

reAnalyst: Scalable Analysis of Reverse Engineering Activities

Tab (Tianyi) Zhang^{a,1}, Claire Taylor^{c,1}, Bart Coppens^a, Waleed Mebane^b, Christian Collberg^b, Bjorn De Sutter^a

^aComputer Systems Lab, Ghent University, Technologiepark-Zwijnaarde 126, 9052, Gent, Belgium

^bDepartment of Computer Science, The University of Arizona, 85721, Tucson, USA

^cLawrence Livermore National Laboratory, 94550, Livermore, USA

Abstract

This paper introduces reAnalyst, a scalable analysis framework designed to facilitate the study of reverse engineering (RE) practices through the semi-automated annotation of RE activities across various RE tools. By integrating tool-agnostic data collection of screenshots, keystrokes, active processes, and other types of data during RE experiments with semi-automated data analysis and annotation, reAnalyst aims to overcome the limitations of traditional RE studies that rely heavily on manual data collection and subjective analysis. The framework enables more efficient data analysis, allowing researchers to explore the effectiveness of protection techniques and strategies used by reverse engineers more comprehensively and efficiently. Experimental evaluations validate the framework's capability to identify RE activities from a diverse range of screenshots with varied complexities, thereby simplifying the analysis process and supporting more effective research outcomes.

Keywords: Reverse Engineering Tools, Software Protection, Man-At-The-End Attacks, Empirical Studies, Analysis tools, Image Analysis

1. Introduction

1.1. Motivation

Understanding the practice of software reverse engineering (RE) is important for teaching it to students, for RE tool and strategy development, and for the development, evaluation, and validation of anti-RE software protections such as software obfuscation [7, 14, 33]. Evaluating and predicting the impact of protections requires the understanding, measuring, and modeling of many aspects of RE. These aspects vary significantly in abstraction level and scope. They range from the protections' impact on individual attack steps, such as the effort required for human comprehension of individual code fragments; over the impact on attack paths, such as which fragments would be visited to

Email addresses: tab.zhang@ugent.be (Tab (Tianyi) Zhang), claire.g.taylor.1988@gmail.com (Claire Taylor), bart.coppens@ugent.be (Bart Coppens), mebanew@arizona.edu (Waleed Mebane), collberg@cs.arizona.edu (Christian Collberg), bjorn.desutter@ugent.be (Bjorn De Sutter)

¹Tab (Tianyi) Zhang and Claire Taylor share dual first authorship.

localize specific fragments of interest; to the impact on the attack-path-of-least-resistance and strategic attack decision making, such as when it becomes useful to switch from static to dynamic analysis or hybrid combinations thereof.

Existing work on understanding such aspects of RE has mostly been based on interviews and surveys conducted with reverse engineers [12, 46, 55], on knowledge extraction from written reports [11, 12], and on performance metrics obtained with controlled experiments [8, 30, 54, 61]. Interviews, surveys, and reports depend on the participants’ memory accuracy, their answering/reporting style, their willingness to disclose information, and their limited availability for answering/reporting. Furthermore, there is always bias resulting from the choice and formulation of the questions or topics to be addressed. For these reasons, such studies all have limited precision (in the sense of producing the same results when they are repeated) and completeness, even if they are conducted with established qualitative research methods [15] such as open coding, in which text fragments are labeled with “codes” that are not limited to a predetermined list of codes. Finally, the production, collection, and processing of interviews, surveys, and reports is a labor-intensive process, inducing a significant amount of effort on the researchers conducting the studies, as well as reporting overhead on the participants. As a result, the aforementioned studies are all one-offs. Executing similar studies in a similar way on a continuous basis is simply not affordable.

Alternatively, data collection techniques can be used to gather activity logs during the execution of RE tasks. Mantovani et al. acquire activity logs with a web-based interactive disassembler with built-in custom activity logging [31]. This approach does not generalize to third-party RE tools that lack such custom activity logging. Taylor’s approach of tool-agnostic activity logging [48, 50] does not suffer from this problem: it logs screenshots, keystrokes, mouse clicks, active process lists, active window information, etc. regardless of the specific RE tools used by the reverse engineers.

Then again, Taylor’s approach also suffers from a lack of scalability, as manually extracting the relevant, more abstract RE activities from those low-level logs has proven to be too time-consuming to scale to large experiments: In our first experiments with Taylor’s tools to annotate the collected low-level data manually with more high-level activities, we found that annotating one minute of RE activity requires more than one minute of a researcher’s time. Such annotations need to be performed by multiple RE researchers for reasons of accuracy and cannot be outsourced to, e.g., a Mechanical Turk because of the complex and domain-specific nature of the data. We therefore concluded that in order to scale, we need to move to a semi-automated annotation process.

1.2. Our Vision and Approach: Automatic Data Extraction and Annotation

In our research, we aim to design processes, protocols, and tool support that will allow researchers to conduct large scale RE and anti-RE experiments as a matter of course. Such experiments can be conducted to evaluate new anti-RE technologies, to run longitudinal studies of how RE strategies change over time, to understand the differences in RE strategies between different classes of subjects, and so on. In contrast to the past practices that are prohibitively expensive, we conjecture that with the proper tool support, we can reach a situation where large amounts of RE data can be collected, semi-automatically annotated and analyzed, and shared between research groups.

To move towards this goal, we are augmenting Taylor’s data collection framework with tools to automatically and efficiently analyze large collections of collected RE data




Figure 1: Overall flow of our approach for learning how RE works.

and to automate the extraction of higher-level RE activity annotations from the tool-agnostic data logs. To foster collaboration with other RE researchers, we are releasing our tools in the public domain.

Our overall flow for analyzing RE is depicted in Figure 1. The first step in this methodology involves designing experiments with which to answer research questions (RQs) — questions designed to provide insight into RE practices. We have accomplished this step with controlled experiments and with public bounty challenges. Some examples of the types of research questions we wish to answer are the following:

- Which obfuscations most effectively hinder code comprehension [8, 54, 61]
- Which obfuscation tools most effectively hinder RE [30]?
- Which code traversal order (e.g., breadth-first or depth-first) is most effective for code comprehension [31]?
- How do attackers of protected software build and execute strategies [11, 12]?
- Which RE strategies are most effective, e.g., using static or dynamic analysis tools [58]?
- Which tool functionality is most popular/effective for some RE task?

In step 2, participants execute their tasks in a closed or open environment, depending on the experiment design. The only requirement is that the participants have our data collection framework running in the background to collect tool-agnostic traces in the form of key logs, screenshots, mouse clicks, active process lists, etc. Optionally, participants can also feed their own annotations (short text messages) into the stream of collected data.

Then follows an optional step 3, in which we foresee that the researchers can add manual annotations to the collected data. We have included this step because we can imagine situations in which it would be useful to let the researchers provide additional information that can be useful to improve the execution of later steps. For example, the researcher could input that some participants used a specific version of a tool (as reported, e.g., in a post-experiment questionnaire) if that information is required to correctly interpret the data in screenshots in the next step.

In step 4, the framework presented later in this paper extracts high-level, time-marked RE activities from the tool-agnostic data, and labels that data with corresponding annotations. Examples of such RE activities are

- From time X to Y, Ghidra showed the code of function Z.
- From time X to Y, GDB was used on binary Z.
- At time X, the participant renamed symbol² Y into Z in IDA Pro.

In the optional step 5, the researcher can again provide additional annotations, or correct the ones generated automatically in the previous step.

Finally, in step 6, all available data and annotations can be analyzed to provide answers to the research questions.

We performed several experiments with this annotation framework to validate the reliability of the techniques we developed as a proof of concept of our vision.

1.3. Contributions of This Paper

The paper’s contributions are:

- We present reAnalyst, an analysis framework designed for RE experiments, with a focus on our method for extracting high-level RE activities from low-level tool-agnostic activity logs.
- We present adaptations to Taylor’s data collection and visualization framework that were necessary to enable the reliable extraction of high-level RE activities.
- We present an evaluation of the reliability of our method.
- We open source our framework.

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces background and reviews relevant literature. Section 3 presents reAnalyst, our interactive analysis framework, and its motivation and overall pipeline. Section 4 and Section 6 respectively discuss the comprehensive pipelines for processing non-image and image data, while Section 5 assesses the performance of processing image data. Finally, Section 7 outlines the directions for our future work.

2. Background and Related Work

This section first discusses the methods and limitations in existing literature analyzing RE practices. More background is then provided on the existing data collection and visualization framework by Taylor et al., on which the work presented in this paper builds. Finally, optical character recognition is briefly introduced, as that is a key component of the pipeline that we contribute.

²In binary executable terminology, symbols are symbolic identifiers of artifacts in binary executable files [25]. Examples are section names, function names, global variable names, etc. We use the term more broadly here, as it can also denote any other construct that is given a name by the reverse engineers or their tools during the RE. A good example is a globally allocated string in a binary. Disassemblers typically replace string addresses with string identifiers because that eases human code readability. Another example of what we consider symbols are mnemonics of disassembled instructions, and register names occurring in the assembly code obtained by disassemblers.

2.1. Methods for Acquiring Knowledge About RE

Some reverse engineers, academics, and practitioners share their knowledge by presenting RE *case studies* in scientific papers and blogs. For example, Guillot and Gazet present a novel RE tool and describe how it improves their productivity in a concrete RE task [17, 18]. Rolles describes how to customize tools to attack software protected with code virtualization, and details all steps of his attack [40].

