

# FoC: Figure out the Cryptographic Functions in Stripped Binaries with LLMs

Guoqiang Chen<sup>\*†</sup>, Xiuwei Shang<sup>\*†</sup>, Shaoyin Cheng<sup>†‡§</sup>, Yanming Zhang<sup>\*†</sup>, Weiming Zhang<sup>†‡§</sup>, and Nenghai Yu<sup>†‡§</sup>

<sup>\*</sup>{ch3nye, shangxw, azesinter}@mail.ustc.edu.cn, <sup>†</sup>{sycheng, zhangwm, ynh}@ustc.edu.cn

<sup>‡</sup> University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, China

<sup>§</sup> Anhui Province Key Laboratory of Digital Security, Hefei, China

**Abstract**—Analyzing the behavior of cryptographic functions in stripped binaries is a challenging but essential task. Cryptographic algorithms exhibit greater logical complexity compared to typical code, yet their analysis is unavoidable in areas such as virus analysis and legacy code inspection. Existing methods often rely on data or structural pattern matching, leading to suboptimal generalizability and suffering from manual work. In this paper, we propose a novel framework called FoC to Figure out the Cryptographic functions in stripped binaries. In FoC, we first build a binary large language model (FoC-BinLLM) to summarize the semantics of cryptographic functions in natural language. The prediction of FoC-BinLLM is insensitive to minor changes, such as vulnerability patches. To mitigate it, we further build a binary code similarity model (FoC-Sim) upon the FoC-BinLLM to create change-sensitive representations and use it to retrieve similar implementations of unknown cryptographic functions in a database. In addition, we construct a cryptographic binary dataset for evaluation and to facilitate further research in this domain. And an automated method is devised to create semantic labels for extensive binary functions. Evaluation results demonstrate that FoC-BinLLM outperforms ChatGPT by 14.61% on the ROUGE-L score. FoC-Sim outperforms the previous best methods with a 52% higher Recall@1. Furthermore, our method also shows practical ability in virus analysis and 1-day vulnerability detection.

**Index Terms**—Binary Code Summarization, Cryptographic Algorithm Identification, Binary Code Similarity Detection, Large Language Model

## I. INTRODUCTION

Cryptography plays a crucial role in computer security. Analyzing the cryptography-related code in stripped binaries is common and important in software reverse engineering, such as analyzing viruses with encryption capabilities, checking for weak cryptographic implementations in legacy software, and verifying privacy encryption compliance. Both the complex logic of cryptographic algorithms and the absence of symbolic information in stripped binaries exacerbate the difficulty of understanding their binary code. Although modern decompilers (e.g., IDA Pro [1]) can heuristically convert binary code into C-like pseudo-code, it remains challenging without human-readable semantic descriptions.

Just as generating documentation for source code enhances maintainability, it is also a way to generate semantic summaries for binary code to improve the efficiency of analysis. A few methods [2], [3] proposed recently utilize language models in binary code summarization and have achieved

preliminary successes. In addition, the Large Language Models (LLMs) in the source-code domain, such as Codex [4], GPT-J [5], and GPT-NeoX [6], have demonstrated impressive code comprehension [7]. It is promising to leverage this capability to analyze binary code, especially the hard analysis on cryptographic functions, to provide comprehensible semantic information to participants. Currently, there is no such study or available dataset.

However, the prediction of generative language models is inherently powerless to reflect minor changes in binary code. It is an essential ability to distinguish between two similar data, especially to recognize the patched and vulnerable cryptographic functions. Methods [8], [9], [10], [11], [12], [13] designed for Binary code similarity detection (BCSD) generate embeddings of binary function, which could be very sensitive to any changes in the code. Therefore, these methods have the potential to compensate for the previously mentioned weakness. While these methods have demonstrated promising results on general datasets, limited attention has been given to the domain of cryptographic binary.

There are also some methods specifically designed to provide semantic information about cryptographic algorithms present in binary code. Existing methods for cryptographic algorithm identification, which provides the primitive classes contained within binaries, include approaches based on constants [14], [15], [16], statistics [17], [18], [19], [20], structures [21], [22], [23], [24], [25], [26], and more. They use static or dynamic analysis to identify distinct patterns to detect cryptographic implementations within binaries. Various factors affecting binary code (e.g., hidden constant features and compilation optimizations) can undermine the effectiveness of these methods. Although these classes is a kind of semantics but carry less information compared to function-level summaries.

In this paper, we first construct a cryptographic binary dataset with popular libraries and employ automated methods to create semantic labels for large-scale binary code. To Figure out what the Cryptographic binary functions do, we propose our framework called **FoC**, which comprises two components: (1) FoC-BinLLM is a generative model for summarizing binary code semantics, where we employ multi-task and frozen-decoder training strategies, and (2) FoC-Sim is a similarity model built upon the FoC-BinLLM, where we

identify cryptographic features and use multi-feature fusion to train an advanced similarity model. In our experiments, FoC-BinLLM shows unprecedented performance and provides detailed semantics in natural language, which is beyond the reach of previous methods. FoC-Sim also outperforms existing methods on the BCSD tasks. In addition, FoC shows promising results in analyzing cryptographic viruses and identifying vulnerable cryptographic implementations in the real-world firmware. We release the code of FoC and the dataset we collected<sup>1</sup>. Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We construct a cryptographic binary dataset cross-compiled from popular open-source repositories written in C language, and we devise an automated method to create semantic labels for extensive binary functions. Our discriminator guarantees a strong alignment between these labels and facts on cryptography-related semantics.
- We propose an LLM-based framework FoC to analyze the cryptographic functions in stripped binaries. To our knowledge, FoC-BinLLM is the first generative model for cryptographic binary analysis, summarizing the behavioral semantics of binary functions in natural language. Fusing code semantics provided by FoC-BinLLM, structure information, and cryptographic features, we further build FoC-Sim for retrieving homologous functions in our cryptographic binary database.
- Experiments show that FoC-BinLLM outperforms ChatGPT by 14.61% on ROUGE-L score in summarizing functions from cryptographic binaries. FoC-Sim outperforms the previous best methods with a 52% higher Recall@1 in retrieving similar cryptographic functions. FoC also shows promising outcomes in analyzing cryptographic viruses and identifying vulnerable cryptographic implementations in the real-world firmware.

## II. BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

### A. Problem Definition

To figure out the cryptographic function in stripped binaries, we expect to obtain a comprehensive summary and a embedding representation. Formally, we consider our method, denoted as  $f$ , capable of analyzing a cryptographic function  $\mathcal{F}$  in a binary file  $\mathcal{B}$ . Our objective is to generate a summary in natural language denoted as  $\mathcal{E}$  elucidating the behavior of  $\mathcal{F}$  for the analyst, and a embedding denoted as  $\mathcal{V}$  for reflecting difference between functions. This process can be formalized as:

$$\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{V} = f(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}) \quad (1)$$

To build the method  $f$ , we are mainly facing the following challenges.

### B. Challenges

**C1: Cryptographic Binary Dataset.** A public dataset is necessary to evaluate methods for cryptographic function analysis in stripped binaries. At present, no such datasets have been published in previous work. Collecting such a

cryptographic binary dataset is a laborious task. There are dozens of cryptographic algorithms currently in the public domain, and a complete collection of implementations of these algorithms is challenging. In short, the absence of a publicly available dataset prevents research on the current issue.

**C2: Variety of Cryptographic Implementation.** We need to collect as many implementations of cryptographic algorithms as possible. Since these implementations may have reference to different standards and protocols as well as be designed for different platforms and purposes. In addition, developers can introduce differences in the same algorithm specification due to programming style. For example, the developers tend to split a cryptographic algorithm containing complex operations into multiple functions or combine multiple simple operations into a single function, which can invalidate some control-flow or data-flow based analysis methods. Meanwhile, we cannot ignore the differences introduced by compilation environments, such as optimizations (e.g., loop unrolling, function inlining, etc.), as well as the architectures.

**C3: Well-built Semantic Labels.** First, comprehending source code is not straightforward for humans and therefore it does not meet the requirement of being easy-to-understand. While function names and primitive classes are too short to carry more details. Second, the source-code comments that describe the functionality well are often absent in the real-world projects. Finally, dealing with a dataset consisting of millions of binary functions, the enormous workload makes manual annotation impossible.

