P_3 \wedge P_6$ that says `status` is `USER_INITIATED_END` and `roundId` is zero, q_4 is represented by $P_4 \wedge P_7$ that says `status` is `SERVER_INITIATED_END` but `roundId` is larger than zero, q_5 is represented by $P_3 \wedge P_7$ that says `status` is `USER_INITIATED_END` but `roundId` is larger than zero, and q_6 having no outgoing transitions suggests it is the final state whose predicates cover all the remaining cases. We believe such automata precisely model smart contract semantics, which is helpful for understanding contract behaviors.

4.5 Termination and Soundness

We now discuss the termination condition of our specification mining rules shown in Fig. 5. To ensure the termination of our algorithm, the applications of the rules have to follow a *fair scheduling*.

A fair scheduling is an infinite sequence of actions: a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n , where $a_i \in \{\text{CONSTRUCT}, \text{RMPATH}\}$ and the following conditions apply:

- (1) CONSTRUCT is the initial action,
- (2) if new states are added, CONSTRUCT keeps applying until it is inapplicable,
- (3) RMPATH appears infinitely often.

Condition (1) enables the initial construction of the automaton, and Condition (2) ensures the integrity of any subsequent automata construction. Condition (3) ensures that every spurious path of the automaton will eventually be removed. We are now ready to prove the termination of our specification mining algorithm with the aforementioned fair conditions. We assume that the algorithm terminates when RMPATH and CONSTRUCT are both no longer applicable.

THEOREM 1. *Our specification mining algorithm terminates after a finite number of actions in any fair scheduling.*

PROOF. For LTS_h which is equivalent to the observed concrete invocation sequences, let N_s be the number of concrete states and N_p be the number of all concrete invocation sequences. For each application of rule RMPATH, it will take no more than $N_p + 1$ times to traverse the resulting automaton to find such a spurious path π if it exists. Therefore, RMPATH itself is terminated.

As discussed in Algorithm 1, a transition may be removed from the resulting automaton. According to the fairness conditions, RMPATH will keep applying until it splits a state to generate two new fine-grained states. Suppose the current automaton has n symbolic states and k symbolic state transitions. We easily have $k \leq n \times |M| \times n$, where $|M|$ is the number of contract functions. Therefore, the times for RMPATH to find one more reachable states is no more than $n \times |M| \times n$. So it takes no more than $N_s \times \max(n) \times |M| \times \max(n)$ times to find all reachable states, where $\max(n) \leq N_s$.

Next, we prove that the number of RMPATH actions in any scheduling cannot exceed $(N_s + 1) \times \max(n) \times |M| \times \max(n)$. We know that finding all reachable states does not exceed $N_s \times \max(n) \times |M| \times \max(n)$. After that, RMPATH will be applied to remove any unreachable transition if applicable. We know this will apply no more than $\max(n) \times |M| \times \max(n)$ times. Finally, RMPATH will be inapplicable and the algorithm will terminate with no more than $(N_s + 1) \times \max(n) \times |M| \times \max(n)$ actions of RMPATH. So, Theorem 1 is proved. \square

Under the fair scheduling, we prove the soundness of the resulting automaton.

THEOREM 2. *The resulting automaton (ignoring loop transitions) is a minimal existential abstraction of LTS_h .*

PROOF. The resulting automaton is an extended finite state machine. To prove Theorem 2, we need to prove that the automaton satisfies Condition (1) and Condition (2) in Definition 5.

Condition (1) holds because by default, all uninitialized state variables of smart contracts are valued zero, and s_0 is the initial concrete state where all state variables are valued zero. The automaton takes the zero-valued predicates of all state variables as the initial symbolic state q_0 . In this setting, $\{s_0\} = \alpha^{-1}(q_0)$. Thus, Condition (1) is satisfied.

Condition (2) can be verified by proving: (i) every observed concrete invocation sequence (i.e., a concrete path in LTS_h) is preserved in the resulting automaton; (ii) every symbolic path of the resulting automaton has a corresponding concrete path in LTS_h , i.e., no symbolic path is spurious. According to rule CONSTRUCT, (i) holds in the resulting automaton. We prove (ii) by contradiction. Suppose the resulting automaton contains a spurious path $\pi : q_0 t_1 t_2 \dots q_n \in EFSM$ where \nexists concretize(π) $\in LTS_h$. The RMPATH rule will be applied to remove π either via state splitting or transition removal at finite actions. Thus, there is no such spurious path π , which is in

Table 2. The Azure smart contract benchmark.

Contract	Description	Formal Specifications	
		# States	# Transitions
AssetTransfer	Selling high-value assets	11	32
BasicProvenance	Keeping record of ownership	4	4
BazaarItemListing	Selling items	4	5
DefectCompCounter	Product counting	3	2
DigitalLocker	Sharing digital files	7	12
FreqFlyerRewards	Calculating flyer rewards	3	3
HelloBlockchain	Request and response	3	3
PingPongGame	Two-player games	4	2
RefrigTransport	IoT monitoring	5	8
RoomThermostat	Thermostat installation and use	3	4
SimpleMarketplace	Owner and buyer transactions	4	4
Average		4.64	7.18

contradiction with the assumption. Therefore, (b) is proved. Hence, Condition (2) is satisfied by the resulting automaton.