Other reverse engineers share their knowledge by participating in (*controlled*) *experiments and observational studies* [2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 20, 23, 26, 27, 30, 31, 37, 39, 46, 47, 53, 54, 56, 59, 60, 61]. The participants (a.k.a. *subjects*) then execute RE tasks on selected programs (a.k.a. *objects*). The participants may get different assignments (a.k.a. different *treatments*), for example when they are forced to use different RE techniques, or when they are given different samples, such as unobfuscated programs vs. obfuscated ones.

With the appropriate methodologies [57], RE researchers can then extract knowledge about RE practices and about the *effects of variables of the subjects, objects, and treatments on variables of the RE task execution*. Depending on the design of the experiment/study, the execution environment can be closed or open to different degrees. Open in this case means that the participating subjects have more freedom in selecting the tools and methods that they use for executing the task, while closed means that the experiment or study designers impose limits on that freedom. In *controlled experiments*, the researchers manipulate a limited number of so-called independent variables of the subjects, objects, and treatments to test their effects on so-called dependent variables of the RE task execution, while controlling all other variables so those do not influence the dependent variables. Section 1.2 lists some research questions that have been studied in the literature in this way.

Typically, the researchers collect limited amounts of data about the task execution. These data include quantitative data such as (sub)task execution time, (intermediate) result correctness and completeness, and qualitative answers to pre-questionnaires and post-questionnaires (a.k.a. exit surveys). The data is then analyzed with parametric [16] and non-parametric [22] statistical analyses, as well as with qualitative research methods [15]. For example, Ceccato et al. used the qualitative research methods of open coding and conceptualization to extract a taxonomy of constructs relevant to the RE of protected applications from post-study free-form reports and interviews [11, 12]. This approach allowed hackers to describe freely their experiences, strategies, and the encountered challenges while taking part in the RE experiment; the goal was to capture their unstructured thought processes without restricting them to predetermined questions. However, these methods based on exit surveys and post reports rely heavily on memory accuracy and subjective experiences of hackers, as well as their willingness to disclose complete information, potentially leading to biased, inaccurate, or incomplete data collection [34]. Closed-form surveys also suffer from these issues, and most often will not capture the real-time decision-making processes and detailed strategies of reverse engineers.

Transitioning from this method of relying on participant reports, Wong et al. and Votipka et al. conducted their research using *semi-structured interview* methods. Wong et al. conduct online interviews with professional malware analysts from different companies, aiming to understand their objectives, workflows, and considerations in dynamic

analysis system setup [58]. Votipka et al. not only conducted video interviews with participants to understand their choice of RE techniques but also asked them to show their process while sharing their screens [55]. This approach hence combined interview and observational study methods. While it provides more depth, structured interviews might not adequately capture nonlinear thought processes inherent to RE.

Others have combined the aforementioned approaches, such as Bryant, who combined a case study with semi-structured interviews and an observational study on how reverse engineers make sense of assembly language representations [6].

Extracting information from (controlled) experiments can also be done with data acquisition tools that collect low-level activity logs on the fly, such as keystrokes, mouse clicks, selected menu options, screenshots, active process lists, etc.) [31, 48, 50]. These logs can be augmented with notes participants make on the fly to describe their activities at a more conceptual level (e.g., why they perform some activity). They can also be augmented afterwards through manual and (semi-)automated analyses of the logged data, in what comes down to (open or closed) coding applied to the activity logs. The visualization software used to do so shows some similarity with video and audio editing software, and it allows the researcher to add additional tracks with annotations, i.e., to add codes to the stream of logged data.

Existing approaches have shortcomings, however. Taylor’s data collection and visualisation framework is agnostic to the used RE tools [48, 50]. It automates the collection of screenshots, window data, key logs, mouse clicks, and process data, and of on-the-fly participant notes. The framework also provides an interface for manual human annotation of the recorded data logs, which will be discussed in more detail later in Section 2.2, but does not automate the interpretation (i.e., higher-level coding) of the recorded data. In short, it cannot automatically, quickly, or scalably answer basic research questions such as which RE tool functionality is being used, which code fragments are being studied, and what code traversal strategies are effective. Providing the annotations manually is time-consuming and error-prone. We experimented with it and concluded that this manual mode of operation simply does not scale to large enough experiments, i.e., experiments that run long enough to be representative of real-world RE activities, and that feature enough participants to draw statistically significant conclusions.

Savin et al. presented the Pathfinder tool to make the human annotation process of a data stream collected during cyber attack activities more efficient [41]. While Savin et al. introduced a relatively comprehensive methodology for collecting detailed data on player behavior, their study was narrowed down to analyzing keyboard input data through command-line interactions and keystroke dynamics. Moreover, their tool only supports so-called closed coding, in which the annotation codes are limited to a predetermined list of allowed codes. In their case, these are the 234 techniques (and even more sub-techniques) from the Mitre ATT&CK Matrix for Enterprise (<https://attack.mitre.org>) [45]. This contrasts with the effort here to provide more granular annotations generated from image data and a variety of subject user interfaces.

In essence, the Pathfinder tool provides an efficient method to select techniques within that structured matrix. While more efficient annotation selection support such as that in Pathfinder could certainly help to make the use of Taylor’s framework more productive—as would any typing support such as good text auto-completion, it would only have a limited impact on the total annotation effort. Indeed, it would only impact how the researchers provide input to the annotation tool, not how the researchers make sense of

the collected data presented to them by the tool. In our experience, the researchers need to invest much more effort in interpreting the data in the collected activity logs than in typing in the resulting annotations.

Mantovani et al. sidestepped the issue of having to interpret low-level activity logs with a web-based interactive disassembler with built-in custom activity logging, with which they can log precisely which functionality of the disassembler is being used [31]. Like Bryant, they aim to obtain a look inside the mind of a reverse engineer. Among other things, the log produced by their tool includes which functions and basic blocks are selected by the participants to be shown on screen. Based on this data, Mantovani et al. analyzed, e.g., which assembly code exploration strategies perform best: breath-first-like or depth-first-like call graph traversals? They were able to automate this analysis and similar ones because the collected data was a perfect match to the raised research questions, and because the tool was designed specifically to enable answering those questions. For example, it only showed one basic block in readable form at a time, thus easing the identification of the basic block a participant was studying, or, at least, showing on screen. However, because of their dependence on custom, built-in logging, their approach cannot be generalized to RE tasks involving third-party tools. Moreover, they customized (i.e., limited) the capabilities of their disassembler to enable the collection of specific data needed to answer specific research questions. Both aspects are important threats to the external validity of their research. These threats are not limited to their concrete experimental design and execution, they are instead fundamental for their approach: Adding custom logging to third-party (commercial) tools is in many cases not possible, and the alternative of developing tool clones that allow custom logging is limited by the required effort, resulting in less capable tools that might not be representative of the true state-of-the-art tools.

2.2. Taylor’s Data Collection and Visualization Framework

For steps 2, 3, and 5 of the overall flow depicted in Figure 1, we will build on Taylor’s data collection and visualisation framework that was already mentioned in the previous section. For an extensive discussion of its technical details and inner workings, we refer to the existing literature [48, 50]; here, we limit discussion to the aspects pertinent to this work’s contribution.

Taylor’s data collection framework (step 2 of the overall flow) is not screen recording software — it does not record video. Instead, it records time-stamped activity logs comprised of interactions by the reverse engineers with their computer; the data is collected on user input interrupt (from keyboard and mouse input) and on periodic polling. More precisely, it collects the following data:

Screenshots Collected on a periodic polling interval and upon user input events.

Window data Collected on a periodic polling interval and upon user input events. Per window on screen, this includes coordinates and dimensions, title, and its associated process.

Process and thread data Collected on a periodic polling interval, and when screenshots are taken. This includes a list of all running processes with their CPU use, memory use, start and end time, arguments, parent process, owning user, process state, etc. This data differs slightly from one OS to another.

Mouse input The software collects x/y-coordinates upon mouse buttons being pressed.

Keyboard input Finally, all keystrokes are collected.

The data collection framework has been designed to operate on most modern operating systems, including macOS, Windows, and Linux. It only has been tested on the latter two, however. In the case of Linux, the software has been tested on Debian-based distributions such as Kali, a distribution for hackers and security analysts. A number of installation and operation modes are supported to serve the needs of different kinds of experiments, including preset participant tokens vs. sign-up, continuous automatic data upload vs. manually triggered uploads, UI vs. no UI, etc.

To illustrate, we ran an experiment with students registered for a Software Hacking and Protection course at Ghent University. In this experiment³, we were not allowed to know which students opted to participate, and all participation had to be pseudonymous. To accomplish this, the students were given randomized participation tokens upon opting into the experiment, which they entered on the data collection web app in order to download an identification provisioned installer. They were then presented with a consent form before installation, and if they agreed the installation process began.

Once the installation is completed, a user interface appears. This interface allows reverse engineers to pause data collection whenever they wish, such as to enter a password or other sensitive data. It also has a text box for reverse engineers to provide annotations related to tasks at hand - such as noting the start of dynamic analysis.

As participants run the data collection, their devices store the collected data locally and asynchronously upload it to our web server via a WebSocket connection. Once there, the data is stored in a relational database so that it may later be viewed, annotated, and otherwise used. The upload algorithm load balances itself and throttles its speed based on available network and endpoint resources. The stored data is linked to the participant numbers only, not to any other personally identifiable information. The same holds for the information the students share with us in online pre- and post-questionnaires, such that those can be linked to the corresponding streams of collected data.

