

Interval Analysis in Industrial-Scale BMC Software Verifiers: A Case Study

Rafael Sá Menezes^{1,3}[0000-0002-6102-4343], Edoardo Manino¹[0000-0003-0028-5440],
Fedor Shmarov²[0000-0002-3848-451X], Mohannad
Aldughaim^{1,4}[0000-0003-1708-1399], Rosiane de Freitas³[0000-0002-7608-2052], and
Lucas C. Cordeiro^{1,3}[0000-0002-6235-4272]

¹ University of Manchester, UK

² Newcastle University, UK

³ Universidade Federal do Amazonas, Brazil

⁴ King Saud University, Saudi Arabia

Abstract. Bounded Model Checking (BMC) is a widely used software verification technique. Despite its successes, the technique has several limiting factors, from state-space explosion to lack of completeness. Over the years, interval analysis has repeatedly been proposed as a partial solution to these limitations. In this work, we evaluate whether the computational cost of interval analysis yields significant enough improvements in BMC’s performance to justify its use. In more detail, we quantify the benefits of interval analysis on two benchmarks: the Intel Core Power Management firmware and 9537 programs in the ReachSafety category of the International Competition on Software Verification. Our results show that interval analysis is essential in solving 203 unique benchmarks.

Keywords: Interval Analysis · Bounded Model Checking · Software Verification.

1 Introduction

Software bugs can cause issues ranging from small nuisances to software exploits [1]. For safety-critical systems, these bugs can cause high-cost damages. As an example, Southwest Airlines had a cost of over one billion dollars due to a cascade of bugs [24]. In a security report, the White House advocated for using formal methods to ensure software quality, emphasizing that testing is not enough [2].

Model checking [9] is a formal methods technique that systematically explores a model against a safety property, ensuring the system’s safety. In software analysis, bounded model checking (BMC) [8] has been popularized in the industry by companies such as Amazon Web Services [11] and ARM [34]. The use of BMC has aided developers in finding bugs in their software. For instance, ESBMC found a bug in the Ethereum spec⁵. Additionally, BMC tools can produce safety

⁵ <https://github.com/ethereum/consensus-specs/pull/3600>

proofs, i.e., giving further evidence that software can not fail the requirements for any input [2].

However, BMC has two major limitations: state-space explosion and lack of completeness [8]. On the one hand, although BMC explores bounded traces, its memory complexity is still exponential in the length of the trace. On the other hand, proving program safety may require exploring an infinite number of traces. Modern BMC tools address these limitations using state-of-the-art SAT/SMT solvers and advanced proof strategies such as k -induction [30]. At the same time, these solutions fall short on many real-world applications.

Interval analysis is a widely used technique in software verification to prove the *absence* of vulnerabilities [13]. In this respect, it can further mitigate the limitations of BMC by removing unreachable program paths and showing that some assertions always hold. Furthermore, interval analysis can produce stronger program invariants, enabling most proof strategies to reach a verdict [30]. Unfortunately, computing precise intervals requires additional computational resources, which may nullify their advantages.

In this light, the problem of efficiently applying interval analysis to state-of-the-art BMC tools is still open. In this paper, we explore the inherent trade-off between these two techniques from three perspectives:

- *Application*. We determine the BMC stage (i.e., proof strategy, decision procedure) at which interval analysis introduces the best improvement.
- *Precision*. We quantify the impact of computing tighter intervals on the overall verification results.
- *Representation*. We compare two interval representations of machine integers: *wrapped intervals* and *integer lattices*.

In more detail, we make the following contributions. First, we implement interval analysis inside ESBMC [25], a state-of-the-art software model checker. Second, we measure the impact of different interval analysis techniques on BMC software verification. Third, we quantify the benefits of instrumenting the program with interval invariants and their effect on SMT-solving time and memory. Fourth, we evaluate the combination of interval analysis and BMC over a set of 9537 C programs from the SV-COMP’23 *ReachSafety* category. Finally, we demonstrate the improvements interval analysis brings when verifying the Intel Core Power Management firmware.

The remainder of this work is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the required background; Section 3 presents how to compute intervals through abstract interpretation; Section 4 describes how to apply the intervals inside a BMC framework; Section 5 compares the experimental results of different interval approaches; Section 6 concludes and sketches a plan for future work.

2 Background

2.1 Bounded Model Checking (BMC)

BMC [6] is a verification technique that symbolically explores a system against an LTL property [15] producing satisfiability formulas. Although applications of

this technique have initially focused on *hardware* [10], it has found success in the *software* domain [23,12]. The advantage of BMC is the limiting factor (i.e., bound) that helps with the state-explosion problem [6]. The downside of BMC is that it is incomplete, as it cannot build a proof over an unbounded trace.

Briefly, BMC can be described as follows: Let \mathcal{P} be a program under verification, defined as a finite state transition system $\mathcal{ST} = (S, R, I, T)$, where S represents the set of states, $R \subseteq S \times S$ is the set of transitions between the states, $I(s_i)$ defines a set of initial states $s_i \in S$, and $T(s_i, s_{i+1})$ defines a set of pre-conditions (i.e., logical formulas) for reaching s_{i+1} from s_i . In this context, a state $s \in S$ consists of the program counter (*pc*) and variable values. Given a safety property ϕ , the BMC problem, $B_\phi(k)$, determines whether there is a counterexample (i.e., a valid sequence of states $\langle s_1, \dots, s_k \rangle$) up to length k that violates ϕ , i.e.:

$$B_\phi(k) = I(s_1) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k-1} T(s_i, s_{i+1}) \wedge \bigvee_{i=1}^k \neg\phi(s_i),$$

where the formula $I(s_1) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k-1} T(s_i, s_{i+1})$ describes the execution of \mathcal{ST} up to k steps, while $\bigvee_{i=1}^k \neg\phi(s_i)$ checks whether the safety property ϕ is violated in one of the reachable states s_i .

When proving software safety for any k , BMC can still be applied by using unwinding assertions [12] or a k -induction transformation [17]:

- *Unwinding assertions.* This property checks whether k is large enough to fully explore all program loops. That is, the negation of the loop conditions becomes assertions after the loop. If there is no counterexample, then all loops are fully explored (and the program is safe).
- *k -induction.* All loop variables are *havocked* (i.e., they are assigned new symbolic values), and then the property is checked against these unrestricted values. If there is no counterexample for the formula, then the property holds for any k . The k -induction main limitation is that the havoc procedure yields very weak invariants.

2.2 Interval Analysis

Interval analysis consists of computing the minimal and maximal values for all variables in a program [13] such that $\forall x \in V. x \in [\underline{x}, \bar{x}]$, where V is the set of all program variables. The technique was introduced for scientific computing by Ramon E. Moore [26,27] to ensure bounds for rounding errors when computing floating-point values [21].

Figure 1 shows an example of an annotated program with intervals for all its statements. The program contains an assertion that $x > 50$. Looking at the intervals of the program, we can see that $x \in [100, 100]$. Therefore, we can guarantee that the assertion always holds. If, for a statement, the computed interval is empty, then we can assume that this statement is unreachable [13].




Fig. 1: Interval analysis of a program. On the left: a program with operations over the variable x , and on the right: the computed intervals.