With Condition (1) and (2) satisfied, Theorem 2 is proved. \square

5 IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION

5.1 Implementation

We implement trace slice approach and specification mining algorithm as a tool named `SmCon`, written in around 3K lines of Python code. Specifically, we apply our trace slicing approach to retrieve independent user action traces from transaction histories according to the given trace slice configurations, and then we invoke `InvCon+` to produce corresponding likely invariants. Based on these sequences and likely invariants, we are able to perform specification mining for smart contracts. Additionally, our algorithm relaxes the `RmPath` rule to allow loops in the contract specifications for better generality (see Sect. 4.3). We used the Z3 SMT solver [51] for discharging satisfiability queries.

We generate function-level invariants for smart contracts from the past transaction histories and filter the generated invariants to keep those expressing parameter relations (see Sect. 4.2). These invariants serve as the parameter predicates that we use for automata construction (see Sect. 4).

Through experiments, we evaluated `SmCon` to answer the following three research questions:

- **RQ1:** How effectively does `SmCon` mine smart contract specifications?
- **RQ2:** How accurate are the mined specification models for real-world smart contracts?
- **RQ3:** How does `SmCon` facilitate the development of DApps?

5.2 Methodology

To answer RQ1, we evaluate `SmCon` on parametric-free smart contracts from a well-studied benchmark used for Azure enterprise blockchain, where none of these contracts have index-related data structures so we do not perform trace slicing on their transactions. This benchmark includes 11 smart contracts exhibiting stateful behaviors, ranging over supply chain management, digital control, virtual games, and etc. Each of these contracts is properly documented, and their specifications have been well formalized and examined by the previous work. Such ground truth specifications are deemed as the reference models in our evaluation. Because `SmCon` aims to dynamically infer specification models from past contract executions, we generate 10,000 transactions per contract using black-box random testing technique similar to `ContractFuzzer` [30]. In detail, we deploy every contract 100 times to our testnet. Each contract instance is tested using 100 randomly generated

transactions, which finally produce a trace, namely a sequence of contract executions. Subsequently, we perform SMCON on these contract traces to mine contract specification models.

To answer RQ2, we evaluate SMCON on real-world parametric smart contracts running on Ethereum. We selected six popular Ethereum DApp smart contracts as shown in Table 4. We selected them from the Top-10 DApps covering different application domains [5], such as decentralized gaming, gambling, non-fungible token (NFT) usage, and an exchange market. For example, the DApp SuperRare has a total trading volume up to 557 million dollars contributed by more than 10,000 users in nearly 100,000 transactions [55]; and MoonCatRescue has a total trading volume up to 73 million dollars involving more than 11,000 users [50]. These DApps have been deployed and running for a long period, since as early as 2017, and their past transaction data can be downloaded from Ethereum. Most of these DApps (except 0xfair) maintain some form of design documentation on their websites or GitHub repositories; some also provide formal specifications, such as Dicether [24]. In addition, well-organized DApp projects, such as the studied ones, maintain test suites that exercise the core functionalities of the contracts with reasonable coverage. With these artifacts, we are able to construct ground models manually for DApp contracts. We collected their contract code and transaction data from Etherscan [6] and Ethereum archive node hosted by QuickNode [7]. Particularly, the number of transactions used for specification mining is also capped at 10,000 for all DApp smart contracts.

Evaluation Metrics. To evaluate SMCON, we use the accuracy metric recommended in [43] for automata specification mining evaluation. The accuracy metric measures the similarity between the mined automata specification and the ground truth, considering both precision and recall. Precision is defined as the percentage of sequences generated by the mined automata that are accepted by the ground truth, while recall is the percentage of sequences generated by the ground truth that are accepted by the mined automata. Following [35], we use the F_1 -score to measure the overall accuracy, which is defined as: $F_1 = \frac{2 \times \text{Precision} \times \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}}$. Since automata may have infinite sequences when they have loop transitions, to obtain accurate precision, recall and F_1 -score, we follow the similar strategies used in previous works [34, 35, 44] to generate the sequences. We set the maximum number of generated sentences to 10,000 with minimum coverage of each transition to be 20 in the generated traces [35] and restrict the length of the traces to twice the number of transitions [32] in the ground-truth models that have been formalized by the Azure benchmark or manually constructed by ourselves. In addition, for RQ1, we divide the transaction data into a training and a test set, where we mine the model from contract executions in the training set. We use another accuracy metric, denoted as Acc, to measure how many percentages of contract executions in testing set are accepted by the mined model.

5.3 Experiment Setup

All experiments were conducted on an Ubuntu 20.04.1 LTS desktop equipped with an Intel Core i7 16-core processor and 32 GB of memory. The ground truth, benchmark contracts, and raw results are available at: <https://sites.google.com/view/smcon/>.