To illustrate another mode, in the Grand Reverse Engineering Challenge user identification was required in order to provide prizes following the event. Users signed up on the data collection web app with a username and used that username rather than a randomized token to download the installer. Still other modes enable external web apps to dynamically add identifiers (whether randomized or not) via an API for other types of experiments — this method was used in the earlier RevEngE competition and associated student experiments [49].

From the web application, administrators and researchers can view or download each session's data via a web visualization or an API, respectively; annotations may be entered in the visualization or programmatically via API. The visualization displays multiple sessions in a timeline view, complete with annotations as shown in Figure 2; clicking on a session starts animated playback as shown in Figure 3.

³The Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Engineering and Architecture approved the experiment and its procedures as documented at <https://github.com/zhan4839/reAnalyst>.

User Timeline for Participant 20240116

Index data: 2041342 bytes; new image data: 9775107253 bytes; new process data: 14943608 bytes; new keystrokes data: 30532398 bytes; new mouse data: 14333430 bytes; finished 1 screenshot, 1 process, 1 keystrokes, and 1 mouse sessions of 1 total sessions.




Figure 2: Simulated timeline view that displays session information next to a chart with active windows, screenshots, and annotations.




Figure 3: Simulated animation view that plays back screenshots and displays keystroke input, current task, and top process.

2.3. OCR Technologies

Part of our research involves using OCR tools to convert massive numbers of screenshots collected from RE experiments into text data to extract useful information. Malkadi et al. conducted an evaluation of six OCR tools' ability to extract source code from online screencasts and screenshots [29], finding that Google Drive OCR and ABBYY FineReader (Abbyy) produced the most accurate results. Tesseract, an open-source OCR tool commonly used by researchers, was found to be less accurate particularly when dealing with difficult fonts or low-quality images. However, Malkadi et al. did not exploit Tesseract's customization and training options to improve its output quality [43, 51], hence more in-depth research on it is necessary.

Not all OCR tools are suitable for our research. To process a large amount of screenshots, we require a tool that is fast and accurate for the specific types of screenshots we work with. Ideally, the tool offers a headless API to ease integration into our framework. In that regard, Tesseract scores best.

3. reAnalyst Design

We developed reAnalyst, an interactive analysis framework designed for RE experiments. Utilizing raw data collected by our data collection framework, from RE experiments conducted with various real-world RE tools, the goal of reAnalyst is to extract valuable information in a semi-automated way with minimal human effort, in order to answer research questions stated in Section 1.2.

3.1. Expected Use

Our framework automates many aspects of RE activity analysis, focusing on some of the most labor-intensive work, such as identifying which functions and basic blocks are displayed in screenshots. It provides researchers the flexibility to adjust configurations and write custom scripts to enhance outcomes and address specific research questions by instantiating the reAnalyst pipeline that will be introduced below.

Despite our aim of making the framework automate as much of the work as possible, we foresee that it can and will be used interactively, i.e., combining automated processing and analysis with manual interventions. Some examples of manual interventions that we foresee are the following:

- When a screenshot processing tool relies on font colors or box colors to identify the items being displayed by some GUI RE tool, and when a researcher notes that a participant in an experiment has configured their tool with a custom color scheme, the researcher could manually override the processing tool's assumptions about the used color scheme.
- When a researcher notes that a participant in an experiment uses custom aliases for shell commands or has renamed some binaries, the researcher can reconfigure tools that extract data from the keystroke logs and from the process data.
- When a data extraction tool does not offer sufficient accuracy or sufficient completeness for relatively rare RE activities, in the sense that it cannot handle certain infrequently occurring RE activities completely automatically and reliably, it might

tag events in the recorded sessions at which it asks the researcher for manual input or confirmation.

Importantly, such manual interventions would only be required once or at most a limited number of times per recorded experiment session, thus not impeding the scaling of the research to large experiments. Some interventions would be required before the bulk of automatic analysis starts, as in the first two examples above, other interventions would be required during or after the automatic analysis. For example, if a tool can detect that a participant renames some symbol in an interactive disassembler at some point during an experiment session, but the tool cannot reliably identify which symbol is renamed or to what new name, it may ask the researcher to provide that information, such that the tool can interpret data collected later in the session taking into account the new name instead of the old one.

3.2. Assumptions

We assume access to *challenge data*. This includes all objects on which the experiments are performed, i.e., all (obfuscated or not) binaries being reverse engineered by the participants as part of their assignments, as well as the unstripped versions of those binaries with full symbol information (and possibly debug information). In addition, the challenge data includes all the information necessary to answer the research questions. For example, if a research question is “To what extent does obfuscation X increase the effort needed for code comprehension?”, we assume the researchers know which parts of the binaries have been transformed by the obfuscation.

Furthermore, we assume that the researchers that use our framework to gather knowledge from data collected during experiments have access to the RE tools used in those experiments. The researchers conducting a study can then deploy the tools on the objects themselves to obtain the mapping between the tools’ outputs that will be recorded in the collected data on the one hand, and artifacts in the challenge data on the other hand. For example, disassemblers such as IDA Pro, Binary Ninja, and Ghidra assign symbolic names to the artifacts they identify in the binaries. Concretely, they give symbolic names to statically allocated global data, functions, local variables, etc. These names are then shown on screen in different views on the binaries, including control flow graphs and decompiled code. These names can differ from one tool version to another because which artifacts are identified can evolve over time and because the heuristics used to give the identified artifacts human-readable, meaningful names can evolve over time.

Under the above assumptions, researchers can find out which names the participants’ tools give to all relevant artifacts, such that the researchers can configure our framework to correctly interpret all the tools’ outputs in the collected data. Because tools such as the mentioned disassemblers also support headless execution modes and because they offer APIs for accessing and exporting the intermediate representations they construct for the challenge binaries, the collection of such names and other relevant data can be completely automated.

Finally, we expect reverse engineers to properly install this data collection framework and to have it enabled when they are performing RE activities during the experiments. We also expect them to have an internet connection that is stable enough to transmit all collected data to the data collection servers. Intermittent connectivity suffices.




Figure 4: Overall pipeline for reAnalyst.

3.3. Collecting Data

The initial input data for reAnalyst is the data collected by the data collection framework introduced in Section 2.2. To enhance the compatibility of this software with reAnalyst and the overall tool flow efficacy and efficiency, we made a number of adaptations to the data collection framework. Because high-quality screenshot images are required to achieve good performance in OCR, we have adapted the compression scheme to use differential lossless compression [42]. We transitioned from the lossy JPG format to the lossless PNG format [32], and we capture only the changed regions between consecutive screenshots, which reduces file size without compromising image quality. Additionally, we have addressed minor bugs and enhanced the overall user experience.

3.4. Overall Pipeline for Our Framework

To generate a list of RE activities from the collected data, reAnalyst implements the simple two-stage pipeline shown in Figure 4. The two stages are:

1. *Data Processing*: ReAnalyst processes the original raw data obtained from the server of our data collection framework, such as original screenshots and process data stored in the database, to make them human-readable or more easily processed, to the extent this is necessary.
2. *RE Activity Identification*: A refined list of RE activities is determined from the processed timestamped data. This is done both manually and automatically.

Both stages can be parameterized by the challenge data, i.e., by the symbol information available in the original binaries, by additional information that can be obtained by deploying the RE tools on the challenge data, and by information known by the researchers, such as a partitioning of all code fragments into sets of relevant and irrelevant fragments for solving a challenge.

4. Image Data Analysis

Figure 5 shows an example screenshot collected from an RE experiment session. Our goal is to identify which function from the challenge binary is being shown in this screenshot. This is not made easy by the window composition in the screenshot. First, it features two main windows, with IDA and GDB being used concurrently. This setup is a common scenario among reverse engineers who prefer to use multiple tools. Within the comparatively smaller IDA window, a string window then partially obscures the graph view window that shows the function’s control flow graph with its basic blocks.




Figure 5: Sample screenshot collected from an experiment.

A screenshot like this may be challenging even for human analysts to visually examine. Still, our framework successfully identifies the corresponding function.

For processing and analyzing image data such as this screenshot, the Data Processing stage of the reAnalyst pipeline consists of two steps: OCR and Content Matching. First, an *OCR* tool converts time-stamped images into time-stamped text outputs to facilitate further analysis. Next, reAnalyst attempts to match that text with content derived from the Challenge Data. In the example, it matches this screenshot with function `sub_8B8A0` and 4 basic blocks, even though some of the basic blocks are only partially visible. In addition, reAnalyst also checks for key symbols or code fragments predetermined as relevant for solving the challenge, such as `dword_F17C0` (highlighted).

In the RE Activity Identification stage, reAnalyst then automatically generates a timeline of visited functions, basic blocks, and key symbols throughout the experiment session, renaming them to their original names in the challenge data. For this screenshot, the original function name for `sub_8B8A0` is ‘`key_check`,’ and the original name for `dword_F17C0` is ‘`check_failed`,’ an integer that changes value when the key check fails. Thus, in this screenshot, as well as any other screenshots with the same function and basic blocks, the reverse engineer appears to be investigating the code segments related to the ‘key check’ failure.