We can compute intervals in different ways: statically [13], dynamically [13] and symbolically [31]. In this work, we focus on computing intervals statically through abstract interpretation.

2.3 Computing Intervals through Abstract Interpretation

Abstract Interpretation is a static analysis framework to compute fixed-point lattices over systems. Proposed first by Cousot in (1977) [14], it can be applied to interval analysis by using specialized abstract domains [14]. Within the same domain, different levels of precision can be applied to speed-up the procedure. For example, interval arithmetics [27] and modular arithmetic for bit-vector semantics [28] may increase precision, while widening and other domain-specific techniques can accelerate the computation of fixed-point [7,32,20,28].

Integer Domain (\mathbb{I}) This is the classic domain over the Integers set [13]. Variables are assumed to range from $-\infty$ up to $+\infty$. This has the advantage of being straightforward when using arithmetic interval operators. However, it is not trivial to do bit-precise machine operations, e.g., sign typecasts and bitwise operations. An interval for a variable x is represented as $x \in [l, u]$ where $l \leq x \leq u$. Figure 2a shows the complete lattice of this domain.

Wrapped Domain (\mathbb{W}) In this domain, first introduced in [18], variables are restricted to a finite range, from the minimum representative for the type to its maximum. Wrapped interval sets are structured as a ring (see Figure 2b). An interval for a variable x is represented as $x \in \langle l, u \rangle$ where $l \leq x \leq u$ iff $l \leq u$, else $x \geq l \vee x \leq u$. Figure 2b contains an example of this domain for a 4-bit signed integer, the interval segment $\langle -4, -8 \rangle$ ranges from -4 up to all positive numbers and back to the negative values.




Fig. 2: Abstract Domains.

Boolean Domain We adopt the C language convention, where boolean values are represented as 0 for *false* and 1 for *true*.⁶ We use the same convention for boolean intervals, which yields the following three-valued logic: $[0, 0]$ is *false*, $[1, 1]$ is *true*, and $[0, 1]$ is *maybe*.

3 Computing Intervals

This section describes how to compute intervals formally. We first introduce the GOTO program language and then define an abstract interpreter for it.

3.1 GOTO language

We chose to base our work on a subset of the GOTO Language, which is an intermediate language used by the CBMC [23] and ESBMC [25] verifiers. The GOTO language has the following statements (see Appendix A for the full grammar):

<code>statements</code>	$\in \mathcal{S}$: <i>Program Statements</i>
<code>statements ::= statements; statements</code>	<i>composition</i>
<code>Assignment v expr</code>	<i>assign v to the result of expr</i>
<code>Assumption bool-expr</code>	<i>assumes that bool-expr is true</i>
<code>Assert bool-expr</code>	<i>asserts that bool-expr is true</i>
<code>IfThenGoto bool-expr l</code>	<i>If bool-expr is true then goto l</i>
<code>Label l</code>	<i>Sets jump location l</i>
<code>Skip</code>	<i>Do nothing</i>

Additionally, for simplicity in the explanations, we will assume that all variables are 32-bit signed integers (unsigned and other sizes are also supported).

Program safety The result of any program execution is a truth value that represents whether any assertion in the program has failed. The procedure `eval` (see Algorithm 1) contains an implementation⁷ to check the evaluation of a pro-

⁶ Note that in C, non-zero values are cast to *true*, which has a numerical value of 1.

⁷ The procedure is not specific to any verification technique. It is described for exemplification purposes.

gram execution where we assume that the *eval-expr* procedure computes the values of expressions and the *eval-state* procedure updates the environment (see Appendix A for a definition of such semantics). Environments $\mathbb{E}_v : \text{Var} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ are maps that define values for all program variables for a given interpretation. For a program to be considered safe, the analyzer needs to prove that for the given program $s \in \mathbb{S}$, $\nexists \rho \in \mathbb{E}_v. \neg \text{eval}(\rho, s)$. In other words, an environment (interpretation) does not exist, leading to an assertion failure.

Algorithm 1 Program evaluation

```

1: procedure EVAL( $\rho \in \mathbb{E}_v, s \in \mathbb{S}$ )
2:   stmts  $\leftarrow$  to-list(s) ▷ Sequentialize all statements in a list
3:   labels  $\leftarrow$  label-indexes(s) ▷ Generate a map for labels to stmts index
4:   pc  $\leftarrow$  1 ▷ Initialise Program Counter
5:   while pc  $\leq$  length(stmts) do
6:     s  $\leftarrow$  stmts[s] ▷ Get statement
7:     if IsAssume(s)  $\wedge$  eval-expr( $\neg s.expr, \rho$ ) then return true
8:     if IsAssert(s)  $\wedge$  eval-expr( $\neg s.expr, \rho$ ) then return false
9:      $\rho \leftarrow$  eval-state(S,  $\rho$ ) ▷ Update environment
10:    pc  $\leftarrow$  pc + 1 ▷ Increment program counter
11:    if IsIfThenGoto(s)  $\wedge$  eval-expr(s.cond,  $\rho$ ) then
12:      pc  $\leftarrow$  labels[s.label]
   return true ▷ Program finishes without any assertion fails

```

3.2 Abstract Domains for GOTO

Now that we have a well-defined syntax and semantics for the GOTO language, we can adapt the classic abstract interpretation framework (see Section 2.3) to it. This requires defining an abstract interpreter for the GOTO language. For this work, we require an abstract domain α that supports the following operations:

- $Init_\alpha()$. Initialize an interval for a state.
- $Transform_\alpha(old, instruction)$. Change the current interval after interpreting the instruction.
- $Join_\alpha(old, new)$. Merge the changes from previous intervals.
- $Widening_\alpha(old, new)$. Widen the intervals based on the previous state.

In the remainder of this section, we will describe how these operations are defined for the Integer (\mathbb{I}) and Wrapped (\mathbb{W}) interval domains.

Initializing the Domain ($Init_\alpha$) When initializing an interval, we assume that the variable can take any representable value, i.e., the *supremum* of the lattice. The supremum is unique for the \mathbb{I} domain, as all variables are initialized as $(-\infty, +\infty)$. However, the \mathbb{W} domain is not a lattice; therefore, we pick an arbitrary interval containing all possible representable values $\langle 0, -1 \rangle$.

Transforming the Domain (Transform $_{\alpha}$) Program instructions can manipulate the domain variables with *operations* (e.g. $x = y + 1$) or with *restrictions* (e.g., **if** $x < 10$ **goto** 3). Considering an abstract domain α , we map variables into intervals by using the notion of abstract environments ($\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{V}_{\alpha}} : \text{Var} \rightarrow \alpha$). A program instruction can then update (*transform*) this abstract environment.

Operations are evaluations of program expressions, including arithmetic, bitwise, and casting (signed and unsigned). The interpretation of an expression $e \in \mathbb{E}$ over an abstract environment $\rho_{\alpha} \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{V}_{\alpha}}$ is defined as $\mathcal{E}_{\alpha}[[e]]\rho_{\alpha}$. The \mathbb{W} domain defines precise semantics for how these operations work, assuming that *overflows* have modulo semantics. In contrast, the \mathbb{I} domain defines arithmetic operations only.⁸ In practice, we may forfeit the precise semantics of these operations (i.e., using the **Init** $_{\alpha}$ function) to trade off precision for quicker computation (more on this in the next section).

