

Do we still need canaries in the coal mine? Measuring shadow stack effectiveness in countering stack smashing

Hugo Depuydt¹, Merve Gülmez², Thomas Nyman³, and Jan Tobias Mühlberg⁴

¹ ENS Rennes, France hugo.depuydt@ens-rennes.fr

² Ericsson Security Research, Sweden merve.gulmez@ericsson.com

³ Ericsson Product Security, Sweden thomas.nyman@ericsson.com

⁴ Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium jan.tobias.muehlberg@ulb.be

Abstract Stack canaries and shadow stacks are widely deployed mitigations to memory-safety vulnerabilities. While stack canaries are introduced by the compiler and rely on sentry values placed between variables and control data, shadow stack implementations protect return addresses explicitly and rely on hardware features available in modern processor designs for efficiency. In this paper we hypothesize that stack canaries and shadow stacks provide similar levels of protections against sequential stack-based overflows. Based on the Juliet test suite, we evaluate whether 64-bit x86 (x86-64) systems benefit from enabling stack canaries in addition to the x86-64 shadow stack enforcement. We observe divergence in overflow detection rates between the GCC and Clang compilers and across optimization levels, which we attribute to differences in stack layouts generated by the compilers. We also find that x86-64 shadow stack implementations are more effective and outperform stack canaries when combined with a stack-protector-like stack layout. We implement and evaluate an enhancement to the Clang x86-64 shadow stack instrumentation that improves the shadow stack detection accuracy based on this observation.

1 Introduction

The urgency of mitigating memory-safety vulnerabilities in software developed with the C and C++ programming languages has grown under increasing regulatory scrutiny [37]. Memory-safety issues are one of the oldest problems in computer security and remain a persistent challenge despite decades of advancements in both offensive and defensive techniques [45]. Among these, stack canaries [15] stand out as one of the earliest systematic mitigations to achieve widespread adoption. In this paper, we reassess stack canaries in light of modern hardware-assisted mitigations, particularly shadow stacks [10], now operational in commodity x86-64 systems [29,30].

Stack canaries—a reference to the historic practice of bringing canary birds into coal mines as they would be affected by toxic gases earlier than the miners—are sentinel values placed between local variables and control data on the stack to detect buffer overflows. Shadow stacks, in contrast, specifically protect function return addresses, preventing exploits such as return-oriented programming (ROP) [42] that hijack a program’s control flow. While shadow stacks target a different threat model, both techniques defend against sequential overflows that corrupt the stack canary or return address. We hypothesize that, with modern compiler optimizations omitting other control

data from stack frames, stack canaries and shadow stacks offer comparable protection against sequential overflows.

This paper and contributions. This paper investigates whether conventional stack canaries still offer security benefits when paired with shadow stack enforcement. We evaluate the effectiveness of both techniques on modern x86-64 systems using the NIST Juliet C/C++ Test Suite [8] which contains a wide range of C/C++ code examples with buffer-overflows among the 118 Common Weakness Enumeration (CWE) categories the suite covers. Our key contributions and findings include:

1. **Systematic evaluation between GCC and Clang.** We evaluate the effectiveness and performance of stack canaries and x86-64 shadow stack in GCC and Clang and show differences in the detection accuracy between the compilers. Overall, Clang demonstrates a better detection rate with stack canaries than GCC, while shadow stacks alone detect significantly less buffer overflows in the sample set compared to stack canaries. We further investigate the reasons for this difference.
2. **Impact of compiler stack layouts.** The stack layout generated by the compiler has a significant impact on detection accuracy for both stack canaries and shadow stack. The stack layout varies between the different compilers, the level of program optimizations used, and between different variants of the stack-canary instrumentation, i.e., the different option variants in the `-fstack-protector` family.
3. **Enhancements to Clang’s shadow stack support.** To enhance the protection the x86-64 shadow stack offers against sequential buffer overflows, we propose new Clang compiler options that emulate stack-protector layouts while relying on shadow stack checks. Our evaluation shows these new options improve detection accuracy while allowing stack canary checks to be omitted and incur only a small ($\approx 0.8\%$ and $\approx 0.25\%$ on rate and speed test suites respectively) performance degradation which is lower than that of the corresponding stack canaries ($\approx 2.18\%$ and $\approx 3.21\%$, when applied to all functions) and comparable to that of conventional x86-64 shadow stacks ($\approx 0.99\%$ and ≈ 0.40).