4.1. OCR

For turning timestamped images into text, we use the OCR tools Abbyy and Tesseract, and they each has unique strengths and weaknesses. When choosing an OCR tool, both output quality and processing speed are important to us because we depend on high-quality OCR outputs for accurate content matching and cannot afford unlimited time and resources. In the initial phase of our research, we chose Abbyy over other OCR tools due to its higher accuracy in text recognition. This decision was based on findings from Malkadi et al., who demonstrated that Abbyy outperforms Tesseract in terms of recognition accuracy [29]. However, as we started to analyze hundreds of thousands of

screenshots from large RE experiments, we observed that the use of Abbyy did not scale well. We encountered significant challenges with Abbyy, including prolonged processing times, occasional crashes of the UI under heavy workloads, and limited customization options.

As a result, we went back to using Tesseract. We discovered that previous research [29] had not fully used Tesseract’s potential for customization and training [43, 44, 51]. We started configuring Tesseract with the challenge data and experimenting with various Tesseract configurations and methods to improve recognition results. In the end, we developed a Python script that features image preprocessing (i.e., doubling the pixel count in both dimensions) and our customized Tesseract configurations (e.g., page segmentation mode, character whitelisting, thresholding method, directory setting), specifically tailored for processing RE experiment data.

By customizing Tesseract, we achieved good-quality OCR results with our experiment screenshots. It processes images at an average processing speed of 4.8 seconds per screenshot in our experimental environment described in Section 5.1, including the time it takes for upscaling images before processing them with Tesseract. The script runs from the command line on any device and can even be integrated into scripts in our framework, in contrast with Abbyy, which only supports graphical interfaces, does not run on Linux, and cannot be further extended. However, it’s important to highlight that we still use Abbyy in our research, particularly for tasks involving low-quality screenshot images.

4.2. Content Matching

After the screenshot images are converted into text files, reAnalyst attempts to identify the corresponding, more abstract, and RE-related constructs that are being shown in each of them.

4.2.1. Function Matching

For screenshots captured during RE activities using GUI disassemblers, reAnalyst first attempts to identify any functions appearing in the screenshots. This is accomplished by searching the OCR text output for symbols in the binaries that are unique to functions according to the Challenge Data.

In preparation for this step, a script relies on the Challenge Data to create a mapping between unique symbols and their associated functions. The script queries the disassemblers (via their headless operation mode) to obtain all the symbols that those tools create for artifacts in the disassembled code and data. It is those symbols that may occur in the screenshots. The script also queries the disassemblers for the functions and basic blocks to which those symbols relate, e.g., when some disassembled instruction in a block in a function refers to a symbol. Many retrieved symbols are filtered out of the retrieved information, such as frequently occurring assembly instructions, registers, and other predefined elements. The remaining symbols are sanitized by removing hexadecimal patterns, pointer information, and specific code patterns. When relevant, the script also normalizes symbols by eliminating tool-specific prefixes, thus ensuring compatibility across different disassemblers which may use varying prefixes. As a final step, the script eliminates symbols that are found in multiple functions to simplify the subsequent matching process. The outcome is a symbol-function map that lists the key symbols and

their associated functions. This preparation step only needs to run once for each binary and disassembler, and only takes a few minutes.

Based on the symbol-function map and the OCR outputs, our framework maps each screenshot to its corresponding function whenever a match is found. It uses a combination of regex-based extraction techniques and the FuzzyWuzzy library’s fuzzy matching algorithms [19] to ensure accuracy. Specifically, regex is used to parse and retrieve potential symbols from complex textual data, while FuzzyWuzzy’s algorithms match these symbols against the symbol-function map, even in the presence of some potential OCR mistakes or variations. Our framework offers the possibility of setting various parameters, such as the fuzzy matching score threshold — a metric that represents the confidence level of a match between the OCR output and the symbol-function map — and additional constraints such as symbol length, to accommodate varying levels of OCR precision and specific analysis needs. To enhance the efficiency of the matching process, as soon as a match with a matching score of 100 is found, the process concludes for that screenshot and moves on to the next one, as all symbols in the symbol-function map are unique to a function. If such a perfect match is not found, the symbol with the highest matching score that exceeds the fuzzy matching score threshold determines the match for that. The final output is a JSON file that lists the mapping between screenshots and shown functions, if any.

4.2.2. Basic Block Matching

In addition, reAnalyst identifies basic blocks displayed in the control flow graph view. This feature is offered by all advanced disassemblers with GUI interfaces, with each basic block being shown in a rectangular box [13, 21, 52].

reAnalyst performs image cropping to separate individual basic blocks from screenshots captured in the control flow graph view, as illustrated in Figure 8. We use OpenCV [4] to identify contours and calculate bounding rectangles for potential cropping regions within images. The Python Imaging Library (PIL) [28] enables the cropping and saving of these identified regions based on predefined size and color filters.

For each screenshot block, OCR then extracts the text in it, and reAnalyst finds the best matching basic block in the challenge data. To this extent, reAnalyst queries the used disassemblers for all the basic blocks those tools can find in the challenge binaries, and for the contents of those challenge blocks, i.e., the disassembled instructions. We call those blocks challenge blocks from here on. This preparatory step only needs to be done once per binary and is in fact done together with the querying required for the construction of the symbol-function map.

To find the best match between screenshot blocks and the challenge blocks, reAnalyst considers every single symbol in the OCR output extracted from each basic block, including opcodes, register names, and memory addresses. Every symbol is considered significant for accurate matching because basic blocks can be very short. The Levenshtein distance algorithm [24] is then used to identify the common symbols shared between a screenshot block and each candidate challenge block, and to compute matching ratios between them. For each screenshot block, the candidate challenge block with the highest matching ratio is considered the best match.

For selecting the candidate challenge blocks among which the best match for a screenshot block will be identified, reAnalyst assumes that the preceding function matching step has correctly identified the function being shown in the full screenshot from which the

screenshot block was cropped. Only the challenge blocks within that function are considered candidates for basic block matching. This reliance on accurate function matching results is primarily for optimization, as performing such matching across the entire database would be time-consuming.

Upon completing the matching process, reAnalyst generates a JSON file that maps the timestamp of each screenshot to the identified functions and basic blocks. For screenshots where no matches are found for functions or basic blocks, the resulting entry in the JSON file will be blank.

4.2.3. *Extracting Disassembler Usage and Symbol Insights*

Finally, our framework offers some additional functionality that relies on straightforward text processing techniques. It identifies disassembler features used by reverse engineers by detecting keywords in the OCR output that indicate such usage. Researchers can also define specific key symbols or code fragments relevant to solving the challenge, accompanied by a brief description for each (e.g., the code where the provided license key is displayed). The framework then searches the screenshots for these predefined symbols or code fragments, creating a timeline that highlights instances of their appearance.

4.3. *RE Activity Identification*

Based on the timestamped RE-related content reAnalyst generates a timeline of RE activities, such as the visited functions. Timelines for basic blocks and selected key symbols/code fragments visited can be generated as well. For each activity, the timeline includes the start time, end time, name of function (or basic block, key symbol/code fragment), and the duration of the interval, as illustrated in Figure 7. Researchers can customize the timeline output in various ways such as:

- Rename symbol names given by the used RE tools to their original names from the challenge data, or to other names of their choice that ease later (human) processing or reporting, as was also done by Mantovani et al., who renamed the relevant functions in their reports to “target function” and “bridge function” [31].
- Define an interval gap to consolidate consecutive intervals by ignoring minor gaps. For instance, if function N appears in screenshots from time interval A to B, and then resumes from C to D after a 5-second pause of having no function (possibly due to OCR inaccuracies, function matching errors, or brief diversions to other windows), setting the gap parameter to 10s or more merges these intervals into a single span.
- Exclude intervals of negligible duration, such as when a function is visible for only a few seconds.
- Specify a list of functions (or other items) for focused analysis, ensuring only these specified items are included in the output.

In addition to text output, a scatter plot visualizing the timeline can be generated, as depicted in Figure 6. It can be customized as well, such as by specifying which functions to include/exclude and the time unit used. Such graphic output is particularly useful for analyzing RE activities visually. Researchers can quickly compare and contrast the strategies used by different reverse engineers with a quick look.




Figure 6: Scatter plot example from function matching data.

Session ID: 002545 **Rename:** Y
Gap to Merge: max 10 secs
Minimum Duration: 7 secs
Specify Functions: N
13:49:58 – 13:52:46 Main (2 minute(s) and 48 second(s))
13:57:39 – 13:59:40 Target (2 minute(s) and 1 second(s))
14:00:01 – 14:04:30 Target (4 minute(s) and 29 second(s))
14:04:52 – 14:08:59 Bridge (4 minute(s) and 7 second(s))
14:09:12 – 14:09:22 Main (0 minute(s) and 10 second(s))
14:09:24 – 14:14:26 Bridge (5 minute(s) and 2 second(s))
.....

Figure 7: Timeline snippet example from function matching data.

While the framework automatically generates a timeline of RE activities from image data, researchers have the opportunity to refine it further, by adding, removing, or adjusting activities based on manual analysis. For example, if the generated timeline from image data suggests that a participant spends a period of time on function A, but windows data and manual analysis indicate that the person is in fact searching for information on the internet while keeping the disassembler windows open, the researcher has the option to adjust the timeline accordingly.

After the optional manual reviews and modifications, timelines can be uploaded to the data collection framework, and become annotations stored in the underlying database. They are then displayed within the session timelines (as shown in Figure 2) and in the left corner of the screen when visualizing the session (as shown in Figure 3).