5.4 RQ1. Effectiveness of SMCON

To answer RQ1, we compare SMCON with five baseline approaches. K-tail [17] learns an automaton from prefix trees of traces by merging nodes with the same ‘tail’ of length k . We evaluate on its two settings, 1-TAIL when $k = 1$ and 2-TAIL when $k = 2$. SEKT [32] is a kind of state-enhanced k-tail, which extends k-tail using program state information inferred from the full set of observed executions. We also evaluate on its two settings, SEKT-1 when $k = 1$ and SEKT-2 when $k = 2$. CONTRACTOR++ [22, 32] creates finite state machine models exclusively based on program invariants

Table 3. Detailed comparison of the results on the Azure benchmark.

Contract	1-TAIL			2-TAIL			SEKT-1			SEKT-2			CONTRACTOR++			SMCON		
	# States	F_1	Acc	# States	F_1	Acc	# States	F_1	Acc	# States	F_1	Acc	# States	F_1	Acc	# States	F_1	Acc
AssetTransfer	24	0.52	0.93	40	0.47	0.77	24	0.52	0.93	40	0.47	0.77	13	0.2	1	13	0.34	0.97
BasicProvenance	4	0.72	1	6	0.67	1	4	0.67	1	6	0.7	1	3	0.63	1	3	0.8	1
BazaarItemListing	9	0.94	1	94	0.97	0.84	9	0.94	1	83	0.98	0.87	3	0.89	1	3	1	1
DefectCompCounter	3	1	1	3	1	1	3	1	1	3	1	1	3	1	1	3	1	1
DigitalLocker	18	0.57	0.95	29	0.34	0.94	18	0.57	0.95	29	0.34	0.94	9	0.95	1	10	0.87	1
FreqFlyerRewards	3	1	1	5	1	1	3	1	1	5	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1
HelloBlockchain	4	1	1	5	1	1	4	1	1	5	1	1	3	1	1	3	1	1
PingPongGame	4	0.77	1	4	0.75	1	4	0.77	1	4	0.75	1	5	0.51	1	4	0.77	1
RefrigTransport	6	0.7	1	8	0.68	1	6	0.7	1	8	0.69	1	5	0.43	1	5	0.69	1
RoomThermostat	5	0.88	1	9	0.88	1	5	0.88	1	9	0.88	1	5	1	1	6	1	1
SimpleMarketplace	5	1	1	6	1	1	5	1	1	6	1	1	4	1	1	5	1	1
Average	7.73	0.83	0.99	19.00	0.80	0.96	7.73	0.82	0.99	18.00	0.80	0.96	5.00	0.78	1.00	5.18	0.86	1.00

inferred from the observed executions. To the best of our knowledge, there exists only one other approach to mine state machine models from smart contract executions, by Guth et al. [29]. However, their tool was not available for comparison at the time of writing. We will discuss this related work and compare it in Sect. 6.

The original benchmark contracts do not always satisfy their specifications. We conducted a preliminary experiment with SMCON and found that the precision score is usually quite low. After further investigation into this benchmark, we realize that the benchmark contracts do not strictly follow their formal specifications, which has also been revealed by a previous study [60]. For fair comparison with other approaches, we manually repaired these issues and also reported them to the developer [8–11]. For instance, *SimpleMarketplace* is a contract application that expresses a workflow for a simple transaction between an owner and a buyer in a marketplace. *SimpleMarketplace* has a *AcceptOffer* function to allow owner to accept the offer made by buyers. However, *AcceptOffer* even succeeds when there is no offer placed, thus violating its formal specification [11].

Evaluation results. Table 3 provides a detailed overview of the comparative performance of various tools, including our developed tool SMCON, in the domain of smart contract specification mining. Each row corresponds to a specific smart contract, with columns showcasing essential metrics such as the number of state machine models generated (# States), the F-score (F_1), and the accuracy (Acc). The evaluated tools, denoted as 1-TAIL, 2-TAIL, SEKT-1, SEKT-2, CONTRACTOR++, and SMCON, allow for a comprehensive analysis of their capabilities in extracting and representing contract specifications. The variety of contracts considered, ranging from *AssetTransfer* to *SimpleMarketplace*, ensures a diverse and thorough assessment of each tool’s performance across different use cases.

Upon closer examination of the data, it is evident that SMCON consistently exhibits competitive performance metrics, followed by CONTRACTOR++. Notably, in the *AssetTransfer* contract, SMCON outperforms CONTRACTOR++ by generating a state machine model with 13 states, resulting an higher F_1 score of 0.34 with neglectable loss of precision. Across all contracts, SMCON maintains an average of 5.18 states per model, an impressive F_1 score of 0.86, and nearly perfect accuracy (1.00). These results highlight the efficacy of SMCON in accurately capturing the intricacies of smart contract behavior. The tool’s robust performance, in terms of model compactness, accuracy and F_1 score, distinguishes it from other baseline approaches, emphasizing its potential as a reliable solution for specification mining tasks.