**C4: Cross-version Awareness.** Given the centrality of cryptographic algorithm libraries to computer security and their widespread use, any vulnerability in the implementation could cause unacceptable damage, such as the Heartbleed Vulnerability [27]. The fixing of a program vulnerability is often a tiny change. We thus expect our method to be aware of such small semantic differences across versions. Unfortunately, it is difficult for generative models to reflect these differences in their prediction results.

### C. Related Works

**Binary Code Summarization.** It has been proposed only recently. BinT5 [2] and HexT5 [3] are two efforts that focus on this issue. BinT5 is built upon CodeT5 [28] to summarize decompiled code. HexT5 is a unified pre-training model for binary code information inference tasks, including decompiled pseudo-code summarization. Both of them are designed for general binary code rather than cryptography domain, therefore, we take them as very basic baselines. In addition, general LLMs also could be used to generate summaries for binary code with an appropriate prompt. We also conduct a comparison with them.

**Cryptographic Algorithm Identification.** It has been studied for more than two decades [32]. Many methods based on program structure have been proposed, especially the data-flow graph (DFG). Aligot [24] identifies the data-flow loops in the execution trace. CryptoHunt [25] and Wherescripto

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/Ch3nYe/FoC>

TABLE I  
COMPARISON WITH RELATED WORKS IN ADDRESSING CHALLENGES.

| Method           | Sp. | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | Method              | Sp. | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 |
|------------------|-----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|-----|----|----|----|----|
| BinT5 [2]        | N.  | X  | X  | ✓  | X  | findcrypt-yara [14] | Y.  | X  | X  | X  | X  |
| HexT5 [3]        | N.  | X  | X  | ✓  | X  | CryptoKnight [29]   | Y.  | ✓  | X  | X  | X  |
| General LLMs     | N.  | X  | X  | ✓  | X  | GENDA [30]          | Y.  | ✓  | ✓  | X  | X  |
| Aligot [24]      | Y.  | X  | X  | X  | X  | PalmTree [11]       | N.  | X  | X  | X  | ✓  |
| CryptoHunt [25]  | Y.  | ✓  | ✓  | X  | X  | Trex [12]           | N.  | X  | X  | X  | ✓  |
| Wherscrypto [26] | Y.  | X  | X  | X  | X  | jTrans [13]         | N.  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  |
| FindCrypt2 [31]  | Y.  | X  | X  | X  | X  | FoC                 | Y.  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  |
| Signsrch [15]    | Y.  | X  | X  | X  | X  | -                   | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  |

Sp. means it is specially designed for cryptographic binary analysis.

[26] build DFGs with symbolic execution. These methods are based on the manual design of graph patterns for known implementations, and they cannot overcome the **C2**. It means that these methods are not robust to any factors that make the binary code change.

Some cryptographic algorithms contain noticeable features, such as constants (e.g., S-box) and statistical attributes. FindCrypt2 [31], Signsrch [15], and findcrypt-yara [14] are three popular tools that identify the cryptographic algorithms present in binary files based on constant features. These methods will fail facing intentionally altered implementations or algorithms where constant values do not exist. Coarse-grained results at the file level (i.e., algorithm classes) fail on **C3**.

CryptoKnight [29] and GENDA [30] respectively use CNN and GNN to learn function semantics to predict primitive classes. However, CryptoKnight uses a dataset almost exclusively from OpenSSL [33], and GENDA collect dataset from only four cryptographic algorithm libraries. They do not address the data diversity well, failing on **C2**.

**Binary Code Similarity Detection.** BCSD methods aim to compare the degree of similarity between two binary code snippets, and have the potential to overcome **C4**. Recently, the advanced three methods employ Transformer encoder as their backbones, and have designed their own pre-training tasks. Trex[12] uses value prediction in micro-trace to learn the execution semantics. PalmTree[11] utilizes context window prediction and def-use prediction to learning assembly code from CFGs and DFGs. While jTrans[13] learns jump-aware semantics through jump target prediction pre-training. We can employ them for detecting cryptographic functions in binaries, although they are not designed for this domain.

As shown in Table I, previous works have not adequately addressed the challenges mentioned above.

#### D. Large Language Model and Our Motivation

Since the LLMs already show powerful understanding capabilities in both natural language (NL) and program language (PL), it has become possible to devise an automated pipeline to create high-quality semantic descriptions for the cryptographic function in source code. It mitigates the challenge of creating semantic labels (**C3**). We thus can confidently gather a rich cryptographic binary dataset to address **C1** and **C2**.

A recent evaluation [34] shows that LLMs perform significantly worse on summarizing binary code than source code.




Fig. 1. Development of open-source cryptography repositories we investigated. The train data highlighted in blue, the test data highlighted in red.

Therefore, using the dataset, we develop a binary LLM to predict comprehensive descriptions for cryptographic functions in stripped binaries, which potentially addresses **C3**. To mitigate the weakness of the generative model against **C4**, we further build a BCSD module based on our binary LLM to create the cross-version aware embedding representation.

### III. DATASET CONSTRUCTION

**Dataset Collection.** We here collect a cryptographic binary dataset for building our methods, as well as pushing further research on this issue. We aim to study the cryptographic algorithm libraries, popular cryptographic implementations, and cryptographic modules in large projects, which are written in C language. Firstly, we conducted a review of the development of existing cryptographic projects and their inter-dependencies. As shown in Figure 1 (a), OpenSSL, one of the most popular cryptographic algorithm libraries, has influenced the development of other libraries (e.g., BoringSSL, LibreSSL, and TongSuo) and has been applied in many large projects (e.g., Linux, Android, and Qemu). Other cryptographic projects have their own unique development histories, and some of them are designed for specific scenarios. For example, wolfSSL and MbedTLS are friendly to embedded devices, while BoringSSL and TongSuo are forked from OpenSSL by enterprises and continue to evolve to meet business requirements. However, for those independently developed projects, it is challenging to ascertain whether they have been influenced by each other. We thus conducted a statistical analysis of code overlap among them, focusing only on the code that would be compiled into their binary files. The results indicate that only projects forked from OpenSSL share some similar functions.

As shown in Figure 2, we employ two compilers, *GCC-11.2.0* and *Clang-13.0*, with four different optimization options (*O0-3*). These projects were compiled for six different target architectures: *x86\_32*, *x86\_64*, *arm\_32*, *arm\_64*, *mips\_32*, and *mips\_64*. Subsequently, we strip the binaries to make them consistent with release versions in real-world scenarios. IDA Pro was used to decompile the binary code. We performed deduplication on all functions in our dataset by the MD5 digest of binary functions. Our dataset contains considerable cryptographic algorithms and takes account of the compilation environment, which allows us to overcome **C1** and **C2**. The statistical information of the dataset is shown in Table II.

**Semantic Labels Creation.** Comment in the source code is a comprehensive semantic summary. Unfortunately, not all functions have developer-written comments, we detected comments in less than 20% of the functions within our dataset.




Fig. 2. The workflow of building our cryptographic binary dataset.

TABLE II  
STATISTICS OF OUR CRYPTOGRAPHIC BINARY DATASET.

| Dataset | Project              | Volume (MB) | Binaries | Functions | Functions-Uni <sup>2</sup> |
|---------|----------------------|-------------|----------|-----------|----------------------------|
| Train   | OpenSSL <sup>1</sup> | 1,302.02    | 192      | 787,535   | 659,112                    |
|         | BoringSSL            | 543.26      | 144      | 222,084   | 189,354                    |
|         | LibreSSL             | 885.08      | 144      | 499,192   | 416,304                    |
|         | TongSuo              | 538.11      | 96       | 319,701   | 273,134                    |
|         | MbedTLS <sup>1</sup> | 232.79      | 288      | 106,430   | 95,155                     |
|         | LibTomCrypt          | 214.08      | 48       | 33,844    | 8,152                      |
|         | Libbrcrypt           | 3.19        | 48       | 706       | 663                        |
|         | Libgcrypt            | 208.22      | 48       | 61,904    | 55,161                     |
|         | Nettle               | 110.06      | 96       | 40,644    | 37,941                     |
| TEA     | 1.51                 | 40          | 660      | 155       |                            |
| Test    | Libsodium            | 81.81       | 48       | 32,460    | 20,456                     |
|         | wolfSSL              | 115.83      | 48       | 47,574    | 42,618                     |
|         | GmSSL                | 113.73      | 48       | 60,028    | 58,472                     |
|         | tiny-AES-c           | 1.24        | 48       | 572       | 523                        |
| Overall | 14                   | 4,350.67    | 1,336    | 2,213,334 | 1,857,200                  |

<sup>1</sup> OpenSSL and MbedTLS have two versions in the dataset.