5. Evaluation of Processing Image Data

We conducted an experimental evaluation to assess the performance of the function matching and basic block matching pipelines introduced in the previous section. To evaluate these image data analysis techniques, we randomly selected screenshots collected




Figure 8: Example of image cropping for basic block matching.

by our data collection framework from three real-world RE experiments conducted over the past three years. These experiments involved a total of 64 participants with varying levels of RE experience, working on 10 different binaries using RE tools such as IDA, Binary Ninja, and Ghidra. This section focuses on evaluating our implementation using the data collected from these experiments, rather than on the outcomes of the experiments themselves, which are subjects of separate studies.

5.1. Evaluation Setup

Our pipeline uses Python 3.10.12 and Java OpenJDK 11, along with OCR tools Tesseract 5.3.4 and Abbyy 16.0. The processing tools operate on an Ubuntu 22.04.4 LTS desktop featuring an Intel Core i7-3770 CPU at 3.40GHz with 8 cores, 16 GB of RAM, and a 480 GB SSD with 47 GB available. Due to compatibility requirements, Abbyy is deployed within a VirtualBox Windows 10 VM on our desktop.

5.2. Datasets

Our evaluation used three datasets, from three separate RE experiments we conducted. The first two datasets came from student experiments, with students from a master-level software protection course we taught, as described in Section 2.2. Participation was completely voluntary and pseudonymous, but the participants received a monetary reward. The third experiment was a public challenge to which anyone was welcome to participate for a chance to win a reward. We received appropriate ethical board approvals for all of these experiments.

- Dataset A (Student experiment 2022, IDA): We created four different binaries (Part 1 and Parts 2A, 2B, and 2C) and participants were asked to complete Part 1 and

were then randomly assigned to one of the 3 binaries in Part 2. The free version of IDA Pro was the primary tool they used as they were trained to use it throughout the course. For this experiment, we embedded a license key checker within an open-source software, veriT, with the key comprising eight subkeys. The license checker incorporates real and fake checks on subkeys, designed to intermittently execute at randomly chosen program points, at which they access and update data structures that encode the global state of the license checker. This checker in essence implements a deterministic finite automaton. Real checks, if they fail, trigger data updates that correspond to state transitions. Fake checks also trigger changes to the data, but those changes do not alter the encoded state. Students were explained the general operation of the license checker, i.e., the automaton’s states and possible transitions, but not what data structures are used to store the state, and how the state is encoded in them. Their assignment was to extract the conditions that valid keys need to meet by identifying the executed checks and by separating the real ones from the fake ones, during an afternoon classroom session of approximately 3 hours. The Part 1 binary used simple integers to encode the state, and the Part 2 binaries used hashmaps. The difference between the three Part 2 binaries was whether or not the injected license checker reused hashmap APIs and/or hashmap instances already in use in the original veriT program. Our goal was to determine the effect of such code and data reuse, which was inspired by the work of Van den Broeck et al. [5], on the resilience of the license checker against reverse engineering attacks. In total, 33 students participated and they properly enabled their data collection framework during the experiment.

- Dataset B (Student experiment 2023, Ghidra): The binaries and assignments used in this experiment were similar to those in Dataset A. The difference was that the encoding function of the automaton state was somewhat simpler to make the challenge easier to solve. Moreover, in the 2023 edition of the course the students used Ghidra instead of IDA Pro. With this tool switch, the focus also switched from reverse engineering assembler control flow graphs to working with C code obtained through decompilation. Everything else remained the same, and participants were also asked to solve Part 1 and one of the three binaries in Part 2. A total of 29 students participated.
- Dataset C (Grand RE Public Challenge 2021, Binary Ninja): Unlike the other two datasets, this dataset comes from a public challenge in which the participants were unconstrained; anyone was welcome to participate, at any time (during the two months of the experiment ran) of their choice, and using any RE tool of their choice. There were ten challenges of ten binaries and participants were eligible for monetary prizes for successfully solving the challenges. To be eligible for the prizes, they were required to download and enable our data collection framework while solving the challenges. More information about the challenges and the binaries can be found online [1]. In the end, only two individuals successfully participated by solving at least one task. Of these, only one produced about 5 hours of data which we evaluated; the other successful participant used multiple devices, switched between challenges often, and had large sections of inactive data where the subject had left their device idling. Due to these factors, it was difficult for us to accurately evaluate the performance of reAnalyst on that user. Apart from the

Dataset	Used RE Tool	Participants		Screenshots	
		Total	Selected	Total	Selected
A	IDA	33	5	406682	500
B	Ghidra	29	5	321328	500
C	Binary Ninja	2	1	45460	500

Table 1: Overview of data sampling for each dataset.

Dataset	Binaries	Functions Per Binary
A	4	961/970/971/967
B	4	977/981/985/981
C	2	23/112

Table 2: Overview of challenge binaries in the datasets.

two successful participants, 24 other users⁴ installed and ran the data collection framework without successfully completing a challenge; their data was not thoroughly evaluated but in the sessions examined we observed little progress toward challenge completion to analyze.

5.2.1. Data Sampling for Function Matching Experiment

To evaluate the usability and accuracy of our techniques among diverse users and various binaries, we used a stratified random sampling approach [36]. For both of the student experiments (Datasets A and B), from pools of 33 and 29 participants, 2 individuals were randomly selected for their data related to Binary Part 1. From the remaining participants, we then randomly select 1 individual for each of the three Part 2 binaries, resulting in a total of 5 participants and 4 binaries for each dataset. For every selected participant, we randomly selected 100 screenshots, meaning 500 screenshots per dataset, to conduct the evaluation. For the Grand RE public challenge (Dataset C), we relied on the data from the sole participant who effectively used our data collection framework across 2 binaries the person solved. From this participant’s data, we randomly selected 500 screenshots. In total, this evaluation comprised 1,500 screenshots. Table 1 and Table 2 summarize data sampling methodology and binaries used. While the majority of these screenshots contain functions, some do not, which assesses our framework’s ability to discern screenshots with functions from irrelevant ones. The datasets used for this evaluation were selected only after the tuning and design of the framework were completed. Separate, non-overlapping samples were used during the tuning and design phases to ensure the independence and integrity of our evaluation.

5.2.2. Data Sampling for Basic Block Matching Experiments

To evaluate our basic block matching implementation, it is necessary to obtain a dataset of screenshots with a control flow graph view. In our experiments, all participants in Dataset A spent a significant amount of their time in graph view browsing in

⁴The data collection system recorded 24 individual data collection user sign ups besides the winners, but it is possible for some to be from the same user since we did not collect identifying information for non-winning subjects.

IDA, but we received very limited data from participants in Datasets B and C using the control flow graph view. Instead, they spent most of their time on decompiler views. We assume this is mainly because Binary Ninja and Ghidra both offer a decompiler view feature, a feature that is more attractive to reverse engineers, while the free version of IDA which participants in Dataset A were asked and trained to use does not. Therefore, we are only able to use Dataset A for this experiment. As mentioned before, the basic block matching feature’s ability to correctly match basic blocks relies on the successful identification of functions in the function matching step. Therefore, we used the same dataset of screenshots initially selected for function matching. Due to the tedious process of establishing ground truth for basic block matching, and the fact that most screenshots contain multiple basic blocks, we chose to work with a smaller dataset. We randomly selected 20 screenshots from each of the original 5 groups of 500 screenshots, totaling 100 screenshots. Screenshots with incorrect function matching results or those not displayed in IDA’s graphical view mode were excluded from this dataset and replaced with randomly selected alternatives. On average, each of the 100 selected screenshots contains 5.19 basic blocks, leading to a total of 519 basic blocks for this evaluation.

5.3. Methodology

For all selected screenshots, we compare the outputs of our function matching and basic block matching techniques as described in Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 to the ground truth results. They are established through manual inspection of each selected screenshot to identify its corresponding function, and when applicable, basic blocks. Any functions or basic blocks that are identifiable in a screenshot are included in our ground truth results. The ground truth results hence serve as the benchmark against which we assess the framework’s accuracy and effectiveness.

For generating the OCR outputs, Tesseract is used for datasets A and B and for additional OCR processing required for basic block matching. Meanwhile, Abbyy is used for dataset C. Unlike datasets A and B, dataset C was collected using lossy image compression, and our evaluation shows that the image quality was too low for Tesseract to produce acceptable results. We changed the compression scheme to lossless compression, as mentioned in Section 3.3, only after dataset C was collected, after realizing the issues with it.

After comparing the ground truth results with results generated by our function matching feature, we record the result of each comparison, as *Correct Label*, *Wrong Function* (when an incorrect function is identified), or *No Function*. A “no function” is recorded when any part of a function’s code is present in a screenshot, but the framework identifies it as a non-function screenshot, even if it appears that the reverse engineer was not actively examining the function’s code at the time. The determination is made solely on the presence of function-related code, regardless of the reverse engineer’s apparent focus. This objective approach ensures consistent and unbiased analysis. Additionally, if the screenshot does not contain a function, the outcomes are recorded as either *Correct Label* (when the framework correctly identifies it as a non-function screenshot) or *Detected Function* (when there is no function in the screenshot but the framework detects one), as demonstrated in Table 3. In the basic block matching experiments, we compare a list of expected basic blocks against actually detected basic blocks for each selected screenshot and then calculate the number of correctly and incorrectly detected basic blocks, as well as the number of undetected basic blocks.

Dataset	Screenshots have functions				Screenshots have no function			Overall Accuracy
	Total	Correct Label	Wrong Function	No Function	Total	Correct Label	Detected Function	
A	362	360	1	1	138	135	3	99.0%
B	416	405	7	4	84	82	2	97.4%
C	343	328	6	9	157	156	1	96.8%
Total	1121	1093	14	14	379	373	6	97.7%

Table 3: Results of function matching across three datasets.