Restrictions are conditions that are required to be met by the target instruction (such as the aforementioned **if** instruction destination). The result of a restriction is a sound approximation of the values that meet the condition. The restriction function over an abstract environment can be defined as $f_{\alpha} : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{V}_{\alpha}} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{V}_{\alpha}}$. This restriction can be implemented through the use of *contractors* [3,25] (for \mathbb{I} domain) or by relying on the meet operator \sqcap (or \leq) to restrict the intervals (e.g. $x \leq 10 \rightarrow [x_l, x_u] \sqcap [-\infty, 10]$), as both \mathbb{I} and \mathbb{W} contains a definition for it.

Finally, we can define how an instruction alters the abstract state through the \mathcal{S}_{α} operator. Let $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha}[[S]]\rho_{\alpha}$ be the interpretation of a statement $S \in \mathbb{S}$ within an abstract environment $\rho_{\alpha} \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{V}_{\alpha}}$, defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}[[s_1; s_2]]\rho_{\alpha} &\triangleq \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}[[s_2]](\mathcal{S}_{\alpha}[[s_1]]\rho_{\alpha}) \\ \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}[[\text{Assignment } v \ e]]\rho_{\alpha} &\triangleq \forall x \in \mathbb{V}. x = v \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_{\alpha}[[e]]\rho_{\alpha} \wedge x \neq v \rightarrow \rho_{\alpha}(x) \\ \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}[[\text{Assume } e]]\rho_{\alpha} &\triangleq f_{\alpha}(e, \rho_{\alpha}) \\ \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}[[\text{Assert } e]]\rho_{\alpha} &\triangleq f_{\alpha}(e, \rho_{\alpha}) \\ \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}[[s \in \mathbb{S}]]\rho_{\alpha} &\triangleq \rho_{\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

Joining Intervals (Join $_{\alpha}$) After transforming an interval, we require a function to merge intervals from different program paths. Before defining the join operation, we need to define the ordering operator represented as $i_p \sqsubseteq i_n$, which is true *iff* i_p is at a higher level than i_n in the domain lattice. Intuitively, the ordering operator represents whether interval i_p is a sound abstraction of interval i_n . The join operation over two intervals i_0 and i_1 consists of computing an interval $i_j = i_0 \sqcup i_1$ such that $i_j \sqsubseteq i_0 \wedge i_j \sqsubseteq i_1$. Both \mathbb{I} and \mathbb{W} contain descriptions for such operators.

⁸ Details of our implementation of integer interval arithmetics with bitwise operators are in Appendix B.

Algorithm 2 Computation of the abstract domain

```

1: procedure COMPUTEABS( $s \in \mathbb{S}$ )
2:    $\text{stmts} \leftarrow \text{to-list}(s)$ ;  $\text{labels} \leftarrow \text{label-indexes}(s)$  ;  $\text{work-list} \leftarrow \{1\}$ ;  $P_\alpha \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3:   while  $\neg \text{work-list.empty}()$  do
4:      $\text{pc} \leftarrow \text{work-list.pop}()$  ;  $s \leftarrow \text{stmts}[\text{pc}]$ 
5:      $\text{state} \leftarrow \neg P_\alpha.\text{contains}(\text{pc}) ? \mathbf{Init}_\alpha : \text{domain-stmt}[\text{pc}]$ 
6:      $\text{next} \leftarrow \{\text{pc} + 1\}$ 
7:     if  $\text{IsIfThenGoto}(s)$  then
8:        $\text{next.add}(\text{labels}[s.\text{label}])$ 
9:     while  $\neg \text{next.empty}()$  do
10:       $\text{to} \leftarrow \text{next.pop}()$ 
11:       $\text{new-state} \leftarrow \mathbf{Transform}_\alpha(\text{old-state}, \text{to})$ 
12:       $\text{old-state} \leftarrow P_\alpha[\text{to}]$ 
13:      if  $\exists x \in \text{old-state} . x = \perp \vee \exists y \in \text{new-state} . y = \perp$  then
14:         $\text{domain-stmt}[\text{to}] \leftarrow \text{new-state}$ 
15:      else
16:         $\text{domain-stmt}[\text{to}] \leftarrow \forall x \in \text{new-state} . \mathbf{Join}_\alpha(\text{old-state}(x), \text{new-state}(x))$ 
17:      if  $\text{old-state} \neq \text{new-state}$  then
18:         $\mathbf{Widening}_\alpha(\text{old-state}, \text{new-state})$  ;  $\text{work-list.add}(\text{to})$ 
return  $P_\alpha$ 

```

Widening Intervals ($\mathbf{Widening}_\alpha$) The widening operator consists of heuristics that accelerate reaching the fixed-point. For the integer domain, the widening consists of rapidly climbing the lattice towards the supremum. The formal definition of such operation is defined as:

$$\text{extrapolate}([l_p, u_p], [l_n, u_n]) = \begin{cases} (-\infty, +\infty) & l_n < l_p \wedge u_n > u_p \\ (l_n, +\infty) & u_n > u_p \\ (-\infty, u_n) & l_n < l_p \\ [l_n, u_n] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

For the wrapped domain, the widening consists of expanding the ring on both sides (by a factor of 2) until the ring is fully completed. To further understand how the ring is expanded, we refer to the original work [18].

3.3 Abstract Interpreter for GOTO

Now that we have described how the domains behave on GOTO statements, we can finally define the associated abstract interpretation procedure. More specifically, the procedure computes an abstract environment (see Section 3.2) over all program statements resulting in the map $P_\alpha : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{V}_\alpha}$.

We present the pseudocode of our abstract interpreter in Algorithm 2. The procedure `computeAbs` starts from an empty domain and a work list containing the first statement (Line 2). Whenever we reach a statement we have never visited, we initialize its state with the \mathbf{Init}_α procedure (Line 5). Then, the abstract




Fig. 3: Domain data structures. (a) a data structure that stores intervals for all variables and statements; (b) a data structure where the intervals are shared between all statements to avoid redundancy; (c) a data structure that improves over (b) by sharing groups of intervals.

interpreter processes any domain transformations (Line 11). The rules for merging conflicting states are in Lines 12 to 16. When the merged state differs from the previous one, the interpreter adds the next instruction to the work list (line 18). We have reached a fixed-point when the work list is empty (Line 3).

Storing the Domain Executing the abstract interpretation in a memory-efficient way is not trivial. We need to define a data structure that keeps track of the interval map P_α for all variables in each statement. A naïve implementation would lead to a $O(MN)$ memory complexity, where M is the number of statements and N is the number of variables (see Figure 3a). To circumvent this, we opt out for a lazy approach that only tracks the used domain references (see Figure 3b). We combine this approach with copy-on-write (COW) semantics to avoid unnecessary copies (see Figure 3c). Furthermore, we reduce the size of our data structure by only tracking the variables that are not *supremum* and using a flag to record whether the domain contains an *infimum*.

4 Using Intervals in ESBMC

To evaluate the techniques presented in Section 3, we extend the Efficient SMT-based Bounded Model Checker (ESBMC), a state-of-the-art industrial-scale software verifier [25]. ESBMC provides the infrastructure to effectively implement interval analysis (i.e., k -Induction and SMT). We expect our methodology to easily apply to other state-of-the-art BMC tools.