<sup>2</sup> Functions-Uni means the number of unique functions after deduplication according to function hash.

Worse yet, their formats are inconsistent, and the quality is not satisfactory. We identify the three most common defects shown in Table IV. To mitigate this problem, we leverage ChatGPT [35], an advanced general LLM, to automatically generate summaries as comments. Specifically, we use the metadata extracted from the source code for each function to build the prompt shown in Figure 2. We prompt the LLM to generate only one-sentence summaries to try to avoid including too much information that is not present in the pseudo-code, such as variable names and macro definitions, which potentially bias the model. On the other hand, a one-sentence summary is easier to read and understand.

**Keyword-based Discriminator.** It is essential to assess whether these summaries align with the facts. Therefore, we propose a keyword-based discriminator to judge the correct-

TABLE III  
CATEGORIES AND CLASSES EMPLOYED BY THE DISCRIMINATOR.

| Category                      | Class   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Cryptographic Primitive Class | 3des, aes, aria, blake2, blowfish, camellia, cast, chacha20, cmac, curve25519, curve448, des, dh, dsa, ecc, ecdh, ecdsa, ecjpake, ed448, ed25519, hmac, idea, md4, md5, mdc2, poly1305, rc2, rc4, ripemd160, rsa, salsa20, sha1, sha224, sha256, sha384, sha512, sha3, siphash, sm2, sm3, sm4, tea, umac, whirlpool, xtea |
| Block Encryption Mode         | cbc, pcbc, cfb, ctr, ecb, ofb, ocf, xts   |
| Authenticated Encryption Mode | ccm, gcm, sgcm, cwc, eax, ocb, siv, iapm  |

TABLE IV  
QUALITATIVE COMPARISON OF DEVELOPER-WRITTEN COMMENTS (DEFECTIVE) WITH MODEL-GENERATED SUMMARIES.

| Defect Type <sup>1</sup> | Comparison <sup>2</sup>   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Lack                     | /* Up until OpenSSL 0.9.5a, this was new_section */<br>Retrieves a configuration section from the specified configuration object.   |
| Indirect                 | /** The old interface to get the same thing as SSL_get_ciphers() */<br>Retrieves the name of the cipher at the specified index from the cipher list of the SSL connection.  |
| Redundant                | /*- Some functions allow for representation of the irreducible * polynomials as an int[], say p. The irreducible f(t) is then * of the form: * t^p[0] + t^p[1] + ... + t^p[k] * where m = p[0] > p[1] > ... > p[k] = 0. /* Performs modular reduction of a and store result in r. r could be a. */<br>Performs modular reduction of a binary polynomial and stores the result in r. |

<sup>1</sup> Defect Types of developer-written comments: the **lack** of functional descriptions, the **indirect** information given, and the **redundant** information.

<sup>2</sup> The upper is developer-written, and the lower is model-generated.

ness of generated summaries on the crucial cryptographic semantics. Specifically, as shown in Table III, we have defined three categories and specific classes. We use whole-word matching to retrieve class-related keywords. For example, aes will be marked with 'aes', 'rijndael', and 'advanced encryption standard' etc. Only if the discriminator gets the same classes between the generation and the source code, will it pass the inspection.

The results indicate that more than 85% of the generation passed and they were retained in the end. We further evaluate the textual consistency between developer-written comments and model-generated summaries. The results show that they have a 43.55% ROUGE-L score, which means a high degree of consistency. And Table IV shows a few generated labels. Overall, for each function in our dataset, we obtain its binary code, source code, and semantic labels, which highly align with the facts. In this way, we addressed the challenges presented in C3.

#### IV. OVERVIEW

Figure 3 illustrates our framework FoC, which consists of two parts. We will briefly describe them below.




Fig. 3. An overview of FoC.

**Build Binary Large Language Model.** In this part, our goal is to train an LLM to tell us the behavior of cryptographic functions in stripped binaries. To this end, we employ three tasks and a frozen-decoder training strategy for training our Binary Large Language Model (FoC-BinLLM) efficiently.

We adopt the Transformer model following the encoder-decoder architecture, which allows us to flexibly apply it in an encoder-only mode for semantic embedding generation, or in an encoder-decoder mode for causal generation. As shown in Figure 3 ①, we initialize our model with the pre-trained weights from a gold implementation, which allows us to avoid heavy training from scratch. We train the base model on our dataset to specialize it for understanding binary code. Our FoC-BinLLM takes the pseudo-code of an unknown function as input and generates a formatted summary for participants, which allows for detailed semantics and mitigates C3.

**Build Binary Code Similarity Model.** We further build a binary code similarity model (FoC-Sim) to search for functions similar to an unknown function within the database. It is built upon our binary LLM and incorporates more information from binary functions.

FoC-Sim takes the pseudo-code, the attributed control-flow graph (ACFG), and the cryptographic features as input, which can be easily extracted from the binary function using a modern decompiler, such as IDA Pro [1]. The model then creates an embedding representation for the function. It is aware of any changes in the binary code, which compensates for the lack of sensitivity of our generative model and mitigates the challenge C4. Additionally, we can use FoC-Sim to inspect binaries to identify vulnerable cryptographic implementations.

## V. DETAILED DESIGN

### A. Binary Large Language Model




Fig. 4. An overview of the training of FoC-BinLLM.

**Golden Model Initialization.** It is intuitively more efficient to train an expert model from a pre-trained model than from scratch, especially when discussing LLMs. As shown in Figure 4, we initialize our binary LLM base on a gold implementation, specifically CodeT5+ [36], a recently released LLM for code understanding and generation in the source-code domain.

CodeT5+ is initialized with weights from previous pre-trained LLMs (CodeGen-mono [37]) and is trained on two large-scale datasets: a multilingual dataset<sup>2</sup> and the CodeSearchNet [38]. Benefiting from the training on bimodal data consisting of both natural language (NL) and programming language (PL), CodeT5+ achieved state-of-the-art performance in various downstream tasks, such as code generation and code summarization, at the time of its release. The pre-built understanding and generation capabilities of CodeT5+ for NL and PL are the cornerstone of training it to become an expert LLM.

**Multi-Task & Frozen-Decoder Training.** We adopt multi-task training to build our cryptographic binary LLM. Figure 4 shows the three tasks: (Task1) Binary Code Summarization, (Task2) Function Name Prediction, and (Task3) Binary-Source Contrastive Learning. Both Task1 and Task2 are causal generation tasks, which will be employed with encoder-decoder mode. Task3 optimizes only the semantic embeddings generated by the encoder.

As mentioned in Section III, we have collected as many summaries as possible for the binary functions in our dataset and only kept the ones that pass the discriminator check. They provide more details than the function name, for example, Figure 5 (a) shows a function `DES_cfb_encrypt(..., int enc)` from project OpenSSL, and this function’s name

<sup>2</sup><https://huggingface.co/datasets/codeparrot/github-code>

```

Function: sub_126670 (DES_cfb_encrypt)
-----
Input:
summarize in one sentence:
int *__fastcall sub_126670(__int64 a1,
__int64 a2, int a3, unsigned __int64 a4,
__int64 a5, int *a6, int a7) {
int *result; // rax
...
result = (int *) (unsigned int) (a3 - 1);
if ( (unsigned int) result <= 0x3F ) {
v9 = (a3 + 7) >> 3;
... } return result;
}
### Response:
-----
Output:
This function takes an input data block and encrypts or
decrypts it using the DES algorithm in Cipher Feedback (CFB)
mode.

```

(a) Binary Code Summarization.

```

Function: sub_126670 (DES_cfb_encrypt)
-----
Input:
recovery function name:
int *__fastcall sub_126670(__int64 a1,
__int64 a2, int a3, unsigned __int64 a4,
__int64 a5, int *a6, int a7) {
int *result; // rax
...
result = (int *) (unsigned int) (a3 - 1);
if ( (unsigned int) result <= 0x3F ) {
v9 = (a3 + 7) >> 3;
... } return result;
}
### Response:
-----
Output:
DES_cfb_encrypt

```

(b) Function Name Prediction.

Fig. 5. An illustration shows two generation tasks that we employ to train FoC-BinLLM.

alone cannot indicate that it performs encryption or decryption operations. These straightforward semantic descriptions include no redundant information that impedes understanding. These advantages keep Task1 from being overly difficult to learn and biasing the model.