Metric	Value	Percentage
Correct Label	1466	97.7%
Wrong Function	14	0.9%
No Function	6	0.4%
Detected Function (Non-function Screenshot)	14	0.9%

Table 4: Aggregate performance of function matching.

5.4. Results for Function Matching Experiments

As demonstrated in Tables 3 and 4, our function matching feature demonstrates a high level of accuracy, with an overall accuracy rate of approximately 97.7%. Table 3 details the function matching results across three distinct datasets, breaking down the outcomes into different categories, along with the total counts for screenshots that have or lack identifiable functions. Table 4 serves as a summary of these detailed results, consolidating the findings from all datasets into overall performance metrics. The overall accuracy rate is calculated as the ratio of the number of correct labels to the total number of screenshots, expressed as a percentage:

$$\text{Overall Accuracy} = \left(\frac{\text{Correct Labels}}{\text{Total Screenshots}} \right) = 97.7\%$$

5.5. Qualitative Analysis for Function Matching

The performance of our framework is fundamentally dependent on two key factors: the quantity of information within the screenshots, and the accuracy of the OCR output. When these two aspects vary, which they sometimes do given the diverse nature of screenshots from different RE tools, the effectiveness of our framework is put to the test.

Our framework demonstrated a high degree of resilience in handling a diverse range of screenshots of varying complexity. Generally, it successfully detected and matched functions, even when they were only partially visible or presented in complex layouts. For instance, Figure 9 displays a zoomed-out screenshot from our experiment dataset. In this case, the texts in its control flow graph appear much smaller which reduces clarity and leads to fewer symbols being recognized accurately by OCR.⁵ However, it also

⁵It is worth noting that a tool-specific feature, IDA’s display of the current function name below the control flow graph, is not considered for function matching in our approach, as it is not unique to a function. Indeed, function names can be shown on screen when the user is watching different functions. For example, a function name can occur in the function list on the left together with other function names, and it can occur in other function’s displayed control flow graphs, namely at its callsites. This current function name shown below the functions control flow graph hence does not compensate for the graph being zoomed out or partially obscured.




Figure 9: The screenshot is zoomed out with a complex graph layout.

presents a larger overview of the code, providing more potential symbols for function matching. Additionally, Figure 10, taken from Binary Ninja, features a dark interface and an overlaying “Define Name” pop-up window. OCR algorithms are optimized for high contrast between text and background [44], so a dark interface may affect OCR effectiveness. The pop-up window obscures part of the control flow graph, which reduces the amount of available information available for function matching. Despite these issues, our framework still correctly identified functions using the limited symbols it could extract from these images.

There are, however, some limitations. For instance, the framework may struggle to identify functions in screenshots where only a small portion of the function is visible. In Figure 11, the user has multiple windows open, revealing only a small section of an IDA function that is also zoomed in, which may not contain sufficient relevant symbols for accurate function matching. In another example shown in Figure 12, the IDA toolbar covers most of the screen, making it difficult for the framework to identify any symbol used for function matching. In both cases, the framework failed to detect any function. In addition, it is worth noting that mistakenly detecting a function when the screenshot has no function rarely occurs. One scenario, as shown in Figure 13, is that a user may open a Defined Strings window. Even though this screenshot does not contain any function, if such a window contains symbols that are also unique symbols in a function, the framework might incorrectly classify the screenshot as depicting a function. For example, printf format strings are typically unique to functions and can then only show up in one function’s control flow graph. However, a string table window will list all such strings, plus other strings, in a single window. Moreover, our framework currently does not support scenarios where more than one function appears in a single screenshot. Such scenarios are rather rare and typically occur only when the reverse engineer is scrolling or browsing through textual views on the assembly code of a program, at which times parts of consecutive functions can be displayed together, rather than when they are conducting a detailed analysis of a function’s code. We have not encountered this




Figure 10: The window obscures a portion of the screenshot and makes the interface even darker.

Group	Binary	Total Basic Blocks	Correct Identifications	Incorrect Identifications	Undetected Blocks
1	1	87	85	1	1
2	1	78	76	0	2
3	2a	179	176	1	2
4	2b	90	86	0	4
5	2c	85	80	2	3

Table 5: Breakdown of basic block matching results for each experiment group.

in any of the screenshots selected for this evaluation. Adding a feature to address this limitation would increase processing time, so we decided against it.

Importantly, occasional function matching mistakes most often have minimal effects on the analysis procedures. In some instances such as in Figure 12, the reverse engineer might not be actively examining the function’s code at the time when the screenshot was taken. As discussed in Section 5.3, for the purpose of this evaluation, we do not take these subjective observations into consideration. Additionally, as discussed in Section 4.3, when creating a timeline of RE activities, reAnalyst consolidates nearby intervals by ignoring minor gaps, including gaps that result from function matching inaccuracies. This means reAnalyst treats the time during the gap as being covered by the same function.

5.6. Results for Basic Block Matching Experiments

Table 5 provides a summary of each group of experiments, each of which contains 20 screenshots with IDA graph view browsing data, totaling 519 basic blocks. Table 6 summarizes these results, showing the overall effectiveness of the basic block matching




Figure 11: The user opened multiple window and only a small portion of the code is visible.

Metric	Value	Percentage
Correct Identifications	503	96.9%
Incorrect Identifications	4	0.7%
Undetected Blocks	12	2.3%

Table 6: Overall performance metrics for basic block matching.

process. As we have excluded any screenshots with incorrect function matches, when calculating the overall accuracy of the basic block matching feature, we multiply the ratio of the number of correct identifications by the overall accuracy of the function matching feature, which is 97.7%. The Overall Accuracy in this context is computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Overall Accuracy} &= \left(\frac{\text{Correct Identifications}}{\text{Total Basic Blocks}} \right) \times \text{Accuracy of Function Matching} \\ &= 94.7\% \end{aligned}$$

Our basic block matching feature exhibits good performance, achieving an overall accuracy rate of approximately 94.7%. This high accuracy rate signifies the framework’s effectiveness in correctly matching basic blocks within the given screenshots, when applicable.

5.7. Qualitative Analysis for Basic Block Matching Experiments

Similar to the function matching feature, basic block matching feature demonstrated solid good performance with a high accuracy rate. However, it did encounter challenges in specific cases. For instance, in Figure 14, seven basic blocks are marked with letters A-G. Basic blocks D, E, and G are typical basic blocks fully visible on the screen, and hence, are relatively easy to match. Basic blocks B and F are small, each with only one




Figure 12: The IDA toolbar covers most of the screen and only a tiny portion of the function is visible.

line, posing a challenge due to their similarity with other basic blocks in the program. Basic blocks C and A are partial blocks, with only a small portion visible on the screen. Although 4 out of the 7 basic blocks pose matching challenges, the framework correctly detected all of them except for basic block C, which has only a minimal portion visible. In such scenarios, our framework may fail to detect these partially visible basic blocks. Even when detection is successful, accurately matching them to the correct basic block may be difficult. This is because multiple basic blocks may share identical tags, complicating the matching process.

6. Non-image Data Analysis

Besides analyzing image data, we also use annotations generated from non-image data when analyzing RE activities. Processing non-image data collected by our data collection framework is simple and straightforward. Such data are collected with the OSHI library [35] and are already stored in a structured format in the database. Researchers can simply specify the type of data (keystrokes, processes, mouse clicks, or window interactions), select specific experiment sessions, and define the time range. Our framework then queries the database and generates a JSON file containing the timestamped data, functioning as a web API.

To facilitate further analysis, reAnalyst processes the raw data as it was stored in the database into higher-level, human-understandable streams. These streams then can be




Figure 13: When Ghidra’s Defined Strings window contains symbol names that also exist as unique symbols in functions.

added as annotations. To accomplish this, we introduce several simple text processing techniques, though we leave for future work adding more sophisticated techniques for this data and in depth evaluation of the results.

For keystroke input, reAnalyst attempts to combine consecutive keystrokes that are likely part of the same input and removes redundant inputs that are likely not meaningful such as pressing the Windows key or deleted characters. We then use temporal bucketing — where all characters detected close enough to each other timewise are combined into a single string — to unitize based on timestamp. The result is a list of time-stamped inputs as shown in Figure 15). For windows data, reAnalyst generates a list of the titles of the windows that the user has opened, as shown in Figure 16, offering insight into the applications and tools used during the session. Future work may introduce more sophisticated language processing techniques (such as those discussed by Plank [38]) to tokenize and annotate keystroke data, particularly in combination with window data where general user activity may be loosely known.

Regardless, with even these initially implemented current processing techniques, users of reAnalyst can then easily determine many RE activities executed by the participants. This includes which tools and tool functionality are being used at which point in time. For example, from K6 in Figure 15 and W3 in Figure 16, researchers can infer that the participant was attempting to locate the code fragment that prints the “Congratulations” message, as this string is associated with the success message in the challenge data. From W4 in Figure 16, researchers can infer that the reverse engineer needed to look up some information online.

For process and thread data, aside from producing a list of interesting processes that have been activated and terminated along with their timestamps, reAnalyst identifies




Figure 14: The framework identified all but basic block C correctly.