4.1 Architecture

Figure 4 shows the portion of ESBMC architecture that is relevant for our interval analysis extension (refer to [25] for a full description). The flow can be described as follows. First, we begin with the source code of the input program, which is compiled into the GOTO language. Second, we compute intervals over the GOTO program using abstract interpretation. Third, we use the intervals




Fig. 4: The ESBMC architecture with interval analysis.

to further transform the program. Fourth, we symbolically execute the transformed GOTO program, resulting in a formula. Finally, we evaluate whether the program is safe via a *Decision Procedure* [22]. The *Decision Procedure* will systematically increase the BMC bound k until either a vulnerability is found, a correctness proof is found (by either the unwinding assertions or k -induction), or resource exhaustion.

In the remainder of this section, we explain how we transform the GOTO program with the information obtained by computing the intervals.

4.2 Optimizations

Once we have access to the intervals, we can optimize the size of the GOTO program by slicing and folding the code. Here, we cover two crucial optimizations: singleton propagation and dead code removal.

When evaluating an expression, the resulting interval may be a singleton, i.e., only one value lies within the interval. In such cases, we can replace the entire content of the expression with the singleton value. An example of this optimization is shown in Figure 5, where the assertion value is the singleton $[1, 1]$. A side effect of singleton propagation is that it yields a tunable *constant propagation* algorithm. The precision level of the interval analysis has a direct impact on the effectiveness of the propagation.

Finally, the intervals can be used to remove unreachable instructions. These can be easily detected by checking whether P_a of the statement contains an *infimum*. Converting such instructions to *Skip* simplifies the program analysis by removing irrelevant branches. In our experimental analysis of Section 5.2, we identify a subset of benchmarks where this optimization can remove entire loops.

4.3 Invariant Instrumentation

ESBMC relies on SMT solvers, which are responsible for proving the satisfiability of the formula. Introducing invariants generally restricts the search space that the solver needs to verify. At the same time, introducing too many invariants might dramatically increase the size of SMT formulae, thus causing the solver to be slower. To explore this trade-off, we prepare three different levels of instrumentation. We list them below in order of verbosity:

<pre>void foo() { int a = * ? 4 : 6; // a: [4.6] assert(a + 2 >= 6); }</pre>	<pre>void foo() { int a = * ? 4 : 6; // a: [4.6] assert(1); }</pre>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------

Fig. 5: Optimization example. The example contains the original program (left) and its optimized form (right).

- *Loop Instructions.* We instrument each loop with the intervals of all variables appearing inside it by adding extra assumptions before and after it.
- *Guard Instructions (full or local).* We instrument each guard instruction (assumption, assertion, condition) with an extra assumption, which covers all variables in the program (full) or just the variables in the guard (local).
- *All Instructions (full or local).* We instrument every instruction in the program with an extra assumption, which covers all variables in the program (full) or just the variables in the corresponding statement (local).

Given the above, we can now apply interval analysis to program verification.

5 Experimental Evaluation

In this work, we pose the question of how to use interval analysis inside a BMC framework and whether its additional processing cost results in better performance. More specifically, we evaluate the impact of interval analysis on two software verification benchmarks: the benchmarks used by the Software Verification Competition (SV-COMP) in Reachability [4], and an industrial case of a power management firmware. This section is divided in three parts: Intel Power Management Firmware, SV-COMP reachability set, and a more in-depth analysis of affected benchmarks.

5.1 Intel Core Power Management Firmware

Intel routinely employs ESBMC to automate firmware analysis. In the past, ESBMC has been applied to the Authenticated Code Module [16], where it found over 30 vulnerabilities. ESBMC is part of the CI pipeline for developing microcode for the Core family of processors [19].

In the interest of expanding its use, Intel assessed the performance of ESBMC on the *Core Power Manager*. This piece of software controls the CPU frequency to reduce thermal damage. More specifically, it has the following features:

- An event-driven behavior where the application reacts to hardware triggers by executing floating-point computations.
- A harness that simulates the triggers with an infinite non-deterministic loop;

Table 1: SV-COMP scoring systems without witness validation.

Result	Score
Correctly identifying that a benchmark has no vulnerabilities (CT)	+2
Correctly identifying that a benchmark has a vulnerability (CF)	+1
Mislabeled a vulnerable program as safe (IT)	-32
Mislabeled a safe program as vulnerable (IF)	-16
The tool crashes due to errors or resource exhaustion	0

- Around 300 global variables that flag various hardware events;
- Around 190,000 lines of code split between 60 C files and 50 headers;

Without interval analysis, this benchmark is challenging for ESBMC and results in timeout after 3 days. However, adding interval analysis at the GOTO level allows ESBMC to reach a verdict in 8 hours. We report the specific combination of flags required to achieve this result in Appendix C. In the next section, we show that interval analysis improves the ESBMC performance across a wider variety of domains.

5.2 SV-COMP Reachability Set

The International Competition on Software Verification (SV-COMP), established in 2012, is one of the major driving forces of innovation in the software verification community [4]. Over the years, the competition has collected many software verification benchmarks divided into run-sets. Each run-set is designed to evaluate state-of-the-art verifiers against a specific software vulnerability, e.g., memory corruption, arithmetic overflows, and assertion failures.

Benchmark Description For this work, we choose the benchmarks in the *ReachSafety* run-set of SV-COMP’23. ReachSafety programs do not contain any undefined behavior according to the C99 standard, including overflows and memory safety issues. Furthermore, ReachSafety programs are the only ones compatible with the k -induction strategy, as implemented in ESBMC.

Experimental Setup We run our experiments in a similar fashion to SV-COMP [4]. Specifically, we execute the benchmarks with version 3.21 of the *benchexec* tool [5]. We limit the computational resources to 120 seconds of CPU time, 1 CPU core and 6GB for memory. We also use a similar scoring system (see Table 1), but we omit the witness validation phase as it would obscure our results. We execute all experiments on a KVM machine running Ubuntu 20.04 with Kernel 5.4.0-177-generic. Our hardware is a 32-core Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2620 v4 @ 2.10GHz with 170GiB of RAM.

Table 2: Aggregate results on SV-COMP reachability benchmarks. We report the number of unique benchmarks solved by each ESBMC Setting in parenthesis.

Setting	CT	CF	IT	IF	Timeout	Memory-out	Crashes	Score
Baseline	2611 (16)	1657 (11)	7 (0)	0 (0)	5112 (294)	119 (4)	31 (0)	6655
Intervals	2789 (194)	1654 (8)	7 (0)	0 (0)	4848 (30)	208 (93)	31 (0)	7008

Table 3: Computational cost of interval analysis. We report mean and standard deviation on the SV-COMP benchmarks solved by both ESBMC Settings.

Setting	CPU (s)	Memory (MiB)	Preprocessing (s)	SMT Solving (s)
Baseline	10.9 ± 19.9	116 ± 166	0.04 ± 0.5	6.15 ± 15.4
Intervals	11.1 ± 20.1	132 ± 288	0.5 ± 3.4	5.94 ± 15.2

Experimental Goals Here, our goal is to confirm whether interval analysis helps ESBMC solve more benchmarks. To this end, we compare two settings:

- *Baseline*. This setting consists of ESBMC without any interval computation. See Appendix C for an in-depth description of the specific flags.
- *Intervals*. This setting enables the use of interval analysis. Specifically, we enable *Integer Domain*, *Optimizations* (see Section 4.2) and *Loop Instructions* instrumentation (see Section 4.3) on top of the *Baseline* setting. In Section 5.3, we demonstrate why this configuration is optimal.