As shown in Figure 5 (b), we also train FoC-BinLLM to reassign descriptive names for the functions whose names are stripped for various reasons (e.g., copyright protection and size reduction). This means that for binary functions where summaries have not been correctly generated, FoC-BinLLM can still learn their semantics in natural language. A descriptive function name is usually a concise summary of the functionality and is helpful for program comprehension in binaries.

Figure 5 shows two examples for Task1 and Task2, where we build the input text with code and a prompt prefix, and the output is the function name or summary. Both of them are auto-regressive generation task, which predicts the next token with the current token sequence. The loss function we used is cross-entropy and can be formalized as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{GEN} = - \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{X}|} \log \mathbf{P}(x_i | \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{0:i-1}) \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{X}$  is the output sequence,  $\mathbf{P}$  is the probability of predicting the  $i$ -th token  $x_i$  base on the part of label  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{0:i-1}$ . We train our model to maximum  $\mathbf{P}$  for each token in labels.

Since the base model is trained on source code rather than binary code, as shown in Figure 6, we employ Binary-Source Contrastive Learning (Task3) to shorten the distance between




Fig. 6. An illustration shows the semantic encoder uses contrastive learning to shorten the distance between the source code embedding and the corresponding binary code embedding.

TABLE V  
SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL FEATURES USED IN FOC AT BLOCK-LEVEL AND FUNCTION-LEVEL.

| Type              | Name                     | Dimension | Feature Type* | Examples       |
|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------|---------------|----------------|
| Basic Block Level | No. of General Opcode    | 1         | G             | mov, push, cmp |
|                   | No. of Arithmetic Opcode | 1         | C             | sub, add, mul  |
|                   | No. of Logic Opcode      | 1         | C             | and, xor, ror  |
|                   | No. of Branch Opcode     | 1         | G             | beq, jmp, ret  |
|                   | BoW of General Opcode    | 120       | G             | -              |
|                   | BoW of Arithmetic Opcode | 76        | C             | -              |
| Function Level    | No. of BBLs              | 1         | G             | -              |
|                   | No. of Edges             | 1         | G             | -              |
|                   | No. of Callees           | 1         | G             | -              |
|                   | No. of Unique Callees    | 1         | G             | -              |
|                   | BoW of Keywords          | 61        | C             | aes, des, dsa  |

\* This feature is categorized as either a general feature (G) or a cryptographic feature (C).

source code and binary code in embedding space, which assists the base model in rapid domain adaptation. We use the cosine distance to measure the similarity between the embeddings. As Equation 3 illustrates, the cosine-similarity loss is used to optimize the model parameters, where the  $V_{source}$  and  $V_{binary}$  are embeddings of the same function in source code and binary code, respectively:

$$\mathcal{L}_{CL} = \left\| 1 - \frac{V_{source} \cdot V_{binary}}{|V_{source}| \times |V_{binary}|} \right\| \quad (3)$$

It is based on the insight from previous work [39], [36] that the decoder is used for complex causal-generation tasks and hence requires more careful training. Instead of training the entire large model, as shown in Figure 4, we freeze the decoder and set only the encoder and the cross-attention layer to be trainable, which reduces a large number of trainable parameters for efficient training.

### B. Binary Code Similarity Model

**Code Semantic & Control Structure Encoding.** We have built FoC-BinLLM above which can capture the semantics of binary code well. We here directly leverage its encoder to create the semantic encoder of FoC-Sim. In Figure 3 ②, the encoder takes a pseudo-code lifted from the binary function and generates an embedding as its semantic representation. Specifically, we use mean pooling on the hidden states in the last layer of the encoder.

Furthermore, we adopt a Graph Convolutional Network (GCN) to capture the information of the function's control

structure, which is essential for the binary code similarity problem according to previous research [40]. As shown in Table 3, we extract the control-flow graph (CFG) and use the statistical features to create the attributed CFG (ACFG). The features we used in the basic block level are shown in Table V. The GCN model uses a feature encoder to generate feature embedding for each node, and then apply message propagation for aggregating the information of neighbors along the edges in the ACFG. For each node  $v_i$ , its hidden state in  $l$ -th layer is denoted as  $h_i^{(l)}$  (for  $(i = 1, 2, \dots, n)$ ). In each layer of the GCN, the message aggregation process can be described as follows:

$$h_i^{(l+1)} = \text{ReLU} \left( \sum_{j \in N(v_i)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\deg(v_i)} \sqrt{\deg(v_j)}} \cdot (\mathcal{W}^{(l)} \cdot h_j^{(l)}) \right) \quad (4)$$

where  $N(v_i)$  and  $\deg(v_i)$  are the set of neighboring nodes and the degree of node  $v_i$ , the  $\mathcal{W}^{(l)}$  is the weights for the  $l$ -th layer of the GCN, and  $\text{ReLU}$  denotes the activation function we used.

We employ a 5-layer GCN to aggregate information from neighboring nodes, meaning that each node can potentially access information from neighbors within five jumps. Finally, through a summation readout operation, the hidden states of all nodes are aggregated to obtain a vector for the representation of the entire graph, namely the function structure embedding.

**Cryptographic Features.** Given that we focus on the cryptography domain, we identify a set of features used to distinguish binary functions implemented from different algorithms better. All of the features we used are detailed in Table V.

Inspired by previous works [41], [16], [40], we use the number of arithmetic and logic opcode as features in basic block-level, as well as the BoW of frequent arithmetic opcodes. Meanwhile, at the function level, we employ the discriminator designed in Section III to identify keywords from the pseudo-code. We then create a BoW vector of the cryptographic class corresponding to the keywords, which incorporates possible string and symbol information. As illustrated in Figure 3, all cryptographic features are fed into the final function embedding from both levels.

**Embedding Fusion & Model Training.** As discussed above, the semantic encoder generates semantic embeddings for pseudo-code, the GCN generates structural information embeddings for ACFGs, and we handcraft the embeddings from statistical features. We use a single-layer MLP to fuse these embeddings, which can be formalized as:

$$\mathbf{V}_{func} = \text{MLP}(\text{concat}(\text{Encoder}(\text{pseudo-code}), \text{GCN}(\text{ACFG}), \mathbf{V}_{manual})) \quad (5)$$

To train FoC-Sim, the similar function pairs are sampled from our cryptographic binary dataset, where functions with the same function name in the same file from the same project are treated as similar and vice versa. We employ the *MultipleNegativesRankingLoss* [42] as the loss function. As illustrated in Equation 6, it processes mini-batch samples size

of  $N$ , denoted as  $\mathcal{B}$ , containing only similar pairs, and these sample pairs are not drawn from the same group pairwise:

$$\mathcal{L}_{sim} = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \log \frac{e^{sim(V_i, V_i^+) / \tau}}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{B} \wedge j \neq i} e^{sim(V_i, V_j^+) / \tau}} \right) \quad (6)$$

where  $V_i$  and  $V_i^+$  are the function embeddings of a pair of similar samples,  $\tau$  is a temperature parameter, and  $sim$  is the similarity function of embeddings. In addition, as shown in Figure 3, the semantic encoder is the largest module in our similarity model. We freeze its parameters to enhance training efficiency, as our evaluation found that it has already been well-trained in the first part.

## VI. EVALUATION

In this section, we conduct extensive experiments to answer the following research questions:

**RQ1:** How well does FoC-BinLLM perform in summarizing semantics in cryptographic stripped binaries? (Section VI-B)

**RQ2:** How well does FoC-Sim perform in binary code similarity detection, especially in the cryptography domain? (Section VI-C)

**RQ3:** Does FoC have practical ability in real-world scenarios? (Section VI-D)

**RQ4:** Which part of our method contributes more in FoC? (Section VI-E)

### A. Experiment Setup

**Model & Training Setting.** We initialize the weights of our binary LLM (FoC-BinLLM) with CodeT5p-220m[36]. By default, FoC-BinLLM has a 12-layer encoder and a 12-layer decoder, 768 hidden size, trainable parameters 38.11%, 32100 vocab size, and 1024 input length. FoC-Sim consists of a semantic encoder initialized from FoC-BinLLM, a 5-layer GCN, and a 256-dimensional single-layer MLP.

During training the FoC-BinLLM, we use Adam optimizer with 1e-4 learning rate, 0.1 weight decay rate, 64 batch size, and 4 training epochs in total (1 for Task3 and 3 for Task1 & Task2). While training the FoC-Sim, we use Adam optimizer with 1e-3 learning rate, 1e-5 weight decay rate, 128 batch size, and 110,000 training steps.