- K1: 08:01:28 AM, Word: controlled
- K2: 08:02:23 AM, Word: ghidra
- K3: 08:03:54 AM, Word: ./task1
- K4: 08:07:39 AM, Word: Contr
- K5: 08:07:43 AM, Word: success
- K6: 08:10:16 AM, Word: Congratulations

Figure 15: Sample keystroke data snippet, in which individual keystrokes have been combined into keyboard inputs

when the reverse engineer has activated a debugger to perform dynamic analysis. The process to do this involves identifying a list of relevant known process names (such as IDA, Ghidra, GDB, or Binary Ninja) and simply looking up processes by those names. Figure 17 shows a resulting list of dynamic analysis activities, namely debugging with GDB and IDA, for a student participant who, while still learning to properly use these tools, was apparently switching between the two debuggers.

All of these features can be flexibly configured and adjusted if necessary. For instance, researchers can choose to include all types of keystroke data, including pressing a single key or deleting texts that are by default excluded by reAnalyst, tailoring the data analysis to their specific requirements.

Several components of this part of the data processing pipeline, such as windows name matching, are straightforward enough that they require little to no evaluation. However, components like keystroke analysis, where the data may be less precise, might benefit from technical evaluation and refinement in future work, although we currently focus on components that would most significantly impact the research outcomes. In the exper-

```
W1: 8:02:25 AM, User: kali, Window Name: Data Collection
W2: 8:02:25 AM, User: kali, Window Name: xfce4-notifyd
W3: 8:10:23 AM, User: kali, Window Name: Search [ Search Text -
"Congratulations" [Listing Display Match
W4: 8:20:36 AM, User: kali, Window Name: what is an option character in
command line - Google Search Mozilla Firefox
```

Figure 16: Sample windows data snippet.

```
D1: 07:47:15 AM - 07:51:12 AM (237 secs, GDB)
D2: 07:53:12 AM - 07:57:24 AM (252 secs, IDA)
D3: 08:14:15 AM - 08:14:18 AM (3 secs, GDB)
D4: 08:14:42 AM - 08:16:35 AM (113 secs, GDB)
D5: 08:15:36 AM - 08:18:34 AM (178 secs, IDA)
D6: 08:48:15 AM - 08:50:13 AM (118 secs, IDA)
D7: 08:53:25 AM - 08:55:26 AM (121 secs, IDA)
```

Figure 17: Sample process data snippet, with dynamic analysis information.

imental data discussed herein, the image processing capabilities of reAnalyst provided more substantial information to researchers compared to the non-image data sources. Consequently, we have concentrated on evaluating the image processing component.

7. Future Work

As discussed in Sections 5.5 and 5.7, our framework still has many limitations that can be improved further to avoid incorrect results. As most of these errors involve complicated images, addressing these issues might require much more advanced OCR and text processing techniques in function and basic block matching processes. In the next phase of our research, we plan to refine our OCR-driven framework for better accuracy, especially in processing screenshots of low-quality or complex layouts. We will also consider combining information from multiple, consecutive screenshots to improve accuracy and obtain more information. For example, we may be able to detect patterns of actions that cannot easily be determined by analyzing screenshots in isolation and to detect that a function is still being shown but zoomed out compared to the previous screenshot.

Fusing multiple data sources — combining OCR with keystrokes, mouse clicks, window data, and process data, as suggested in 6 — presents technical challenges but may improve overall results as well. For instance, using image processing and mouse clicks combined with keystrokes could yield a better understanding of what subjects are doing with user interfaces. In some cases, fusing background processes with other data sources could perhaps indicate the context of automated workflows a subject is conducting. Thus, additional processing of non-image data and, in particular, data fusion is an area for additional research.

Integrating machine learning with all of this could also provide deeper insights, not just for improving accuracy but also for developing predictive models. These models could revolutionize our understanding of RE by forecasting the likely next steps of engineers based on their ongoing actions.

We also aim to develop a comprehensive guideline for efficiently organizing and conducting RE experiments, collecting data with our data collection framework, and analyzing collected data with reAnalyst. Our focus will be on streamlining the data collection and analysis process, ensuring that it is as time-efficient and accurate as possible. By doing so, we hope to make the process more accessible and practical for researchers, enhancing their ability to analyze RE activities in depth and with effective and ethical practices and greater precision. This guideline will serve as a valuable resource for those utilizing our framework in various RE contexts.

8. Availability

Our contributions are open source and available in GitHub repositories. The reAnalyst framework is available at <https://github.com/zhan4839/reAnalyst>. We encourage researchers to contribute to its enhancement. Additionally, the adapted version of the data collection framework can be accessed at <https://github.com/taylor239/UserMonitorServer>. We invite the community to explore, utilize, and improve these resources.

9. Conclusions

Our research introduces a scalable OCR-driven analysis framework that enhances the process of data collection and analysis of RE activities. By allowing reverse engineers to use their preferred RE tools, our framework, reAnalyst, gathers authentic and comprehensive data, overcoming the limitations of previous methods that relied heavily on interviews or restricted platforms. Our semi-automated annotation process, combining OCR technology with manual insights, aims to facilitate more efficient data analysis, thereby enabling researchers to gain a deeper understanding of reverse engineers' strategies and thought processes more efficiently.

The experiments conducted demonstrate the reliability and efficiency of our techniques, marking a significant step forward in evaluating software protection techniques. This work lays the foundation for more detailed and accurate assessments of existing software protection techniques which ultimately contribute to the development of more secure software systems. As we continue improving our framework, we aim to keep pace with the evolving challenges in software security and provide valuable insights and tools for researchers and developers in the field.

10. Funding

This research was funded in part by The Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO) [Project nr.: 3G0E2318], and by the Cybersecurity Research Program Flanders. We also acknowledge support from the NSF under grants SATC/EDU-2029632 and SATC/TTP-1525820.

References

- [1] Grand reverse engineering challenge. <https://grand-re-challenge.org>. Accessed: 2024-04-10
- [2] Bin Shamlan, M.H., Alaidaroos, A.S., Bin Merdhah, M.H., Bamatraf, M.A., Zain, A.A.: Experimental evaluation of the obfuscation techniques against reverse engineering. In: F. Saeed, T. Al-Hadhrami, F. Mohammed, E. Mohammed (eds.) *Advances on Smart and Soft Computing*, pp. 383–390. Springer Singapore, Singapore (2021). DOI 10.1007/978-981-15-6048-4_33
- [3] BinShamlan, M.H., Bamatraf, M.A., Zain, A.A.: The impact of control flow obfuscation technique on software protection against human attacks. In: *2019 First International Conference of Intelligent Computing and Engineering (ICOICE)*, pp. 1–5 (2019). DOI 10.1109/ICOICE48418.2019.9035187
- [4] Bradski, G.: The opencv library. *Dr. Dobb’s Journal: Software Tools for the Professional Programmer* **25**(11), 120–123 (2000)
- [5] Van den Broeck, J., Coppens, B., De Sutter, B.: Flexible software protection. *Computers & Security* **116**, 102,636 (2022)
- [6] Bryant, A.R.: Understanding how reverse engineers make sense of programs from assembly language representations. Air Force Institute of Technology (2012)
- [7] Ceccato, M.: On the need for more human studies to assess software protection. In: *Workshop on Continuously Upgradeable Software Security and Protection*, pp. 55–56 (2014)
- [8] Ceccato, M., Di Penta, M., Falcarin, P., Ricca, F., Torchiano, M., Tonella, P.: A family of experiments to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of source code obfuscation techniques. *Empirical Software Engineering* **19**(4), 1040–1074 (2014)
- [9] Ceccato, M., Di Penta, M., Nagra, J., Falcarin, P., Ricca, F., Torchiano, M., Tonella, P.: Towards experimental evaluation of code obfuscation techniques. In: *Proceedings of the 4th ACM Workshop on Quality of Protection, QoP ’08*, pp. 39–46. Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), New York, NY, USA (2008). DOI 10.1145/1456362.1456371
- [10] Ceccato, M., Penta, M.D., Nagra, J., Falcarin, P., Ricca, F., Torchiano, M., Tonella, P.: The effectiveness of source code obfuscation: An experimental assessment. In: *2009 IEEE 17th International Conference on Program Comprehension*, pp. 178–187 (2009). DOI 10.1109/ICPC.2009.5090041
- [11] Ceccato, M., et al.: How professional hackers understand protected code while performing attack tasks. In: *2017 IEEE/ACM 25th International Conference on Program Comprehension (ICPC) (2017)*. DOI 10.1109/icpc.2017.2
- [12] Ceccato, M., et al.: Understanding the behaviour of hackers while performing attack tasks in a professional setting and in a public challenge. *Empirical Software Engineering* **24**(1), 240–286 (2018). DOI 10.1007/s10664-018-9625-6
- [13] Clausing, J.: A few ghidra tips for ida users, part 4 - function call graphs. <https://isc.sans.edu/diary/A+few+Ghidra+tips+for+IDA+users+part+4+function+call+graphs/25032> (2019). Last Updated: 2019-06-14 20:17:47 UTC
- [14] De Sutter, B., Collberg, C., Preda, M.D., Wyseur, B.: Software Protection Decision Support and Evaluation Methodologies (Dagstuhl Seminar 19331). *Dagstuhl Reports* **9**(8), 1–25 (2019). DOI 10.4230/DagRep.9.8.1. URL <https://drops.dagstuhl.de/opus/volltexte/2019/11682>
- [15] Flick, U.: *An Introduction to Qualitative Research* (4th edition). Sage, London (2009)
- [16] Geisser, S., Johnson, W.O.: *Modes of parametric statistical inference*. John Wiley & Sons (2006)
- [17] Guillot, Y., Gazet, A.: Semi-automatic binary protection tampering. *Journal in Computer Virology* **5**(2), 119–149 (2009). DOI 10.1007/s11416-009-0118-4
- [18] Guillot, Y., Gazet, A.: Automatic binary deobfuscation. *Journal in computer virology* **6**(3), 261–276 (2010)
- [19] Hall, P.A., Dowling, G.R.: Approximate string matching. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* **12**(4), 381–402 (1980)
- [20] Hänsch, N., Schankin, A., Protsenko, M., Freiling, F., Benenson, Z.: Programming experience might not help in comprehending obfuscated source code efficiently. In: *Fourteenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS 2018)*, pp. 341–356 (2018)
- [21] Hex-Rays: Ida help: Graph view. <https://hex-rays.com/products/ida/support/idadoc/42.shtml> (2023). Accessed: 2024-03-05
- [22] Hollander, M., Wolfe, D.A., Chicken, E.: *Nonparametric statistical methods*. John Wiley & Sons (2013)
- [23] Kuang, K., Tang, Z., Gong, X., Fang, D., Chen, X., Wang, Z.: Enhance virtual-machine-based code obfuscation security through dynamic bytecode scheduling. *Computers & Security* **74**, 202–220 (2018)