Overall Improvements Overall, interval analysis improves the performance of ESBMC by 5% (see Table 2). The majority of the improvements come from the ability of interval analysis to prove the safety of additional benchmarks rather than finding violations in the unsafe ones. The few incorrect results are unrelated to the interval analysis introduction in ESBMC. Indeed, the *Baseline* version of ESBMC produces the same incorrect results. We reported the issue to the developers, but no solution was implemented at the time of this writing.⁹

Resource Consumption Computing intervals increases the computational load (see Section 3.3). Here, we quantify the cost of interval analysis by comparing it with the baseline setting in ESBMC. In Table 3, we report the time and memory consumption on all benchmarks on which both versions of ESBMC reached the same verdict. From the data, we can see a slight increase in the CPU time and a moderate increase in memory consumption.

Unique Benchmarks Solved In Figure 6, we isolate the subset of the SV-COMP benchmarks that are particularly affected by the introduction of interval

⁹ <https://github.com/esbmc/esbmc/issues/1652>




Fig. 6: Unique results per category. Y-axis consists of categories where the unique results were identified and X-axis is the quantity.

analysis. There, we report the number of unique benchmarks that are only verifiable by either the *Baseline* (no intervals) or the *Interval* setting, but not both. More in detail, we observe unique results in the following sub-categories:

- *Combinations, DeviceDrivers, ECA, ProductLines*. These benchmarks contain manipulation of (global) “guard” variables in an event system, i.e., variables that represent that an event has happened. Computing intervals over these variables reduces the number of paths BMC has to reason on.
- *Loops*. These benchmarks contain infinite loops. Interval analysis introduces useful invariants for the *k-induction* algorithm, while optimization removes loops that do not affect the relevant assertions in the program.
- *Hardware*. These benchmarks are generated from formal hardware descriptions and contain infinite loops with thousands of variables. As such, computing intervals result in memory and time exhaustion.
- *Arrays*. These benchmarks are solved within 5s from the timeout, thus causing a small number of spurious unique results.

We use this reduced set of benchmarks for our detailed analysis in Section 5.3.

5.3 Comparing Intervals Modes

Sections 5.2 and 5.1 show positive results for interval analysis. However, we obtained them under very different experimental setups (see Appendix C). Thus, identifying the best way to use intervals inside a BMC framework remains open. Here, we answer it by running additional experiments on the SV-COMP sub-categories of Figure 6. We structure our experiments according to the three perspectives of interval application, precision, and representation.

Application There are two main strategies when using the intervals: optimizations (Section 4.2) and instrumentation (Section 4.3). In Table 4, we demonstrate their separate impact on the performance of ESBMC. The results show that:

Table 4: Comparison between optimization and instrumentation.

Setting	CT	CF	IT	Score
Baseline	1832	997	3	4565
Optimization Only	1934	983	3	4755
All Instructions Full	1925	926	3	4680
All Instructions Local	1932	990	3	4758
Guard Instructions Full	1928	988	3	4748
Guard Instructions Local	1931	986	3	4752
Loop Instructions	1989	987	3	4869

Table 5: Interval precision and representation domain (\mathbb{I} - integer, \mathbb{W} - wrapped).

Setting	CT- \mathbb{I}	CT- \mathbb{W}	CF- \mathbb{I}	CF- \mathbb{W}	IT- \mathbb{I}	IT- \mathbb{W}	Score- \mathbb{I}	Score- \mathbb{W}
No Arithmetic	1991	1942	988	921	3	3	4874	4709
Arithmetic	1640	1640	709	519	0	0	3989	3799
Arithmetic & Widening	1992	1896	988	717	3	3	4876	4413

- None of the settings helps ESBMC identify additional safety violations (CF).
- Optimization has similar results to instrumentation. This shows that these two strategies have considerable overlap.
- The Loop Instructions setting achieves the best results. We use this setting throughout Section 5.2.

Precision In Table 5, we demonstrate the impact of enabling the Arithmetic and Widening operators in conjunction with the optimizations and Loop Instructions setting. The results show that enabling Arithmetic causes around 30% more timeouts. This is expected as the additional precision of Arithmetic requires more iterations to reach a fixed-point. Enabling Widening makes the issue disappear. Introducing more precise interval computation does not reduce the SMT solving time (<1% impact). However, the Arithmetic setting can solve 3 unique ECA benchmarks by finding a violation in less than 90 seconds.

Representation Also in Table 5, we compare the use of the Integer and Wrapped domains. The results show that ESBMC solves fewer benchmarks with the Wrapped domain. This is because the Wrapped domain has an extra cost associated with the Join operation, thus resulting in more timeouts. This effect is most visible in the Hardware category, where the time needed to verify the benchmarks doubled.

5.4 Limitations

Although we successfully demonstrated the performance of our prototype on 9538 different benchmarks, there are a few known limitations in our implementation:

- We provide no support for dereferencing operations. Any storage operation over dereferences resets the entire domain to *supremum* to maintain soundness. Adding such support might improve the precision of interval analysis.
- Programs that contain function pointers may lead to incorrect invariants. This is because the ESBMC memory model has inconsistent behavior when dealing with values being cast into pointers.¹⁰

6 Conclusions

This work presents a case study using interval analysis in a BMC framework for software verification. Specifically, we compare interval domains supporting infinite integer precision and machine-aware representations. Furthermore, we conducted a series of experiments with different levels of interval precision and analyzed their impact on BMC program analysis.

Our results show that using intervals to optimize and instrument the program increases the SV-COMP scores from 6655 to 7008, with 202 unique benchmarks solved. Additionally, using intervals in real-world software enabled our prototype to verify it. Additionally, interval analysis enables us to verify large-scale real-world firmware. Indeed, the only downside of interval analysis is its additional computational cost, which can lead to resource exhaustion in a limited number of cases. In all other scenarios, our results show that a lightweight interval analysis with low precision yields stronger invariants, which can be exploited by the BMC and k -induction algorithms.

In the future, we plan to expand the current work in two directions. First, we will add support for other types of assertions (i.e., overflows and memory safety), enabling us to infer stronger interval invariants. Second, we will apply interval analysis during symbolic execution (like in [35]), which will allow us to reason on a bounded trace.

Acknowledgements

This work is partially funded by ARM, EPSRC EP/T026995/1, EPSRC EP/V000497/1, Ethereum Foundation, EU H2020 ELEGANT 957286, UKRI Soteria, Intel, and Motorola Mobility (through Agreement N° 4/2021).