**Dataset.** Using only the cryptographic dataset could result in a biased model, therefore we used the same compilation environment to build general data from the GNU repositories<sup>3</sup> and added them to our training set. We prevented data leakage from code shared between projects by using MD5 deduplication. Further, we remove textually similar data via MinHash [43] (threshold<sup>4</sup>=0.95) to prevent overfitting. Finally, we split 5% of the training data as the validation set. The statistics are shown in Table VI.

**Environment.** We used an Ubuntu 20.04 machine with a 48-core Intel Xeon Gold 5220 CPU (2.0GHz, 42MB L3 Cache), 256GB RAM, and 10 \* NVIDIA RTX 3090 GPU. We

<sup>3</sup><http://ftp.gnu.org/gnu>

<sup>4</sup>[https://github.com/bigcode-project/bigcode-dataset/blob/main/near\\_deduplication/minhash\\_deduplication.py](https://github.com/bigcode-project/bigcode-dataset/blob/main/near_deduplication/minhash_deduplication.py)

TABLE VI  
STATISTICS OF THE FINAL DATASET USED IN THE EVALUATION.

|                       | Train            | Valid          | Test           |
|-----------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|
| MD5-Dedup             | 2,982,036        | 156,949        | 122,069        |
| <b>MiniHash-Dedup</b> | <b>2,388,677</b> | <b>125,719</b> | <b>122,069</b> |

TABLE VII  
COMPARISON WITH EXISTING METHODS ON BINARY CODE SUMMARIZATION.

| Method       | ROUGE-L       | BLEU-4        | METEOR        | Time(s)       |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| BinT5 [2]    | 0.1398        | 0.0132        | 0.0925        | 0.2697        |
| HexT5*[3]    | 0.0927        | 0.0098        | 0.1057        | 1.1378        |
| Mixtral [51] | 0.4006        | 0.1109        | 0.3283        | 9.0232        |
| ChatGPT [35] | 0.3607        | 0.1356        | 0.3640        | -             |
| FoC-BinLLM   | <b>0.4134</b> | <b>0.1447</b> | <b>0.4020</b> | <b>0.1533</b> |

\* Thanks to the authors of HexT5 for sharing their model with us.

employ BinKit [44] to build a cross-compiling environment to construct our binary dataset. We then use IDA Pro [1] to decompile binary functions from stripped binaries and use srcML to extract metadata from source code. As for model training, we use Python language with PyTorch [45] and transformers [46] to implement our models, and accelerate the training with DeepSpeed [47] in ZeRO2.

### B. Cryptographic Binary Code Summarization

**Metrics.** We employ three text consistency metrics to show comprehensive assessment: ROUGE-L [48] is a recall-oriented metric, BLEU-4 [49] emphasizes precision, and METEOR [50] is more balanced and considers synonyms. Time is the average analysis time for each function.

The results are shown in Table VII. FoC-BinLLM shows impressive performance on the test set. Specifically, we have 41.34%, 14.47%, and 40.20% scores on ROUGE-L, BLEU-4, and METEOR, respectively. We even outperform Mixtral (Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct-v0.1<sup>5</sup>) and ChatGPT (chatgpt-3.5-turbo-1106<sup>6</sup>), which are generally much larger than FoC-BinLLM. Both BinT5 and HexT5 exhibit significant performance degradation compared to results reported by them, which could be attributed to our cryptographic binary surpassing the domain where they collect their dataset. For time overhead, our approach also has advantages due to its relatively small size. ChatGPT is accessed through API, which depends on the network situation, so its time was not evaluated.

**Cryptographic Algorithm Identification.** In analysis tasks, such as detecting weak cryptographic algorithms, the analyst needs to know which primitives are used in binaries. Therefore, we further perform comparison experiments on this task. We use our keyword-based discriminator to identify primitives from FoC-BinLLM prediction.

We select the popular tools and Wherescrypto[26] as the baseline methods. FindCrypt2, findcrypt-yara, and Signsrch

<sup>5</sup><https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct-v0.1>

<sup>6</sup><https://platform.openai.com/docs/models>

TABLE VIII  
COMPARISON WITH EXISTING METHODS ON THE NUMBER OF CRYPTOGRAPHIC PRIMITIVE CLASSES IDENTIFIED IN BINARIES.

| Project                 | tiny-AES-c | wolfSSL | Libsodium | GmSSL | Overall | Time(ms) <sup>1</sup> |
|-------------------------|------------|---------|-----------|-------|---------|-----------------------|
| FindCrypt2 [31]         | 1          | 5       | 2         | 6     | 14      | 0.226                 |
| Signsrch [15]           | 1          | 7       | 3         | 10    | 21      | 0.129                 |
| findcrypt-yara [14]     | 1          | 7       | 2         | 7     | 17      | 0.081                 |
| Wherescrypto [26]       | 1          | 3       | 0         | 0     | 4       | 1209                  |
| FoC-BinLLM <sup>2</sup> | 1(0)       | 12(1)   | 14(2)     | 19(2) | 46(5)   | 0.228                 |

<sup>1</sup> Average time cost on each binary function.

<sup>2</sup> In parentheses is the number of false positive cryptographic primitives.

TABLE IX  
RESULTS OF BINARY CODE SIMILARITY DETECTION ON THE GENERAL DATASET.

| Method       | Description* | AUC (one2one) |             |             |             | XM (one2many) |             |             |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|
|              |              | XC            | XC+XB       | XA          | XM          | MRR@10        | Recall@1    | Recall@10   |
| Zeek [52]    | S            | 0.84          | 0.85        | 0.84        | 0.84        | 0.28          | 0.13        | 0.56        |
| Gemini [53]  | G+F          | 0.81          | 0.82        | 0.80        | 0.81        | 0.36          | 0.28        | 0.53        |
| SAFE [9]     | S            | 0.80          | 0.81        | 0.80        | 0.81        | 0.29          | 0.16        | 0.46        |
| Asm2Vec [54] | S+G          | 0.77          | 0.69        | 0.60        | 0.65        | 0.12          | 0.07        | 0.18        |
| GMN [55]     | G+F          | 0.85          | 0.86        | 0.86        | 0.86        | 0.53          | 0.45        | 0.58        |
| FoC-Sim      | S+G+F        | <b>0.99</b>   | <b>0.98</b> | <b>0.97</b> | <b>0.99</b> | <b>0.83</b>   | <b>0.78</b> | <b>0.95</b> |

\* Code Semantics (S), Graph Structure (G), Feature Engineering (F).

are based on cryptographic constant values and signatures. Wherescrypto offers only executable for 32-bit binary and supports four cryptographic algorithms (i.e., AES, SHA1, MD5, and XTEA). Other methods mentioned in Section II-C cannot be reproduced due to various reasons, such as not yet being open-sourced or dependencies being inaccessible.

We conduct an experiment using four binary in `x86_64` from our test set. The results in Table VIII present the number of primitive classes correctly identified by each method. FoC-BinLLM has successfully identified a greater number compared to other methods but has more misprediction. The other methods have no false positives, benefiting from their design. Overall, our FoC-BinLLM can summarize the behavior of cryptography-related functions in stripped binaries and achieves superior performance compared to previous methods.

### C. Binary Code Similarity Detection

**Metrics.** We evaluate FoC-Sim and existing BCSD methods in one2one and one2many search scenarios. Following the previous study [40], we use Area Under ROC (AUC) for one2one search, Mean Reciprocal Rank (MRR@K) and Recall (Recall@K) at different K thresholds for one2many search.

Firstly, we conduct experiments on a benchmark dataset released by previous work [40], which contains 7 projects, two of which are used as the test set. We here use its original experiment setup. In particular, for the one2one search, the test set consists of 50k positive pairs and 50k negative pairs. For the one2many search, 1,400 positive pairs and 140k negative pairs are selected, i.e., finding one positive function in 101 functions.

As shown in Table IX, FoC-Sim presents excellent performance on the general datasets. Specifically, we achieves a 78% Recall@1 that exceeds the baseline method GMN [55]






Fig. 7. An example of analysis binary cryptographic function in a virus with FoC.