- [24] Levenshtein, V.: Binary codes capable of correcting deletions, insertions, and reversals. *Soviet Physics Doklady* **10**(8), 707–710 (1966)
- [25] Levine, J.: *Linkers & Loaders*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers (2000)
- [26] Liu, H.: Towards better program obfuscation: Optimization via language models. In: *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Software Engineering Companion, ICSE'16*, pp. 680–682. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2016). DOI 10.1145/2889160.2891040. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2889160.2891040>
- [27] Liu, H., Sun, C., Su, Z., Jiang, Y., Gu, M., Sun, J.: Stochastic optimization of program obfuscation. In: *2017 IEEE/ACM 39th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pp. 221–231 (2017). DOI 10.1109/ICSE.2017.28
- [28] Lundh, F., Clark, J.A., contributors: *Pillow (PIL Fork) Documentation*. <https://pillow.readthedocs.io/en/stable/> (2024). Version 10.2.0
- [29] Malkadi, A., Alahmadi, M., Haiduc, S.: A study on the accuracy of ocr engines for source code transcription from programming screencasts. In: *Proc. 17th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories* (2020)
- [30] Manikyam, R., McDonald, J.T., Mahoney, W.R., Andel, T.R., Russ, S.H.: Comparing the effectiveness of commercial obfuscators against mate attacks. In: *Proceedings of the 6th Workshop on Software Security, Protection, and Reverse Engineering, SSPREW '16*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2016). DOI 10.1145/3015135.3015143. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3015135.3015143>
- [31] Mantovani, A., Aonzo, S., Fratantonio, Y., Balzarotti, D.: RE-Mind: a first look inside the mind of a reverse engineer. In: *Proc. 31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, pp. 2727–2745 (2022)
- [32] Miano, J.: *Compressed Image File Formats: JPEG, PNG, GIF, XBM, BMP*. Addison-Wesley Professional (1999)
- [33] Nagra, J., Collberg, C.: *Surreptitious Software: Obfuscation, Watermarking, and Tamperproofing for Software Protection: Obfuscation, Watermarking, and Tamperproofing for Software Protection*. Pearson Education (2009)
- [34] Nunukoosing, K.: The problems with interviews. *Qualitative Health Research* **15**(5), 698–706 (2005)
- [35] *Operating System and Hardware Information: Operating system and hardware information documentation*. <https://www.oshi.ooo/> (2024). Last Published: 2024-03-10
- [36] Parsons, V.L.: Stratified sampling. In: N. Balakrishnan, T. Colton, B. Everitt, W. Piegorsch, F. Ruggeri, J. Teugels (eds.) *Wiley StatsRef: Statistics Reference Online*. Wiley (2017). DOI 10.1002/9781118445112.stat05999.pub2. URL <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118445112.stat05999.pub2>
- [37] Piazzalunga, U., Salvaneschi, P., Balducci, F., Jacomuzzi, P., Moroncelli, C.: Security strength measurement for dongle-protected software. *IEEE Security & Privacy* **5**(6), 32–40 (2007). DOI 10.1109/MSP.2007.176
- [38] Plank, B.: Keystroke dynamics as signal for shallow syntactic parsing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.03321* (2016)
- [39] Quist, D.A., Liebrock, L.M.: Visualizing compiled executables for malware analysis. In: *2009 6th International Workshop on Visualization for Cyber Security*, pp. 27–32 (2009). DOI 10.1109/VIZSEC.2009.5375539
- [40] Rolles, R.: Unpacking virtualization obfuscators. In: *Proceedings of the 3rd USENIX Conference on Offensive Technologies, WOOT'09*, pp. 1–7. USENIX Association (2009). URL https://www.usenix.org/legacy/events/woot09/tech/full_papers/rolles.pdf
- [41] Savin, G.M., et al.: Battle ground: Data collection and labeling of ctf games to understand human cyber operators. In: *Proc. 16th Cyber Security Experimentation and Test Workshop* (2023)
- [42] Sayood, K.: *Introduction to Data Compression*, chap. 1.1.1. Morgan Kaufmann (2017)
- [43] Smith, R.: An overview of the tesseract ocr engine. In: *Ninth International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition (ICDAR 2007)*, vol. 2. IEEE (2007)
- [44] Sporic, D., Cuşnir, E., Boiangiu, C.A.: Improving the accuracy of tesseract 4.0 ocr engine using convolution-based preprocessing. *Symmetry* **12**(5), 715 (2020)
- [45] Strom, B.E., Applebaum, A., Miller, D.P., Nickels, K.C., Pennington, A.G., Thomas, C.B.: *Mitre att&ck: Design and philosophy*. In: *Technical report*. The MITRE Corporation (2018)
- [46] Sutherland, I., et al.: An empirical examination of the reverse engineering process for binary files. *Computers & Security* **25**(3), 221–228 (2006)
- [47] Tang, Z., Li, M., Ye, G., Cao, S., Chen, M., Gong, X., Fang, D., Wang, Z.: *Vmguards: A novel virtual machine based code protection system with vm security as the first class design concern*.

- Applied Sciences **8**(5), 771 (2018)
- [48] Taylor, C.: Remotely observing reverse engineers to evaluate software protection. Ph.D. thesis, The University of Arizona (2022)
 - [49] Taylor, C., Colberg, C.: A tool for teaching reverse engineering. In: 2016 USENIX Workshop on Advances in Security Education (ASE 16) (2016)
 - [50] Taylor, C., Collberg, C.: Getting revenge: A system for analyzing reverse engineering behavior. In: Proc. Malware Conference (2019)
 - [51] Tesseract OCR Team: Tesseract User Manual (2023). URL <https://tesseract-ocr.github.io/tessdoc/>. Accessed: 2024-03-05
 - [52] Vector 35 LLC: Binary ninja user documentation: User guide. <https://docs.binary.ninja/guide/index.html> (2023). Accessed: 2024-03-05
 - [53] Viticchié, A., Regano, L., Basile, C., Torchiano, M., Ceccato, M., Tonella, P.: Empirical assessment of the effort needed to attack programs protected with client/server code splitting. *Empirical Software Engineering* **25**(1), 1–48 (2020)
 - [54] Viticchié, A., Regano, L., Torchiano, M., Basile, C., Ceccato, M., Tonella, P., Tiella, R.: Assessment of source code obfuscation techniques. In: 2016 IEEE 16th international working conference on source code analysis and manipulation (SCAM), pp. 11–20. IEEE (2016)
 - [55] Votipka, D., Rabin, S., Micinski, K., Foster, J.S., Mazurek, M.L.: An observational investigation of reverse engineers’ process and mental models. In: Extended Abstracts of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (2019). DOI 10.1145/3290607.3313040
 - [56] Wermke, D., Huaman, N., Acar, Y., Reaves, B., Traynor, P., Fahl, S.: A large scale investigation of obfuscation use in google play. In: Proceedings of the 34th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference, ACSAC ’18, pp. 222–235. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2018). DOI 10.1145/3274694.3274726. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3274694.3274726>
 - [57] Wohlin, C., Runeson, P., Höst, M., Ohlsson, M., Regnell, B., Wesslén, A.: *Experimentation in Software Engineering - An Introduction*. Kluwer Academic Publishers (2000)
 - [58] Wong, Y.M., Landen, M., Antonakakis, M., Blough, D.M., Redmiles, E.M., Ahamad, M.: An inside look into the practice of malware analysis. In: Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, pp. 3053–3069 (2021)
 - [59] Zeng, Q., Luo, L., Qian, Z., Du, X., Li, Z., Huang, C.T., Farkas, C.: Resilient user-side android application repackaging and tampering detection using cryptographically obfuscated logic bombs. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* pp. 1–1 (2019). DOI 10.1109/TDSC.2019.2957787
 - [60] Zhao, Y., Tang, Z., Ye, G., Gong, X., Fang, D., Tan, Z.: Input-output example-guided data deobfuscation on binary. *Security and Communication Networks* **2021** (2021). DOI 10.1155/2021/4646048
 - [61] Zhuang, Y., Protsenko, M., Muller, T., Freiling, F.C.: An(other) exercise in measuring the strength of source code obfuscation. In: 2014 25th International Workshop on Database and Expert Systems Applications, pp. 313–317 (2014). DOI 10.1109/DEXA.2014.69