In summary, SMCON emerges as a promising tool for smart contract specification mining, combining precision, recall, and accuracy effectively. The presented results demonstrate its consistent ability to generate accurate state machine models across a diverse set of contracts. The high average F_1 score and accuracy substantiate SMCON’s effectiveness in capturing the intended behavior of smart contracts. These results establish SMCON as a valuable resource for researchers and practitioners in search of a dependable and adaptable tool for real-world smart contract analysis.

Table 4. DApp smart contract benchmark.

DApp	Contract Description	LoC	Year	Mined Specifications	
				# States	# Transitions
CryptoKitties	kitty auction	565	2018	4	5
CryptoPunks	punk market	246	2017	20	82
SupeRare	art market	688	2018	14	71
MoonCatRescue	cat adoption game	331	2017	16	60
Oxfair	RPS game	317	2018	4	5
Dicether (0xaec1f783)	bet game	1,483	2018	8	16




Fig. 7. The mined automaton for Oxfair.

5.5 RQ2. Experiment Results on Real-world Smart Contracts

Table 4 illustrates the evaluation results of SmCON on the real-world DApp contracts. The model complexity of specifications mined varies a lot. *CryptoKitties* has the simplest model with two states and three transitions. The model can be interpreted as a regular language ($createAuction \rightarrow bid \mid cancelAuction$)*, where each active auction accepts only one bid.

Figure 7 shows the specifications mined for *Oxfair*², which perfectly articulates use scenarios of a Rock-Paper-Scissor game. *Oxfair* employs a seal mechanism to achieve fairness where nobody can cheat on others. First, the creator encrypts his choice and publicizes choice proof, namely the corresponding cryptographic signature, when creating a game via *createGame*. Normally, the second player joins this game with explicit choice via *joinGame*. Finally, the creator reveals his choice by decrypting his choice with their secret key, thus determining the game winner. In addition, games should be closed when it expires because no other players join or creators fail to reveal his choice.

The remaining four DApps have relatively complex models. We manage to assess these mined models through their existing test suites. We first have re-run all the test cases for each DApp and found that many of test cases failed. Specifically, *CryptoPunks* has 46 test cases of which 15 passed and the remaining 31 failed. *SupeRare* has 35 test cases: 34 passing and 1 failing. *MooncatRescue* has 1,119 test cases: 993 passing and 126 failing. *Dicether* has 98 test cases: 82 passing and 16 failing. We investigate all the failing test cases. Most of them are caused by the mismatch between actual transaction error message and the hard-coded expected error message, which actually does not compromise contract correctness. For instance, all the failed *MoonCatRescue* test cases are rooted in this reason. The others reveal a semantic difference between contract implementation and expectation, which can be detected through functional invariants inferred. For example, *CryptoPunksMarket* has 8 test cases failing due to such difference in scenarios like putting another bid, outbidding, and other edge cases.

Next, we were able to construct their ground truth specifications manually, where two of the authors spent two hours per smart contract individually. In particular, we ensured that the tested behaviors must be included in the ground-truth specifications and added any additional untested behaviors clearly documented. Because the transaction data used is collected from an uncontrolled blockchain environment, the diversity of historic use behaviors has a considerable impact on the

²<https://etherscan.io/address/0xa8f9c7ff9f605f401bde6659fd18d9a0d0a802c5#code>

Table 5. The contract evolution of Dicether.

Id	Address	Commit	Solidity version	Deployment date	Last tx date	Total transactions
1	0xc95d227a1cf92b6fd156265aa8a3ca7c7de0f28e	e69d8f53	0.4.18	Mar-31-2018	May-29-2018	830
2	0xbf8b9092e809de87932b28f5aa00d520b04359aa	944417a4	0.4.24	May-29-2018	Aug-25-2018	687
3	0x3e07881993c7542a6da9025550b54331474b21dd	e8642130	0.4.24	Aug-25-2018	Sep-06-2018	147
4	0xeb6f4ec38a347110941e86e691c2ca03e271df3b	ce3e3fef	0.4.24	Sep-06-2018	Oct-25-2018	2,294
5	0x9919d97e50397b7483e9ea61e027e4c4419c8171	d4015572	0.4.24	Sep-28-2018	Feb-14-2019	4,720
6	0x7e0178e1720e8b3a52086a23187947f35b6f3fc4	2d96213c	0.5.0	Feb-06-2019	Mar-31-2019	2,893
7	0xaec1f783b29aab2727d7c374aa55483fe299fefa	91deaf6e	0.5.0	Mar-31-2019	Mar-12-2022	11,551
8	0xa867bF8447eC6f614EA996057e3D769b76a8aa0e	dbcd3ac0	0.8.11	Mar-13-2022	Jan-14-2024	1,974




Fig. 8. Dicether (0xc95d227a1cf92b6fd156265aa8a3ca7c7de0f28e).




Fig. 9. Dicether (0xaec1f783b29aab2727d7c374aa55483fe299fefa).

mined model. Our study shows that the highest recall rate of the mined models is at 97 % for SuperRare, while the highest precision is at 100 % for GameChannel, respectively. Therefore, we believe our mined models for real-world DApp contracts shall capture widely-used high-level program specifications, which can be used to enhance DApp development, e.g., uncovering issues of DApp document and test suites.