Our observations have already been shared with security researchers in the GCC and Clang communities, with whom we confirmed that our findings can be publicly disclosed.

2 Background

Over half a century since their discovery [2], memory-safety vulnerabilities have become the most prevalent class of software vulnerability [37]. Major software manufacturers, such as Microsoft and Google [20], attribute up to 70% of vulnerabilities discovered in their products to memory-safety issues [35,20]. Examples of vulnerabilities, attacks, and outages attributed to memory-safety issues include the Heartbleed bug in OpenSSL [44], the BLASTPASS exploit chain used to deliver commercial spyware [12], and the CrowdStrike outage of 2024 [16]. The cost to businesses, and society as a whole, of responding to cyber emergencies caused by memory-safety bugs have prompted cybersecurity authorities to urge software manufacturers to adopt memory-safe programming languages, memory-safe hardware, and develop empirical metrics to

measure “*cybersecurity quality*” [37]. Nevertheless, the massive scale at which C and C++ are deployed across the software industry today means memory-unsafe code will remain for the foreseeable future [21].

Code written in, C, C++, or any other language that is compiled down to native code can, however, be hardened against memory-safety bugs, such as buffer overflows, through the use of compiler-inserted mitigations [38]. These are designed to render residual memory-safety vulnerabilities non-exploitable by forcefully terminating a vulnerable application if a bug is triggered. However, compiler developers lack good tools to verify whether such security hardening features generate code correctly [4]. This is because conventional software testing practices only verify whether hardened code produces the expected output for a given input; not whether the hardening feature operates correctly across different code patterns when a memory-safety bug is triggered. To address this gap, we perform an empirical evaluation of two production-grade security hardening features available in the GCC and Clang open-source compilers focusing on their effectiveness in detecting classic *buffer overflows* under a variety of scenarios.

2.1 Buffer overflows

Buffer overflows are one of the first well-documented memory-safety bugs that saw a large increase in both discovered and exploited cases in the middle-90’s [31]. A “*buffer*” is simply a contiguous block of computer memory that holds multiple instances of the same data type. In C and C++, buffers are commonly implemented as character arrays. Arrays, like all variables in C and C++, can be declared either static or dynamic. Static variables are allocated at load time from the executable’s data or block starting symbol (BSS) segment. In contrast, dynamic variables are allocated automatically from the program’s stack, or explicitly at run time from the program’s heap. An “*overflow*” occurs when the program erroneously writes beyond the upper bound of the allocated array. Conversely, an “*underflow*” occurs when writes occur beyond the lower bound of the array. Buffer overflows can, under the right circumstances, be exploitable by memory attacks regardless of where the underlying array is allocated. However, early exploitation techniques such as “*stack smashing*” [31] target buffer overflows that occur in stack-allocated arrays since these are particularly easy to exploit. This is because, as shown in Figure 1a, stack-allocated buffers (❶) are placed just below the frame record containing the *saved frame pointer* (❷) and *return address* (❸). In the x86 instruction set architecture (ISA), including its contemporary x86-64 variant [3], the base pointer register (%rbp in x86-64 and %ebp on x86) records the beginning of local variables in function’s stack frame throughout the execution of a function. In contrast, the %rsp records the end of the stack frame. The saved %rbp holds the value of %rbp for the caller functions, while the return address holds the address succeeding the call instruction in the caller that transferred control to the function. By corrupting either the saved %rbp or return address an attacker can override the location of the previous stack frame (*stack-pivoting* [40]) or the address the function returns to (*control-flow hijacking* [36]).




Figure 1: Stack layout in the x86-64 architecture (1a). A stack canary (1b ①) is placed on the stack between the local variables (②) and saved `%rbp` value (③) so that the canary will be overwritten in case a stack buffer overflows into the frame record. A shadow stack protects the return address in the frame record (1c). If the frame pointer (`%rbp`) is omitted, the protected stack pointer acts as a canary value (1d).