TABLE X  
RESULTS OF BINARY CODE SIMILARITY DETECTION ON THE CRYPTOGRAPHIC DATASET.

| Method        | Description* | AUC (one2one) |              |              |              | XM (one2many) |              |              |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
|               |              | XO            | XC           | XA           | XM           | MRR@10        | Recall@1     | Recall@10    |
| PalmTree [11] | S+G          | 0.902         | 0.871        | -            | 0.865        | 0.465         | 0.391        | 0.639        |
| Trex [12]     | S            | 0.905         | 0.905        | 0.831        | 0.785        | 0.302         | 0.211        | 0.580        |
| jTrans [13]   | S            | 0.929         | 0.923        | 0.845        | 0.841        | 0.463         | 0.380        | 0.668        |
| FoC-Sim       | S+G+F        | <b>0.996</b>  | <b>0.996</b> | <b>0.998</b> | <b>0.994</b> | <b>0.940</b>  | <b>0.910</b> | <b>0.990</b> |

\* Code Semantics (S), Graph Structure (G), Feature Engineering (F).

by 33%. GMN utilizes CFG and BoW of Opcode from a binary function, which is a subset of the information fused by our similarity model. Besides that, FoC-Sim benefits from semantic information provided by our binary LLM, which could be an essential factor for the advantage.

To further evaluate, we fine-tune and evaluate the state-of-the-art BCSD methods on our cryptographic dataset. Specifically, we employ PalmTree [11], Trex [12], and jTrans [13]. We use the same settings as mentioned above.

The results are shown in Table X. FoC-Sim significantly outperforms the other methods on all metrics. Specifically, our method achieves 91% Recall@1 on the XM task of one2many search, while for one-to-one searches we achieve more than 99% AUC for all sub-tasks. Notably, all of the previous methods generate semantic embedding from assembly code, which is sensitive to the compilation environment, especially in the XA task. Instead, FoC-Sim can benefit from the cross-architecture capabilities provided by the pseudo-code. The control structure information and cryptographic features we identified also boost our model.

#### D. Practical Ability

In this section, we explore the ability of FoC in two real-world scenarios: (1) analyzing cryptographic functions in a virus, and (2) retrieving vulnerable cryptographic implementations in firmware.

**Cryptographic Function Analysis in Virus.** We employ FoC-BinLLM to analyze an open-source Linux Remote Access Trojan (RAT) sample named splinter<sup>7</sup>. Since the source code is available, we know that it utilizes the cryptographic library MbedTLS to implement the encrypted communication module.

<sup>7</sup><https://github.com/tuian/splinter>

TABLE XI  
RESULTS OF VULNERABLE CRYPTOGRAPHIC FUNCTIONS DETECTION IN REAL-WORLD FIRMWARE.

| Library       | CVE-ID         | Vuln Detect |           |           | Vuln & Patch |           |           |
|---------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|
|               |                | NETGEAR     | TP-LINK   | Xiaomi    | NETGEAR      | TP-LINK   | Xiaomi    |
| OpenSSL       | CVE-2015-0286  | -           | 3 / 3     | 22 / 22   | -            | 3 / 3     | 22 / 22   |
|               | CVE-2015-0289  | -           | 10 / 12   | 82 / 88   | -            | 7 / 12    | 75 / 88   |
|               | CVE-2015-1790  | -           | 3 / 3     | 22 / 22   | -            | 2 / 3     | 15 / 22   |
|               | CVE-2016-0797  | -           | 20 / 20   | 44 / 44   | -            | 20 / 20   | 44 / 44   |
|               | CVE-2016-2105  | -           | 10 / 10   | 22 / 22   | -            | 10 / 10   | 22 / 22   |
|               | CVE-2016-2180  | 6 / 6       | 10 / 10   | 22 / 22   | 6 / 6        | 10 / 10   | 22 / 22   |
|               | CVE-2017-3731  | 8 / 8       | -         | -         | 4 / 8        | -         | -         |
|               | CVE-2019-1547  | 16 / 16     | 8 / 8     | 15 / 15   | 11 / 16      | 6 / 8     | 15 / 15   |
|               | CVE-2020-1971  | 19 / 19     | 20 / 20   | 15 / 15   | 13 / 19      | 18 / 20   | 9 / 15    |
|               | CVE-2021-23841 | 20 / 20     | 22 / 22   | 15 / 15   | 20 / 20      | 22 / 22   | 15 / 15   |
| CVE-2022-0778 | 8 / 8          | 6 / 6       | 5 / 5     | 7 / 8     | 6 / 6        | 5 / 5     |           |
| mbedtls       | CVE-2021-36475 | 3 / 3       | 13 / 16   | 14 / 15   | 3 / 3        | 16 / 16   | 15 / 15   |
|               | CVE-2021-36476 | 3 / 3       | 14 / 14   | 12 / 12   | 0 / 3        | 4 / 14    | 6 / 12    |
|               | CVE-2021-36647 | 4 / 4       | 13 / 16   | 14 / 15   | 4 / 4        | 13 / 16   | 15 / 15   |
|               | CVE-2021-43666 | 4 / 4       | 16 / 16   | 15 / 15   | 0 / 4        | 0 / 16    | 6 / 15    |
| Libgcrypt     | CVE-2021-40528 | 0 / 6       | 0 / 5     | 0 / 3     | 2 / 6        | 5 / 5     | 3 / 3     |
| Total         | #16            | 91 / 97     | 168 / 181 | 319 / 330 | 70 / 97      | 142 / 181 | 289 / 330 |


The former is the number of vulnerabilities discovered and the latter is the total number of potential vulnerabilities.

However, understanding the binary code within its executable file is challenging for defenders due to the absence of symbol information.

We show a part of our analysis in Figure 7, where each box represents a binary function in the virus, and we manually obtained the corresponding function name from the source code and judged how well our model predictions agreed with the facts. We start our analysis from the entry point, the main function, and analyze the callee functions within. Initially, we encounter a series of context initialization functions, such as the function sub\_2DCC0. FoC-BinLLM conducted automated analysis and predicted a function name ssl\_init and a summary, describing its functionality correctly.

Then, functions are called one after another. And FoC-BinLLM provides us with comprehensible descriptions in NL. It is noteworthy that the predicted name for mbedtls\_ssl\_write does not match the original name but mentions the behavior of handshake verification. These reveal the potential of FoC-BinLLM in automated malware analysis.

**Vulnerability Detection.** To further explore our similarity model, FoC-Sim, we utilize it to detect vulnerable cryptographic functions. We first build a *vulnerability database* with vulnerable & patched functions related to 16 CVEs. We then



(a) Ablation of parameters used in (b) Ablation of Task3 used in FoC-BinLLM.

Fig. 8. Loss curves of ablation study of FoC-BinLLM.

collect cryptographic libraries from the firmware of different vendors to build a *firmware database*. We determine the existence of vulnerable functions based on the version number of the library file. We perform two search tasks. (1) We search for vulnerable functions in the firmware database according to the vulnerability database. It is considered a successful identification if the vulnerable functions are found among the top 10 most similar in all functions from a suspicious file. The results are shown in the “Vuln Detect” column in Table XI. (2) We evaluate the ability of the model to distinguish between vulnerable functions and patched functions. Specifically, a vulnerable function from the firmware database is considered to be successfully distinguished if it has a higher similarity to the vulnerable version rather than the patched version. The results are shown in the “Vuln & Patch” column in Table XI.

The results show that FoC-Sim can accurately detect the majority of vulnerable functions and can correctly distinguish vulnerable functions from patched functions. It demonstrates that FoC-Sim has the ability to overcome **C4**. However, we observed a failed case in *Libgcrypt*. With manual inspection, we found that there is a huge difference between the vulnerable functions from the firmware database and the vulnerability database in both text and structure.

### E. Ablation Study

**Parameters & Training-Task of Binary LLM.** We further train a scaled FoC-BinLLM with 2B parameters on the same dataset, using the same training tasks and strategies. It slightly outperforms the default one on binary code summarization (43.96% v.s. 41.34% on Rouge-L). However, Figure 8 (a) shows that the 2B model has a faster convergence speed.

We leverage contrastive learning (Task3) described in Section V-A to facilitate rapid adaptation of the base model to the binary domain. Figure 8 (b) indicates that the model trained with Task3 shows lower training loss at the same steps.

**Contributions to Similarity Model.** We have built FoC-Sim for generating function embeddings, which incorporates various information from binary functions, including code semantics, control structures, and cryptographic features. We further explore their contributions here.

We compare the performance of our FoC-Sim on the cryptographic dataset by ablating each of the three information sources. As shown in Table XII, we observe that the absence of any of the three sources results in performance degradation.