5.6 RQ3. Usefulness in DApp Development

Out-of-Date Document during Contract Maintenance. *Dicether* is a gambling game running on Ethereum. We investigated and collected all the deployed contract instances of *Dicether* so far from DAppRadar [5] and Smart Contract Search Service by Etherscan [6]. Table 5 lists contract address, the according repository commit version, the Solidity version used, the date of deployment and last transaction of eight contracts as of the time of writing. It is clear that maintenance frequently happened in 2018 and each contract lived for about two months on average. In contrast, the last three contracts remain relatively stable and alive for quite long time.

The reasons behind this contract maintenance could be classified into: (1) regular patching for security or reliability, and (2) functionality changes for business evolution. For example, by default, contracts written in Solidity version 0.8.x do not permit integer overflow or underflow, so




Fig. 10. Part of the mined automaton for CryptoPunks.

developers migrated the seventh contract from 0.5.0 to 0.8.11 and safely removed the well-known protection of the SafeMath library. This is a case of regular patching. As for functionality changes, minor functionality changes can be pinpointed through program analysis techniques, e.g., the game counter was initialized to 0 for the first two contracts while it was initialized to 1 from the third contract onwards. However, major functionality changes can only be identified and interpreted through high-level contract semantic models.

Figure 8 shows the mined model for the first contract, denoted as contract #1, while Fig. 9 shows the model for contract #7. The comparison between the two mined models demonstrates the major functionality changes of *Dicether*. First, we could observe function renaming changes, e.g., *playerCancelActiveGame* to *userCancelActiveGame*. Second, we observed that for contract #1, normally a created game must be accepted first, then the game server or player can perform specific operations. However, such functionality was removed in contract #7. Beyond these major changes, we found that all the historic user behaviors in contract #1, excluding *acceptGame* and *cancelGame* are subsumed in the mined model for contract #7. Yet, the existing formal document [24] that explains the protocol for building *Dicether* does not reflect these function renaming or logic changes. Therefore, we believe mined specification models could ease the burden to maintain high-quality documentation.

Test Suite Bias. *CryptoPunks* is one of the earliest examples of using Non-Fungible Tokens (NFTs) on Ethereum, which inspired the ERC-721 standard to some extent. *CryptoPunks* has 10,000 unique collectible characters called punks, with proof of ownership stored on Ethereum [4]. Figure 10 shows part of the mined automaton by SmCON. To start with, function *getPunk* or *setInitialOwners* is called to assign punks to users. Users can transfer the ownership of a punk by calling *transferPunk*. Users can make a bid to a punk via *enterBidForPunk*. *CryptoPunks* has a set of test suites in its GitHub repository covering seven use scenarios such as setting the initial owner(s) of punks or opening a sale for punks [2]. However, in the existing test suites, there is only one test case for *setInitialOwners*, while the other test cases all focus on *setInitialOwner*. An interesting observation is that, based on transaction histories, the contract manager tends to use *setInitialOwners* to assign a batch of punks to the initial owners instead of *setInitialOwner* for individual assignment to reduce the transaction costs. Our mined contract specification highlights this disproportional focus on rarely used functions, while inadequate tests were written for more frequently used functionalities.

To conclude, SmCON can capture the realistic usage of smart contracts, and the mined automata are useful in tracing contract behavior changes and helping developers improve test suites. All details about the case studies and experiment results are available on <https://sites.google.com/view/smcon/>.

Threats to validity. One internal threat is that the manually derived ground truth for DApp contract specifications may contain errors. To mitigate this threat, we collected smart contracts from popular DApp projects that are well-documented and also re-ran their test suites. Our implementation of SMCON as well as our scripts for running the experiments may contain bugs. Two of the authors worked closely on the implementation of the tool and frequently reviewed code together. We have also checked for various outliers in our results and indeed discovered a couple of bugs, which have been fixed since then. The external threat is that our findings may not generalize to other DApp smart contracts. To mitigate this issue, we selected representative DApps from many different application domains.

6 RELATED WORK

In this section, we compare SMCON with the related works.

6.1 Smart Contract Specification Mining and Verification

There exist many specification mining works for smart contracts and the specifications mined are either low-level functional specifications [38, 39, 42, 56, 59] or high-level behavior specifications [29].

SolType [56] serves as a type checking tool tailored for Solidity smart contracts, empowering developers to integrate refinement type annotations into their codebase. These annotations enable static analysis to validate the safety of arithmetic operations, ensuring resilience against integer overflows or underflows. While SolType exhibits proficiency in inferring type annotations, its scope is confined to contract-level invariants associated with arithmetic operations. In an effort to leverage SolType’s verification capabilities for policy learning, Cider [38] utilizes deep reinforcement learning to automatically learn contract invariants. Primarily, these learned invariants act as guards over arithmetic operations within smart contracts, mitigating the risk of integer overflow and underflow. Nonetheless, the learned contract invariants remains unverified, thus may not always hold. SmartInv [59] adopts a multimodal learning approach for smart contract invariant inference, aimed at extracting pertinent invariants to effectively identify “machine un-auditable” bugs. Additionally, InvCon [39] and InvCon+ [42] are tools for inferring likely invariants from blockchain transactions of smart contracts, where the correctness of invariants can be verified by InvCon+. However, the invariants mined by these tools only hold at function entries/exits, and do not directly capture high-level state transitions between function calls, as what SMCON’s mined specifications do.