References

1. Microsoft Research a proactive approach to more secure code. <https://msrc.microsoft.com/blog/2019/07/a-proactive-approach-to-more-secure-code/>, accessed: 2024-04-18
2. BACK TO THE BUILDING BLOCKS: A PATH TOWARD SECURE AND MEASURABLE SOFTWARE. Tech. rep., The White House (02 2024)

¹⁰ <https://github.com/esbmc/esbmc/issues/1539>

3. Aldughaim, M., Alshmrany, K., Menezes, R., Cordeiro, L., Stancu, A.: Incremental symbolic bounded model checking of software using interval methods via contractors. arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.11245 (2020)
4. Beyer, D.: State of the art in software verification and witness validation: Sv-comp 2024. In: International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems. pp. 299–329. Springer (2024)
5. Beyer, D., Löwe, S., Wendler, P.: Reliable benchmarking: requirements and solutions. *International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer* **21**(1), 1–29 (2019)
6. Biere, A., Cimatti, A., Clarke, E.M., Fujita, M., Zhu, Y.: Symbolic model checking using sat procedures instead of bdds. In: Proceedings of the 36th annual ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference. pp. 317–320 (1999)
7. Blanchet, B., Cousot, P., Cousot, R., Feret, J., Mauborgne, L., Miné, A., Monniaux, D., Rival, X.: A static analyzer for large safety-critical software. In: Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 2003 conference on Programming language design and implementation. pp. 196–207 (2003)
8. Clarke, E., Biere, A., Raimi, R., Zhu, Y.: Bounded model checking using satisfiability solving. *Formal methods in system design* **19**, 7–34 (2001)
9. Clarke, E.M.: Model checking. In: Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science: 17th Conference Kharagpur, India, December 18–20, 1997 Proceedings 17. pp. 54–56. Springer (1997)
10. Clarke, E.M., Henzinger, T.A., Veith, H., Bloem, R., et al.: Handbook of model checking, vol. 10. Springer (2018)
11. Cook, B., Khazem, K., Kroening, D., Tasiran, S., Tautschnig, M., Tuttle, M.R.: Model checking boot code from aws data centers. In: Computer Aided Verification: 30th International Conference, CAV 2018, Held as Part of the Federated Logic Conference, FloC 2018, Oxford, UK, July 14–17, 2018, Proceedings, Part II 30. pp. 467–486. Springer (2018)
12. Cordeiro, L., Fischer, B., Marques-Silva, J.: Smt-based bounded model checking for embedded ansi-c software. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* **38**(4), 957–974 (2011)
13. Cousot, P.: Principles of Abstract Interpretation. MIT Press (2021)
14. Cousot, P., Cousot, R.: Abstract interpretation: a unified lattice model for static analysis of programs by construction or approximation of fixpoints. In: Proceedings of the 4th ACM SIGACT-SIGPLAN symposium on Principles of programming languages. pp. 238–252 (1977)
15. Fisher, M.: An introduction to practical formal methods using temporal logic. John Wiley & Sons (2011)
16. Futral, W., Greene, J., Futral, W., Greene, J.: Fundamental principles of intel® txt. Intel® Trusted Execution Technology for Server Platforms: A Guide to More Secure Datacenters pp. 15–36 (2013)
17. Gadelha, M.Y., Ismail, H.I., Cordeiro, L.C.: Handling loops in bounded model checking of c programs via k-induction. *International journal on software tools for technology transfer* **19**(1), 97–114 (2017)
18. Gange, G., Navas, J.A., Schachte, P., Søndergaard, H., Stuckey, P.J.: Interval analysis and machine arithmetic: Why signedness ignorance is bliss. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems (TOPLAS)* **37**(1), 1–35 (2015)
19. Gwennap, L.: P6 microcode can be patched. *Microprocessor Report* (1997)
20. Isaacson, E., Keller, H.B.: Analysis of numerical methods. Courier Corporation (2012)

21. Kahan, W.: Ieee standard 754 for binary floating-point arithmetic. Lecture Notes on the Status of IEEE **754**(94720-1776), 11 (1996)
22. Kroening, D., Strichman, O.: Decision procedures. Springer (2016)
23. Kroening, D., Tautschnig, M.: Cbmc-c bounded model checker: (competition contribution). In: Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems: 20th International Conference, TACAS 2014, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2014, Grenoble, France, April 5-13, 2014. Proceedings 20. pp. 389–391. Springer (2014)
24. Lampert, A., Singh, R.K.: Southwest network failure raises concerns over system’s strength (2023), <https://www.reuters.com/business/aerospace-defense/southwest-network-failure-raises-concerns-over->
25. Menezes, R.S., Aldughaim, M., Farias, B., Li, X., Manino, E., Shmarov, F., Song, K., Brauße, F., Gadelha, M.R., Tihanyi, N., et al.: Esbmc v7. 4: Harnessing the power of intervals: (competition contribution). In: International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems. pp. 376–380. Springer (2024)
26. Moore, R.E.: Interval analysis, vol. 4. Prentice-Hall Englewood Cliffs (1966)
27. Moore, R.E.: Methods and applications of interval analysis. SIAM (1979)
28. Müller-Olm, M., Seidl, H.: Analysis of modular arithmetic. ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems (TOPLAS) **29**(5), 29-es (2007)
29. Parsons, T.W.: Introduction to compiler construction. Computer Science Press, Inc. (1992)
30. Ramalho Gadelha, M., et al.: Scalable and precise verification based on k-induction, symbolic execution and floating-point theory. Ph.D. thesis, University of Southampton (2019)
31. Sankaranarayanan, S., Ivančić, F., Gupta, A.: Program analysis using symbolic ranges. In: International Static Analysis Symposium. pp. 366–383. Springer (2007)
32. Singh, G., Püschel, M., Vechev, M.: Fast polyhedra abstract domain. In: Proceedings of the 44th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages. pp. 46–59 (2017)
33. Warren, H.S.: Hacker’s delight. Pearson Education (2013)
34. Wu, T., Xiong, S., Manino, E., Stockwell, G., Cordeiro, L.C.: Verifying components of arm(r) confidential computing architecture with esbmc (2024)
35. Zaks, A., Yang, Z., Shlyakhter, I., Ivancic, F., Cadambi, S., Ganai, M.K., Gupta, A., Ashar, P.: Bitwidth reduction via symbolic interval analysis for software model checking. IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems **27**(8), 1513–1517 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCAD.2008.925777>

A GOTO Language

A program written in the language evaluates to *true* if there are no inputs that can cause an assertion failure. For this work, the language has the following characteristics:

- No support for pointers;
- The values are typed by width and sign.
- No recursive expressions. All expressions have an intermediate variable to hold the values: $x + y + 1$ becomes $t = x + y \rightarrow t + 1$.
- The complete relation P_t that maps all program variables into types: $\mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}\mathbf{y}$ such that $\forall v \in \mathbb{V}, P_t(v) \in \mathbb{T}\mathbf{y}$. In other words, this is similar to a compiler symbol table [29], containing information of all types for every variable.