TABLE XII  
ABLATION STUDY RESULTS OF FoC-SIM MODEL.

| Model                      | AUC (one2one) |              |              |              | XM (one2many) |              |              |
|----------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
|                            | XO            | XC           | XA           | XM           | MRR@10        | Recall@1     | Recall@10    |
| FoC-Sim                    | <b>0.996</b>  | <b>0.996</b> | <b>0.998</b> | <b>0.994</b> | <b>0.940</b>  | <b>0.910</b> | <b>0.990</b> |
| w/o Code Semantics         | 0.976         | 0.977        | 0.984        | 0.971        | 0.802         | 0.724        | 0.951        |
| w/o Control Structure      | 0.986         | 0.986        | 0.877        | 0.983        | 0.907         | 0.868        | 0.981        |
| w/o Cryptographic Features | 0.996         | 0.993        | 0.994        | 0.991        | 0.939         | 0.901        | 0.987        |

In particular, the code semantics from our binary LLM plays an important role, especially in the one2many search, where FoC-Sim (w/o Code Semantics) drops by 18% on Recall@1 sharply.

## VII. DISCUSSION

In this section, we discuss the limitations of our method and potential ways for future research.

**Quality of Summaries.** LLM-generated summaries are an NL translation of source code (including developer-written comments), their quality largely depends on the LLMs used. We can use the discriminator to check the crucial semantics within the cryptography domain. However, in the general domain, how to create better semantic labels for binary code is a worthwhile research direction.

**Primitive Classes of Discriminator.** We have investigated popular open-source repositories, collected a number of the most common primitives from them, and included keywords associated with them. However, we must recognize that omissions exist. Systematically researching and collecting these cryptographic primitives is also valuable work that can help us understand what cryptographic algorithms are currently secure and what scenarios they are suitable for.

**Obfuscated Binaries.** In this paper, we have not considered obfuscated binaries. Aligot [24] and CryptoHunt [25] design methods for cryptographic algorithm detection based on input-output relationships of loop structures in obfuscated binaries. However, their methods are limited by manually involved work. Enhancing the robustness of FoC to obfuscated binaries is our future work.

## VIII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, our work addressed the challenges that existing works did not and provided a public dataset for future research on the current issue. We present FoC, a novel LLM-based framework for the analysis of cryptographic functions in stripped binaries. Our evaluation results show that FoC-BinLLM can summarize function semantics in natural language, and outperforms ChatGPT by 14.61% on ROUGE-L score. On the other hand, FoC-Sim achieves 52% higher Recall@1 than previous methods on the cryptographic dataset for the BCSO task, which compensates for the intrinsic weakness of the prediction of our generative models. The two components of FoC have shown practical ability in virus analysis and 1-day vulnerability detection.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Hex-Rays SA, “IDA Pro,” <https://www.hex-rays.com/products/ida>, 2023.
- [2] A. Al-Kaswan, T. Ahmed, M. Izadi, A. A. Sawant, P. Devanbu, and A. van Deursen, “Extending source code pre-trained language models to summarise decompiled binarie,” in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 260–271.
- [3] J. Xiong, G. Chen, K. Chen, H. Gao, S. Cheng, and W. Zhang, “Hex5: Unified pre-training for stripped binary code information inference,” in *2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 774–786.
- [4] M. Chen, J. Tworek, H. Jun, Q. Yuan, H. P. de Oliveira Pinto, J. Kaplan, H. Edwards, Y. Burda, N. Joseph, G. Brockman, A. Ray, R. Puri, G. Krueger, M. Petrov, H. Khlaaf, G. Sastry, P. Mishkin, B. Chan, S. Gray, N. Ryder, M. Pavlov, A. Power, L. Kaiser, M. Bavarian, C. Winter, P. Tillet, F. P. Such, D. Cummings, M. Plappert, F. Chantzis, E. Barnes, A. Herbert-Voss, W. H. Guss, A. Nichol, A. Paino, N. Tezak, J. Tang, I. Babuschkin, S. Balaji, S. Jain, W. Saunders, C. Hesse, A. N. Carr, J. Leike, J. Achiam, V. Misra, E. Morikawa, A. Radford, M. Knight, M. Brundage, M. Murati, K. Mayer, P. Welinder, B. McGrew, D. Amodei, S. McCandlish, I. Sutskever, and W. Zaremba, “Evaluating large language models trained on code,” 2021.
- [5] B. Wang and A. Komatsuzaki, “GPT-J-6B: A 6 Billion Parameter Autoregressive Language Model,” <https://github.com/kingoflolz/mesh-transformer-jax>, May 2021.
- [6] S. Black, S. Biderman, E. Hallahan, Q. Anthony, L. Gao, L. Golding, H. He, C. Leahy, K. McDonnell, J. Phang, M. Pieler, U. S. Prashanth, S. Purohit, L. Reynolds, J. Tow, B. Wang, and S. Weinbach, “GPT-NeoX-20B: An open-source autoregressive language model,” in *Proceedings of BigScience Episode #5 – Workshop on Challenges & Perspectives in Creating Large Language Models*. virtual+Dublin: Association for Computational Linguistics, May 2022, pp. 95–136. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.bigscience-1.9>
- [7] F. F. Xu, U. Alon, G. Neubig, and V. J. Hellendoorn, “A systematic evaluation of large language models of code,” in *Proceedings of the 6th ACM SIGPLAN International Symposium on Machine Programming*, ser. MAPS 2022. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, p. 1–10. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3520312.3534862>
- [8] L. Luo, J. Ming, D. Wu, P. Liu, and S. Zhu, “Semantics-based obfuscation-resilient binary code similarity comparison with applications to software and algorithm plagiarism detection,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 43, no. 12, pp. 1157–1177, 2017.
- [9] L. Massarelli, G. A. Di Luna, F. Petroni, R. Baldoni, and L. Querzoni, “Safe: Self-attentive function embeddings for binary similarity,” in *Detection of Intrusions and Malware, and Vulnerability Assessment*, R. Perdisci, C. Maurice, G. Giacinto, and M. Almgren, Eds., 2019, pp. 309–329.
- [10] Y. Duan, X. Li, J. Wang, and H. Yin, “Deepbindiff: Learning program-wide code representations for binary diffing,” in *Proceedings of the 2020 Network and Distributed Systems Security Symposium (NDSS)*, 2020.
- [11] X. Li, Q. Yu, and H. Yin, “Palmtree: Learning an assembly language model for instruction embedding,” *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2021.
- [12] K. Pei, Z. Xuan, J. Yang, S. Jana, and B. Ray, “Learning approximate execution semantics from traces for binary function similarity,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 49, no. 04, pp. 2776–2790, apr 2023.
- [13] H. Wang, W. Qu, G. Katz, W. Zhu, Z. Gao, H. Qiu, J. Zhuge, and C. Zhang, “jtrans: jump-aware transformer for binary code similarity detection,” in *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*, 2022, pp. 1–13.
- [14] polymorf, “findcrypt-yara,” <https://github.com/polymorf/findcrypt-yara>, 2022.
- [15] Sirmabus, “ida\_signsrch,” [https://github.com/nihilus/IDA\\_Signsrch](https://github.com/nihilus/IDA_Signsrch), 2015.
- [16] Z. Wang, X. Jiang, W. Cui, X. Wang, and M. Grace, “Reformat: Automatic reverse engineering of encrypted messages,” in *Computer Security—ESORICS 2009: 14th European Symposium on Research in Computer Security, Saint-Malo, France, September 21-23, 2009. Proceedings 14*. Springer, 2009, pp. 200–215.
- [17] F. Gröbert, C. Willems, and T. Holz, “Automated Identification of Cryptographic Primitives in Binary Programs,” in *Recent Advances in Intrusion Detection*, R. Sommer, D. Balzarotti, and G. Maier, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011, pp. 41–60.
- [18] L. Benedetti, A. Thierry, and J. Franco, “Detection of cryptographic algorithms with grap,” *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, Paper 2017/1119, 2017, <https://eprint.iacr.org/2017/1119>. [Online]. Available: <https://eprint.iacr.org/2017/1119>
- [19] J. Li, Z. Lin, J. Caballero, Y. Zhang, and D. Gu, “K-hunt: Pinpointing insecure cryptographic keys from execution traces,” in *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ser. CCS ’18. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2018, p. 412–425. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3243734.3243783>
- [20] P. Kochberger and F. Seitzl, “Detecting cryptography through ir visualization,” in *2018 International Conference on Software Security and Assurance (ICSSA)*, 2018, pp. 25–29.
- [21] R. Zhao, D. Gu, J. Li, and Y. Zhang, “Automatic detection and analysis of encrypted messages in malware,” in *Information Security and Cryptology*, D. Lin, S. Xu, and M. Yung, Eds. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2014, pp. 101–117.
- [22] J. Li, L. Jiang, and H. Shu, “Binary code level cyclic feature recognition of cryptographic algorithm,” *Computer engineering and design*, vol. 35, no. 8, pp. 2628–2632, 2014.
- [23] P. Lestringant, F. Guihéry, and P.-A. Fouque, “Automated identification of cryptographic primitives in binary code with data flow graph isomorphism,” in *Proceedings of the 10th ACM Symposium on Information, Computer and Communications Security*, ser. ASIA CCS ’15. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2015, p. 203–214. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2714576.2714639>
- [24] J. Calvet, J. M. Fernandez, and J.-Y. Marion, “Aligot: Cryptographic function identification in obfuscated binary programs,” in *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ser. CCS ’12. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2012, p. 169–182. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2382196.2382217>
- [25] D. Xu, J. Ming, and D. Wu, “Cryptographic function detection in obfuscated binaries via bit-precise symbolic loop mapping,” in *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, 2017, pp. 921–937.
- [26] C. Meijer, V. Moonsamy, and J. Wetzels, “Where’s crypto?: Automated identification and classification of proprietary cryptographic primitives in binary code,” in *30th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2021, August 11-13, 2021*, M. Bailey and R. Greenstadt, Eds. USENIX Association, 2021, pp. 555–572. [Online]. Available: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity21/presentation/meijer>
- [27] “CVE-2014-0160.” Available from MITRE, CVE-ID CVE-2014-0160., Dec. 3 2013. [Online]. Available: <http://cve.mitre.org/cgi-bin/cvename.cgi?name=CVE-2014-0160>
- [28] Y. Wang, W. Wang, S. Joty, and S. C. Hoi, “CodeT5: Identifier-aware unified pre-trained encoder-decoder models for code understanding and generation,” in *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, M.-F. Moens, X. Huang, L. Specia, and S. W.-t. Yih, Eds. Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic: Association for Computational Linguistics, Nov. 2021, pp. 8696–8708. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.685>
- [29] G. Hill and X. Bellekens, “Cryptoknight: Generating and modelling compiled cryptographic primitives,” *Information*, vol. 9, no. 9, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mdpi.com/2078-2489/9/9/231>
- [30] X. Li, Y. Chang, G. Ye, X. Gong, and Z. Tang, “Genda: A graph embedded network based detection approach on encryption algorithm of binary program,” *J. Inf. Secur. Appl.*, vol. 65, no. C, mar 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jisa.2021.103088>
- [31] I. Guilfanov, “Findcrypt2,” <https://hex-rays.com/blog/findcrypt2/>, 2006.
- [32] C. Zhao, F. Kang, J. Yang, and H. Shu, “A review of cryptographic algorithm recognition technology for binary code,” *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, vol. 1856, no. 1, p. 012015, apr 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1856/1/012015>
- [33] OpenSSL, “Openssl,” <https://github.com/openssl/openssl>, 2023.
- [34] X. Jin, J. Larson, W. Yang, and Z. Lin, “Binary code summarization: Benchmarking chatgpt/gpt-4 and other large language models,” 2023.
- [35] L. Ouyang, J. Wu, X. Jiang, D. Almeida, C. L. Wainwright, P. Mishkin, C. Zhang, S. Agarwal, K. Slama, A. Ray, J. Schulman, J. Hilton, F. Kelton, L. Miller, M. Simens, A. Askell, P. Welinder, P. Christiano,