The closest work to ours is Guth et al.’s [29], which also mines smart contract specifications from past transaction histories. They first slice transaction histories into independent interaction sequences by analyzing read/write dependencies between different transactions. Then, a finite state machine is constructed over the interaction sequences, according to a predefined cost metric and user-provided configurations. Our approach differs in two aspects. First, our algorithm considers the typical contract interaction patterns observed in test suites and produces a parametric binding for trace slicing. Relying on data dependency alone may be imprecise: transactions belonging to different sessions may still share certain state variables, e. g., a counter. Second, we mine an extended finite state machine, which is strictly more expressive.

6.2 Automata Specification Mining

There is a large body of work on automata specification mining [13, 16, 17, 23, 32, 35, 45, 57].

Traditional grammar inference technique [27] has been used for automata learning. Aarts et al. [13] proposed an approach to learn behavioral models of realistic systems. Their approach uses counterexample-guided abstraction refinement [21] and is built on an extension to the L* algorithm [14]. In this case, the execution traces are dynamically generated. The learned model

is a restricted extended finite state machine, which only considers function input parameters. RPNI-MDL [23] is an evidence-driven automata generation technique [33] based on minimum description length principle to merge states. RPNI-MDL works when the provided execution traces are all positive examples.

The k-tail algorithm [17] was first proposed in 1972 and has been the basis for many automata mining techniques [32, 45]. The input to k-tail algorithm is a set of execution traces. The traditional k-tail algorithm [32] first builds a prefix-tree-acceptor (PTA) corresponding to the execution traces. Then states are merged if they have same set of “tail” invocation sequences. Furthermore, Lorenzoli et al. [45] extended k-tail by incorporating input predicates within the mining process. The mined automata are a restricted kind of EFSM which can express data relation on the invocation parameters. However, this automata does not allow operation on data, i.e., updating function is absent. To address this, Krka et al. [32] proposed TEMI to mine extended finite state machine, but the mined extended finite state machine tends to be more complex due to their bottom-up approach in computing abstractions. Synoptic [16] first finds three kinds of temporal invariants from system logs, e. g., an event type always follows another one. Then, k-tail is applied to generate the final automaton.

Although the aforementioned state-merging techniques have been proven effective, many other automata mining approaches also exist. For example, CONTRACTOR++ [22, 32] creates finite state machine models exclusively based on program invariants inferred from the observed executions. Moreover, Le and Lo [35] proposed to mine program specification with deep learning. Their approach generates test cases to produced execution traces, which are used to train a recurrent neural network-based language model [49]. The language model is later used for automata specification generation.

However, the realm of smart contract specification mining diverges significantly from these traditional specification mining paradigms. Unlike its traditional counterparts, smart contract specification mining usually operates within a dynamic and stateful environment inherent to real-world applications. Central to this distinction is the user-oriented nature of smart contracts, where myriad user actions can intricately intertwine within the transaction history. This user-centric dynamic introduces complexities that necessitate specialized techniques, such as trace slicing, to disentangle relevant actions from the plethora of user interactions. Through trace slicing, smart contract specification mining can effectively discern and extract pertinent behaviors and specifications embedded within the transaction history. This emphasis on real-world applicability and user-centric behavior underscores the unique challenges and methodologies inherent in smart contract specification mining, setting it apart from traditional specification mining approaches.

7 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have formally defined the specification mining problem for smart contracts, and proposed a CEGAR-like approach to mine automata specifications based on past transaction histories. The mined specifications capture not only the allowed function invocation sequences, but also the inferred program invariants describing contract semantics precisely. Such contract specifications are useful in contract understanding, testing, verification, and validation. Our evaluation results show that our tool, SmCON, mines specifications accurately and efficiently; it may also be used to maintain high-quality document and improve test suites.

REFERENCES

- [1] 2015. EIP-20: A standard interface for tokens. <https://eips.ethereum.org/EIPS/eip-20>.
- [2] 2017. CryptoPunks: Collectible Characters on the Ethereum Blockchain. <https://github.com/larvalabs/cryptopunks/tree/master/test>.