Basics We will start describing the basic features of the language. The language contains typed variables and 32-bit signed constants. The supported types are signed and unsigned integers. Additionally, the language has support for explicit program labels.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
v & \in \mathbb{V}: \text{Variables} \\
n & \in \mathbb{M}: \text{32-bit signed integers} \\
l & \in \mathbb{L}: \text{Explicit program Labels} \\
\text{type} & \in \mathbb{T}\mathbb{y}: \text{Types} \\
\text{type} & ::= \text{Signed } n \\
& \quad | \text{Unsigned } n \\
\text{term} & \in \mathbb{T}: \text{Program terminals} \\
\text{term} & ::= v \quad \text{variable} \\
& \quad | n \quad \text{constant}
\end{array}$$

Expressions The language has support for classic arithmetic expressions, boolean operations and bitwise operations.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{arith-expr} & \in \mathbb{A}: \text{Arithmetic Expressions} \\
\text{arith-expr} & ::= \text{term } \oplus \text{ term} \quad \forall \oplus \in \{+, -, *, /\} \\
\\
\text{bool-expr} & \in \mathbb{B}: \text{Boolean Expressions} \\
\text{bool-expr} & ::= \text{term } \&\& \text{ term} \quad \text{conjunction} \\
& \quad | \text{!term} \quad \text{negation} \\
& \quad | \text{term } \leq \text{term} \quad \text{less than equal} \\
& \quad | \text{term} \quad \text{plain value} \\
\\
\text{bitwise-expr} & \in \mathbb{B}\mathbb{w}: \text{Bitwise Expressions} \\
\text{bitwise-expr} & ::= (\text{type}) \text{ term} \quad \text{casting} \\
& \quad | \sim \text{term} \quad \text{bitflip} \\
& \quad | \text{term } \oplus \text{ term} \quad \forall \oplus \in \{\ll, \gg, \&, \|\, , \} \\
\\
\text{expr} & \in \mathbb{E}: \text{Expressions} \\
\text{expr} & ::= \text{arith-expr} \quad \text{arithmetic expression} \\
& \quad | \text{bool-expr} \quad \text{boolean expression} \\
& \quad | \text{bitwise-expr} \quad \text{bitwise expression}
\end{array}$$

A.1 Semantics of GOTO Language

Term Semantics In order to define values for the terms, we need to get the values for all the variables. For that, we first define the relation $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{V}$ that maps $\mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$. An environment is a $\rho \in \mathbb{E}\mathbb{V}$, such that for a $v \in \mathbb{V}$, $\rho(v) \in \mathbb{M}$. Given an environment $\rho \in (\mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{M})$, and an $T \in \mathbb{T}$. Let $\mathcal{T}[[T]]\rho$ be the computation of the term into \mathbb{M} , defined as:

$$\begin{array}{l}
\mathcal{T}[[i \in \mathbb{Z}]]\rho \doteq i \\
\mathcal{T}[[v \in \mathbb{V}]]\rho \doteq \rho(v)
\end{array}$$

Expression Semantics When computing expressions, we use the same semantics of C99 standard (including the implicit casts). The arithmetic expressions can *overlap* (unsigned) or *overflow* (signed). For overlaps, we use the same semantics shown by the C99 standard. For overflow, the semantics are undefined. Given an environment $\rho \in (\mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{M})$, and an $A \in \mathbb{A}$. Let $\mathcal{A}[[A]]\rho$ be the computation of the arithmetic expression into \mathbb{Z} , let $\mathcal{B}_w[[B_w]]\rho$ be the computation of the bitwise expression into \mathbb{M} , defined as:

$$\mathcal{A}[[t_0 \oplus t_1]]\rho \triangleq (\mathcal{T}[[t_0]]\rho \oplus \mathcal{T}[[t_1]]\rho), \forall \oplus \in \{+, -, *, /\}$$

Semantics for the Bitwise operations $\mathcal{B}_w[[B_w]]\rho$ and boolean expressions $\mathcal{B}[[B]]\rho$ are defined in similar fashion. Finally, given an environment $\rho \in (\mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{M})$, and an $E \in \mathbb{E}$. Let $\mathcal{E}[[E]]\rho$ be the computation of an expression E into \mathbb{M} , defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}[[e \in \mathbb{A}]]\rho &\triangleq \mathcal{A}[[e]]\rho \\ \mathcal{E}[[e \in \mathbb{B}]]\rho &\triangleq \mathcal{B}[[e]]\rho \\ \mathcal{E}[[e \in \mathbb{B}_w]]\rho &\triangleq \mathcal{B}_w[[e]]\rho \end{aligned}$$

Statement Semantics Given an environment $\rho \in (\mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z})$, and an $S \in \mathbb{S}$. Let $\mathcal{S}[[S]]\rho$ be the computation of an expression S into \mathbb{E}_v , defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}[[s_1; s_2]]\rho &\triangleq \mathcal{S}[[s_2]](\mathcal{S}[[s_1]]\rho) \\ \mathcal{S}[[\text{Assignment } v \ e]]\rho &\triangleq \forall x \in \mathbb{V}. x = v \rightarrow \mathcal{A}[[e]]\rho; x \neq v \rightarrow \rho(x) \\ \mathcal{S}[[s \in \mathbb{S}]]\rho &\triangleq \rho \end{aligned}$$

B Interval bitwise operators with integers of any bit width

In Section 3 we presented our interval analysis framework for 32-bit signed integer variables. In reality, C code supports signed and unsigned integers of various bit length (typically 8, 16, 32 and 64). As a result, we need to define interval-based operators for these integers as well.

While arithmetic operations are a trivial extension of Table 6, bitwise operations require a little more care. For 32-bit integers, the work of [33] provide interval algorithms that cover the operators OR, AND, XOR and NOT. Integers of length different than 32 bits are not covered, as well as shift and typecast operators (truncation, extension).

Here, we present our bit-agnostic implementation of bitwise operators. These can be used with integers of any length (not necessarily powers of two), and offer a considerable performance improvement over the algorithms in [33].

Table 6: Operators for Integer Domain.

Operand	Result
$[l_0, u_0] +_I [l_1, u_1]$	$[l_0 + l_1, u_0 + u_1]$
$[l_0, u_0] -_I [l_1, u_1]$	$[l_0 - u_1, u_0 - l_1]$
$[l_0, u_0] *_I [l_1, u_1]$	$[\min(l_0 * u_0, l_0 * u_1, l_1 * u_0, l_1 * u_1), \max(l_0 * u_0, l_0 * u_1, l_1 * u_0, l_1 * u_1)]$
$[1, 1] /_I [l, u]$	$u < 0 \vee 0 < l \rightarrow [1/u, 1/l]; \textit{otherwise} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty)$
$[l_0, u_0] /_I [l_1, u_1]$	$[l_0, u_0] * ([1, 1] / [l_1, u_1])$

The code for computing the lower (respectively upper) bounds of a bitwise or operation $[\text{minOR}, \text{maxOR}] = [a, b] \mid [b, c]$ is given in Listings 7 and 8. For ease of comparison, we present the 32-bit algorithm in [33] side-by-side. Note how the algorithm in [33] requires scanning all 32 bits via the one-hot variable `m`, from most significant to least significant. In contrast, our algorithms have two advantages. First, they perform the scan from least to most significant bit via the one-hot variable `lsb`. As a result, we can support `unsigned` integers of any bit length. Second, we only consider the bits that are important for the final result, thus executing the body of the `while(m != 0)` loop for fewer iterations than the bit length of `unsigned`.

The other bitwise operators (signed and unsigned AND, OR, XOR and typecasts) can be defined in terms of `minOR` and `maxOR`. Furthermore, shifts and negation require few lines of code. For more details on these algorithms, refer to the file `bitwise_bounds.h` in our GitHub repository¹¹ (or in the Zenodo artifact) and the commented examples therein.