2.2 Stack canaries

As the exploitation techniques for buffers overflow bugs became prevalent, research into countermeasures resulted in several mitigation schemes [15,48,18] of which *stack canaries* were eventually integrated into mainstream compilers [49,22]. Stack canaries detect a stack buffer overflow before the execution of malicious code can occur. Figure 1b illustrates a function’s stack layout instrumented with stack canaries, where stack canaries (①) are values placed on the stack between a function’s local variables (②), and the stored `%rbp` (③). A linear buffer overflow modifies the stack canary before corrupting stored `%rbp` and return address (④). A check inserted by the compiler before returning from a function detects if the canary has been modified and calls an error-handling routine, `__stack_chk_fail()`, that typically terminates the program, rather than allowing the function to return using a corrupt return address.

Canary values. While the operating principle of stack canaries remains the same across implementations there are different approaches to choosing the canary values which affect their security against adaptive attackers:

Terminator canaries include commonly used terminators such as `'\0'` or `'\n'` to prevent attackers from overflowing buffers beyond the canary without modifying it through misuses of string functions, such as `strcpy`, which copies bytes from the source until a terminator is reached. Non-ASCII characters or invalid Unicode can be added to protect against overflows in text-only protocols.

Random canaries use a random value as the canary. The value is typically generated by the C standard library initialization code and stored in a randomized location in program memory. However, since the reference value must be accessed to set and check it, and because the canary is stored unprotected on the stack, randomized canaries are susceptible to information leakage that reveal their value.

Random XOR canaries are random canaries that are additionally XORed against a non-static value in the program (usually the `%rbp`). In modern operating systems (OSs) that leverage address space layout randomization (ASLR) the `%rbp` value for a particular function invocation will vary across different runs of the program. This adds an extra layer of randomization to the value, making it more difficult to predict.

On x86-64 Linux with the GNU C library (glibc), the stack canary is a 64-bit random value with the final bytes zeroed to make it simultaneously act as a terminator canary.

Variable placement. To improve stack canary efficacy, objects on the stack that are more likely to overflow should be placed closer to the stack canary so that overflows are more likely to overwrite the canary. If there are multiple arrays in a function, arrays further from the canary could overflow into arrays closer to the canary without the overflow being detected. Both GCC and Clang use the following rules when deciding the local variable layout [34]:

- Large arrays and structures containing large arrays (\geq `ssp-buffer-size`) are nearest to the canary.
- Small arrays and structures containing small arrays ($<$ `ssp-buffer-size`) are next nearest to the canary.
- Variables that have had their address taken are the third nearest to the canary.
- Other variables are further still.

Limitations. Stack canaries are often insufficient for stopping sophisticated attacks as they can be bypassed through exploitation primitives that corrupt memory non-sequentially. They also may not protect against data-only attacks [11]. Alternatively, canary values can be guessed or directly read, e.g., by repeated attempts to attack a program that does not change its stack canary after crashing, which can happen when forking, or by exploiting information leaks. Typically, the stack canary value is the same in all functions and can, e.g., be retrieved from uninitialized stack memory from a previous function call [23,6,5]. Nevertheless, stack canaries are routinely enabled by Linux distributions for software that they distribute. A survey of deployed compiler-based mitigations indicates that stack canaries are enabled in 85% of desktop binaries [51].

2.3 Shadow stacks

A shadow stack [10] is a mechanism to protect a function’s stored return address while it resides on the call stack. To achieve this, a copy of the return address is stored in a separate, isolated region of memory area that is not accessible to the attacker. Before the function returns, its stored return address is compared against the protected copy on the shadow stack to ensure the original address has not been modified, for example as a result of a buffer overflow. If there is a mismatch between the return address on the call stack and its copy on the shadow stack, program execution is terminated.