- J. Leike, and R. Lowe, "Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback," 2022.
- [36] Y. Wang, H. Le, A. D. Gotmare, N. D. Q. Bui, J. Li, and S. C. H. Hoi, "Codet5+: Open code large language models for code understanding and generation," 2023.
- [37] E. Nijkamp, B. Pang, H. Hayashi, L. Tu, H. Wang, Y. Zhou, S. Savarese, and C. Xiong, "Codegen: An open large language model for code with multi-turn program synthesis," *ICLR*, 2023.
- [38] H. Husain, H. Wu, T. Gazit, M. Allamanis, and M. Brockschmidt, "Codesearchnet challenge: Evaluating the state of semantic code search," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1909.09436, 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1909.09436>
- [39] Y. Li, D. Choi, J. Chung, N. Kushman, J. Schrittwieser, R. Leblond, T. Eccles, J. Keeling, F. Gimeno, A. Dal Lago *et al.*, "Competition-level code generation with alphacode," *Science*, vol. 378, no. 6624, pp. 1092–1097, 2022.
- [40] A. Marcelli, M. Graziano, X. Ugarte-Pedrero, Y. Fratantonio, M. Mansouri, and D. Balzarotti, "How machine learning is solving the binary function similarity problem," in *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, 2022, pp. 2099–2116.
- [41] J. Caballero, P. Poosankam, C. Kreibich, and D. Song, "Dispatcher: Enabling active botnet infiltration using automatic protocol reverse-engineering," in *Proceedings of the 16th ACM conference on Computer and communications security*, 2009, pp. 621–634.
- [42] M. Henderson, R. Al-Rfou, B. Strobe, Y.-H. Sung, L. Lukács, R. Guo, S. Kumar, B. Miklos, and R. Kurzweil, "Efficient natural language response suggestion for smart reply," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.00652*, 2017.
- [43] A. Z. Broder, "On the resemblance and containment of documents," in *Proceedings. Compression and Complexity of SEQUENCES 1997 (Cat. No. 97TB100171)*. IEEE, 1997, pp. 21–29.
- [44] D. Kim, E. Kim, S. K. Cha, S. Son, and Y. Kim, "Revisiting binary code similarity analysis using interpretable feature engineering and lessons learned," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, pp. 1–23, 2022.
- [45] Facebook, Inc., "PyTorch," <https://pytorch.org>, 2023.
- [46] T. Wolf, L. Debut, V. Sanh, J. Chaumond, C. Delangue, A. Moi, P. Cistac, T. Rault, R. Louf, M. Funtowicz, J. Davison, S. Shleifer, P. von Platen, C. Ma, Y. Jernite, J. Plu, C. Xu, T. L. Scao, S. Gugger, M. Drame, Q. Lhoest, and A. M. Rush, "Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing," in *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, Oct. 2020, pp. 38–45. [Online]. Available: <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/2020.emnlp-demos.6>
- [47] microsoft, "DeepSpeed," <https://github.com/microsoft/DeepSpeed/>, 2023.
- [48] C.-Y. Lin, "ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries," in *Text Summarization Branches Out*. Barcelona, Spain: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2004, pp. 74–81. [Online]. Available: <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W04-1013>
- [49] K. Papineni, S. Roukos, T. Ward, and W. jing Zhu, "Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation," 2002, pp. 311–318.
- [50] S. Banerjee and A. Lavie, "METEOR: An automatic metric for MT evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments," in *Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evaluation Measures for Machine Translation and/or Summarization*, J. Goldstein, A. Lavie, C.-Y. Lin, and C. Voss, Eds. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jun. 2005, pp. 65–72. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/W05-0909>
- [51] A. Q. Jiang, A. Sablayrolles, A. Roux, A. Mensch, B. Savary, C. Bamford, D. S. Chaplot, D. de las Casas, E. B. Hanna, F. Bressand, G. Lengyel, G. Bour, G. Lample, L. R. Lavaud, L. Saulnier, M.-A. Lachaux, P. Stock, S. Subramanian, S. Yang, S. Antoniak, T. L. Scao, T. Gervet, T. Lavril, T. Wang, T. Lacroix, and W. E. Sayed, "Mixtral of experts," 2024.
- [52] N. Shalev and N. Partush, "Binary similarity detection using machine learning," in *Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Programming Languages and Analysis for Security*, ser. PLAS '18. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2018, p. 42–47. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3264820.3264821>
- [53] X. Xu, C. Liu, Q. Feng, H. Yin, L. Song, and D. Song, "Neural network-based graph embedding for cross-platform binary code similarity detection," in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ser. CCS '17. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2017, p. 363–376. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3133956.3134018>
- [54] S. H. H. Ding, B. C. M. Fung, and P. Charland, "Asm2vec: Boosting static representation robustness for binary clone search against code obfuscation and compiler optimization," in *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, 2019, pp. 472–489.
- [55] Y. Li, C. Gu, T. Dullien, O. Vinyals, and P. Kohli, "Graph matching networks for learning the similarity of graph structured objects," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 3835–3845.