C ESBMC Details

In this Appendix, we will present selected options of ESBMC that are used throughout this work. In Table 7, we show the flags and their explanations. Although the interval domain and precision can be selected through flags, the instrumentation and optimization can not (we provide ESBMC builds for each instrumentation/optimization configuration in Zenodo).

Industrial Example (Section 5.1). `-no-pointer-check -no-div-by-zero-check -no-bounds-check -no-vla-size-check -no-align-check -no-pointer-relation-check -no-unlimited-scanf-check -unwind 1 -partial-loops -interval-analysis`

SV-COMP Baseline (Section 5.2). `-no-div-by-zero-check -force-malloc-success -state-hashing -add-symex-value-sets -no-align-check -k-step 2 -floatbv -unlimited-k-steps -no-vla-size-check -32/-64 -witness-output witness.graphml`

¹¹ https://github.com/esbmc/esbmc/blob/master/src/goto-programs/abstract-interpretation/bitwise_bounds

<pre> uint32_t minOR(uint32_t a, uint32_t b, uint32_t c, uint32_t d) { uint32_t m, tmp; m = 0x80000000; while (m != 0) { if (~a & c & m) { tmp = (a m) & ~m; if (tmp <= b) { a = tmp; break; } } else if (a & ~c & m) { tmp = (c m) & ~m; if (tmp <= d) { c = tmp; break; } } m = m >> 1; } return a c; } </pre>	<pre> unsigned bestOR(unsigned x, unsigned y, unsigned m) { unsigned best, lsb, tmp; best = x; while(m != 0) { lsb = m & (-m); tmp = (x lsb) & (~lsb); if(tmp > y) break; best = tmp; m &= (m - 1); } return best; } unsigned minOR(unsigned a, unsigned b, unsigned c, unsigned d) { unsigned best_a, best_c; best_a = bestOR(a, b, ~a & c); best_c = bestOR(c, d, a & ~c); unsigned m = best_a c; unsigned n = a best_c; return (m < n)? m: n; } </pre>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Fig. 7: Left: original algorithm for 32-bit unsigned or (lower bound) in [33] page 75. Right: optimised version for integers of any bit length.

-enable-unreachability-intrinsic -no-pointer-check -no-bounds-check -error-label
 ERROR -goto-unwind -unlimited-goto-unwind -k-induction -max-inductive-step
 3

SV-COMP Intervals (Section 5.2). -no-div-by-zero-check -force-malloc-
 success -state-hashing -add-symex-value-sets -no-align-check -k-step 2 -floatbv
 -unlimited-k-steps -no-vla-size-check -32/-64 -witness-output witness.graphml
 -enable-unreachability-intrinsic -no-pointer-check -no-bounds-check -error-label
 ERROR -goto-unwind -unlimited-goto-unwind -k-induction -max-inductive-step
 3 -interval-analysis

Application unique (Section 5.3). -no-div-by-zero-check -force-malloc-
 success -state-hashing -add-symex-value-sets -no-align-check -k-step 2 -floatbv -unlimited-
 k-steps -no-vla-size-check -32/-64 -witness-output witness.graphml -enable-unreachability-

<pre> uint32_t maxOR(uint32_t a, uint32_t b, uint32_t c, uint32_t d) { uint32_t m, tmp; m = 0x80000000; while (m != 0) { if (b & d & m) { tmp = (b - m) (m - 1); if (tmp >= a) { b = tmp; break; } tmp = (d - m) (m - 1); if (tmp >= c) { d = tmp; break; } } m = m >> 1; } return b d; } </pre>	<pre> unsigned maxOR(unsigned a, unsigned b, unsigned c, unsigned d) { unsigned e, m, lsb; unsigned tmp_b, tmp_d; e = 0; m = b & d; while(m != 0) { lsb = m & (-m); tmp_b = (b - lsb) (lsb - 1); tmp_d = (d - lsb) (lsb - 1); if(tmp_b < a && tmp_d < c) break; e = (lsb - 1); m &= (m - 1); } return b d e; } </pre>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Fig. 8: Left: original algorithm for 32-bit unsigned or (upper bound) in [33] page 77. Right: optimised version for integers of any bit length.

```

intrinsic -no-pointer-check -no-bounds-check -error-label ERROR -goto-unwind
-unlimited-goto-unwind -k-induction -max-inductive-step 3 -interval-analysis

```

Precision unique (Section 5.3). -no-div-by-zero-check -force-malloc-success
-state-hashing -add-symex-value-sets -no-align-check -k-step 2 -floatbv -unlimited-
k-steps -no-vla-size-check -32/-64 -witness-output witness.graphml -enable-unreachability-
intrinsic -no-pointer-check -no-bounds-check -error-label ERROR -goto-unwind
-unlimited-goto-unwind -k-induction -max-inductive-step 3 -interval-analysis -
interval-analysis-bitwise? -interval-analysis-arithmetic? -interval-analysis-extrapolate?

Representation unique (Section 5.3). -no-div-by-zero-check -force-malloc-
success -state-hashing -add-symex-value-sets -no-align-check -k-step 2 -floatbv
-unlimited-k-steps -no-vla-size-check -32/-64 -witness-output witness.graphml
-enable-unreachability-intrinsic -no-pointer-check -no-bounds-check -error-label
ERROR -goto-unwind -unlimited-goto-unwind -k-induction -max-inductive-step
3 -interval-analysis -interval-analysis-bitwise? -interval-analysis-arithmetic? -
interval-analysis-extrapolate? -interval-analysis-wrapped

Table 7: ESBMC flags and descriptions.

Flag	Description
-floatbv	Encode floats using BitVector theory
-k-induction	Enables the incremental k-induction strategy
-unlimited-k-steps	Remove any upper bound for the BMC incremental approach
-k-step 2	Increments each bound limit by 2 for iteration
-max-inductive-step 3	Do not apply the inductive step over bound 3
-32/-64	Sets the architecture
-no-div-by-zero-check	Disable division by zero assertions
-no-align-check	Disable memory alignment check
-no-vla-size-check	Disable out-of-bounds check over VLAs
-no-pointer-check	Disable pointer safety checks
-no-pointer-relation-check	Disable pointer relation checks
-no-unlimited-scanf-check	Allow partial check over scanf inputs
-no-bounds-check	Disable out-of-bounds checks
-state-hashing	Removes duplicate states in interleaving (for concurrency)
-add-symex-value-sets	Adds assumptions of pointer destinations (during symbolic execution)
-goto-unwind	Statically unroll loops of known lengths
-enable-unreachability-intrinsic	Allows early termination for some float point operational models
-partial-loops	allows partial execution of loops
-force-malloc-success	assumes that dynamic allocation can never fail
-unlimited-goto-unwind	Removes the upper bound limit from goto-unwind
-witness-output	construct a witness report using SV-COMP format
-error-label	assumes that reaching the defined program label is an error
-interval-analysis	Enables the use of Interval Analysis
-interval-analysis-wrapped	Replaces Integer Domain with Wrapped Domain
-interval-analysis-arithmetic	Enables arithmetic computations during interval analysis
-interval-analysis-bitwise	Enables bitwise computations during interval analysis
-interval-analysis-extrapolate	Enables widening during interval analysis