- [3] 2021. Daikon. <http://plse.cs.washington.edu/daikon/>. The Daikon invariant detector.
- [4] 2023. CryptoPunks. <https://www.larvalabs.com/cryptopunks/>.
- [5] 2023. DAppRadar. <https://dappradar.com/>.
- [6] 2023. Etherscan. <https://etherscan.io>.
- [7] 2023. QuickNode. <https://www.quicknode.com/>.
- [8] 2024. Bug report in defective-component-counter smart contract. <https://github.com/Azure-Samples/blockchain/issues/278>.
- [9] 2024. Bug report in digital-locker smart contract. <https://github.com/Azure-Samples/blockchain/issues/279>.
- [10] 2024. Bug report in hello-blockchain smart contract. <https://github.com/Azure-Samples/blockchain/issues/280>.
- [11] 2024. Bug report in simple-marketplace smart contract. <https://github.com/Azure-Samples/blockchain/issues/281>.
- [12] 2024. InvConPlus. <https://github.com/Franklinliu/InvConPlus-Tool>.
- [13] Fides Aarts, Faranak Heidarian, Harco Kuppens, Petur Olsen, and Frits Vaandrager. 2012. Automata learning through counterexample guided abstraction refinement. In *International Symposium on Formal Methods*. Springer, 10–27.
- [14] Dana Angluin. 1987. Learning regular sets from queries and counterexamples. *Information and computation* 75, 2 (1987), 87–106.
- [15] Sidi Mohamed Beillahi, Gabriela Ciocarlie, Michael Emmi, and Constantin Enea. 2020. Behavioral simulation for smart contracts. In *Proceedings of the 41st ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. 470–486.
- [16] Ivan Beschastnikh, Yuriy Brun, Sigurd Schneider, Michael Sloan, and Michael D Ernst. 2011. Leveraging existing instrumentation to automatically infer invariant-constrained models. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGSOFT symposium and the 13th European conference on Foundations of software engineering*. 267–277.
- [17] Alan W Biermann and Jerome A Feldman. 1972. On the synthesis of finite-state machines from samples of their behavior. *IEEE transactions on Computers* 100, 6 (1972), 592–597.
- [18] Pankaj Chauhan, Edmund Clarke, James Kukula, Samir Sapra, Helmut Veith, and Dong Wang. 2002. Automated abstraction refinement for model checking large state spaces using SAT based conflict analysis. In *International Conference on Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design*. Springer, 33–51.
- [19] Ting Chen, Yufei Zhang, Zihao Li, Xiapu Luo, Ting Wang, Rong Cao, Xiuzhuo Xiao, and Xiaosong Zhang. 2019. TokenScope: Automatically detecting inconsistent behaviors of cryptocurrency tokens in ethereum. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*. 1503–1520.
- [20] Kwang-Ting Cheng and Avinash S Krishnakumar. 1993. Automatic functional test generation using the extended finite state machine model. In *30th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference*. IEEE, 86–91.
- [21] Edmund Clarke, Orna Grumberg, Somesh Jha, Yuan Lu, and Helmut Veith. 2000. Counterexample-guided abstraction refinement. In *International Conference on Computer Aided Verification*. Springer, 154–169.
- [22] Guido De Caso, Victor Braberman, Diego Garbervetsky, and Sebastian Uchitel. 2010. Automated abstractions for contract validation. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 38, 1 (2010), 141–162.
- [23] Colin De la Higuera. 2010. *Grammatical inference: learning automata and grammars*. Vol. 24. Cambridge University Press. 291–293 pages.
- [24] Dicether 2018. Dicether: A Secure dice game. <https://dicether.github.io/paper/paper.pdf>.
- [25] Thomas Durieux, João F Ferreira, Rui Abreu, and Pedro Cruz. 2020. Empirical review of automated analysis tools on 47,587 Ethereum smart contracts. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International conference on software engineering*. 530–541.
- [26] Josselin Feist, Gustavo Grieco, and Alex Groce. 2019. Slither: a static analysis framework for smart contracts. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 2nd International Workshop on Emerging Trends in Software Engineering for Blockchain (WETSEB)*. IEEE, 8–15.
- [27] E Mark Gold. 1967. Language identification in the limit. *Information and control* 10, 5 (1967), 447–474.
- [28] Susanne Graf and Hassen Saidi. 1997. Construction of abstract state graphs with PVS. In *Computer Aided Verification*, Vol. 97. 72–83.
- [29] Florentin Guth, Valentin Wüstholtz, Maria Christakis, and Peter Müller. 2018. Specification mining for smart contracts with automatic abstraction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.07822* (2018).
- [30] Bo Jiang, Ye Liu, and WK Chan. 2018. ContractFuzzer: Fuzzing Smart Contracts for Vulnerability Detection. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM/IEEE International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. ACM, 259–269.
- [31] Jiao Jiao, Shuanglong Kan, Shang-Wei Lin, David Sanan, Yang Liu, and Jun Sun. 2020. Semantic understanding of smart contracts: Executable operational semantics of Solidity. In *2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 1695–1712.
- [32] Ivo Krka, Yuriy Brun, and Nenad Medvidovic. 2014. Automatic mining of specifications from invocation traces and method invariants. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Foundations of Software Engineering*. 178–189.

- [33] Kevin J Lang, Barak A Pearlmutter, and Rodney A Price. 1998. Results of the Abbadingo one DFA learning competition and a new evidence-driven state merging algorithm. In *International Colloquium on Grammatical Inference*. Springer, 1–12.
- [34] Tien-Duy B Le, Xuan-Bach D Le, David Lo, and Ivan Beschastnikh. 2015. Synergizing specification miners through model fissions and fusions (t). In *2015 30th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, 115–125.
- [35] Tien-Duy B Le and David Lo. 2018. Deep specification mining. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. 106–117.
- [36] Choonghwan Lee, Feng Chen, and Grigore Roşu. 2011. Mining parametric specifications. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Software Engineering*. 591–600.
- [37] Ao Li, Jemin Andrew Choi, and Fan Long. 2020. Securing smart contract with runtime validation. In *Proceedings of the 41st ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. 438–453.
- [38] Junrui Liu, Yanju Chen, Bryan Tan, Isil Dillig, and Yu Feng. 2022. Learning Contract Invariants Using Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the 37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. 1–11.
- [39] Ye Liu and Yi Li. 2022. InvCon: A Dynamic Invariant Detector for Ethereum Smart Contracts. In *Proceedings of the 37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*.
- [40] Ye Liu, Yi Li, Shang-Wei Lin, and Qiang Yan. 2020. ModCon: A Model-Based Testing Platform for Smart Contracts. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (FSE)*.
- [41] Ye Liu, Yi Li, Shang-Wei Lin, and Rong Zhao. 2020. Towards automated verification of smart contract fairness. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*. 666–677.
- [42] Ye Liu, Chengxuan Zhang, et al. 2024. Automated Invariant Generation for Solidity Smart Contracts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.00650* (2024).
- [43] David Lo and Siau-Cheng Khoo. 2006. QUARK: Empirical assessment of automaton-based specification miners. In *2006 13th Working Conference on Reverse Engineering*. IEEE, 51–60.
- [44] David Lo, Leonardo Mariani, and Mauro Santoro. 2012. Learning extended FSA from software: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Systems and Software* 85, 9 (2012), 2063–2076.
- [45] Davide Lorenzoli, Leonardo Mariani, and Mauro Pezzè. 2008. Automatic generation of software behavioral models. In *Proceedings of the 30th international conference on Software engineering*. 501–510.
- [46] Anastasia Mavridou and Aron Laszka. 2018. Designing secure ethereum smart contracts: A finite state machine based approach. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security*. Springer, 523–540.
- [47] Anastasia Mavridou and Aron Laszka. 2018. Tool demonstration: FSolidM for designing secure Ethereum smart contracts. In *International conference on principles of security and trust*. Springer, 270–277.
- [48] Anastasia Mavridou, Aron Laszka, Emmanouela Stachtiri, and Abhishek Dubey. 2019. VeriSolid: Correct-by-design smart contracts for Ethereum. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security*. Springer, 446–465.
- [49] Tomas Mikolov, Martin Karafiát, Lukas Burget, Jan Cernocký, and Sanjeev Khudanpur. 2010. Recurrent neural network based language model. In *Interspeech*, Vol. 2. Makuhari, 1045–1048.
- [50] MoonCatRescue 2022. MoonCatRescue. <https://dappradar.com/ethereum/games/mooncatrescue>.
- [51] Leonardo de Moura and Nikolaj Bjørner. 2008. Z3: An efficient SMT solver. In *International conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*. Springer, 337–340.
- [52] Satoshi Nakamoto. 2008. Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system. *Decentralized Business Review* (2008), 21260.
- [53] Anton Permenev, Dimitar Dimitrov, Petar Tsankov, Dana Drachler-Cohen, and Martin Vechev. 2020. Verx: Safety verification of smart contracts. In *2020 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 1661–1677.
- [54] Kaihua Qin, Liyi Zhou, Benjamin Livshits, and Arthur Gervais. 2021. Attacking the DeFi ecosystem with flash loans for fun and profit. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security*. Springer, 3–32.
- [55] SuperRare 2022. SuperRare. <https://www.dapp.com/app/SuperRare>.
- [56] Bryan Tan, Benjamin Mariano, Shuvendu K Lahiri, Isil Dillig, and Yu Feng. 2022. SolType: refinement types for arithmetic overflow in solidity. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 6, POPL (2022), 1–29.
- [57] Neil Walkinshaw, Ramsay Taylor, and John Derrick. 2016. Inferring extended finite state machine models from software executions. *Empirical Software Engineering* 21, 3 (2016), 811–853.
- [58] Haijun Wang, Yi Li, Shang-Wei Lin, Lei Ma, and Yang Liu. 2019. VULTRON: Catching Vulnerable Smart Contracts Once and for All. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Software Engineering: New Ideas and Emerging Results (ICSE-NIER)*. IEEE Press, 1–4.
- [59] Sally Junsong Wang, Kexin Pei, and Junfeng Yang. 2024. SMARTINV: Multimodal Learning for Smart Contract Invariant Inference. In *2024 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE Computer Society, 126–126.

- [60] Yuepeng Wang, Shuvendu K Lahiri, Shuo Chen, Rong Pan, Isil Dillig, Cody Born, Immad Naseer, and Kostas Ferles. 2019. Formal verification of workflow policies for smart contracts in azure blockchain. In *Working Conference on Verified Software: Theories, Tools, and Experiments*. Springer, 87–106.
- [61] Gavin Wood. 2014. Ethereum: A Secure Decentralised Generalised Transaction Ledger. *Ethereum project yellow paper* 151 (2014), 1–32.