By protecting the integrity of return addresses, shadow stacks ensure that returning from function calls leads back to the respective call site, a form of backward-edge Control-Flow Integrity (CFI) [1]. Attacks that violate CFI have been demonstrated at different levels of semantic granularity, across programming languages, and in the presence of defensive mechanisms [42,17,7,41,6,25,19,5]. The prevalence of ROP, in particular, have prompted processor manufacturers to incorporate hardware support for shadow stacks into all processor architectures including x86-64 [13], AArch64 [14], and RISC-V [47]. On x86-64 hardware shadow-stack support is provided by Intel’s Control-flow Enforcement Technology (CET) as well as AMD’s Shadow Stack hardware features. At the time writing, recent releases of commodity Linux distributions, such as Ubuntu 18.04 ship with the necessary software support for x86-64 shadow stacks, but software built with shadow stack support (`-fcf-protection=return` in GCC 8.0.1 and Clang 7.0.0 and later) must explicitly opt-in to shadow-stack enforcement using a glibc tunable (`glibc.cpu.hwcaps=SHSTK` in glibc 2.39 and later). Additionally, a Linux Kernel 6.6 or later built with `CONFIG_X86_USER_SHADOW_STACK=y` and a CPU with x86-64 shadow stack support (AMD Zen 3 or Intel Tiger Lake, Alder Lake, or Sapphire Rapids and later microarchitectures) is required.

The x86-64 shadow stack is stored in protected pages in a process’ address space and is accessible only through specific instructions. The `call` and `ret` instructions implicitly push, pop, and check return addresses on the call and shadow stack. Figure 1c illustrates the call stack layout with `-fcf-protection` enabled. The layout is identical to Figure 1a, but the integrity of the return address is protected by the comparison to the protected copy on the shadow stack.

Comparison of stack canaries and x86-64 shadow stack. Table 1 shows a high-level comparison between stack canaries and the x86-64 shadow stack. The x86-64 shadow stack operates as a mechanism similar to stack canaries to protect the return address. However, due to its placement, the x86-64 shadow stack cannot protect the frame pointer, whereas stack canaries detect corruption of the frame pointer and the return address. Stack canaries rely on heuristics to determine which functions receive the canary instrumentation based on the option shown in Table 1 (with the exception of `-fstack-protector-all` which applies to all functions). The x86-64 shadow stack applies implicitly to all functions. Stack canaries will detect any linear and contiguous stack buffer overflow that overwrites the canary value but can be bypassed if the canary value becomes known to an adversary that subsequently can overflow the buffer, overwriting the canary with its original value, or if the buffer overflow is not contiguous the adversary can “skip” over the canary without overwriting it. The x86-64 shadow stack

can prevent any use of the overwritten return addresses but may be more easily guessable than stack canaries and could allow overwriting data further down the stack. On the other hand, the return address benefits from ASLR, whereas stack canary entropy derives from the initial value chosen by the glibc initialization code.

Table 1: Comparison between stack canaries and the x86-64 shadow stack

Compiler option	Protection of frame record		Characteristics	
	Frame pointer	Return address	Protection coverage	Enforcement model
Stack Canaries				
<code>-fstack-protector</code>	✓	✓	Heuristic ¹	Probabilistic
<code>-fstack-protector-strong</code>	✓	✓	Heuristic ²	Probabilistic
<code>-fstack-protector-all</code>	✓	✓	All functions	Probabilistic
Shadow stack				
<code>-fcf-protection=return</code>	✗	✓	All functions	Deterministic

¹ : `-fstack-protector` applies stack canaries to any function with character arrays that equal or exceed the `ssp-buffer-size` setting set via `--param=ssp-buffer-size` (8 by default).

² : `-fstack-protector-strong` applies stack canaries to any function that 1) takes the address of any of its local variables on the right-hand-side of an assignment or as part of a function argument, 2) allocates a local array, or a struct or union which contains an array, regardless of the type of length of the array, 3) has explicit local register variables.

Omitting the frame pointer. In Figures 1a to 1c the base pointer register (`%rbp`) serves as a stable reference to the beginning of a function’s stack frame. This is convenient in hand-written assembly and during debugging but compilers can track offsets from the stack pointer register (`%rsp`), and the DWARF debugging format allows access to stack frames without a frame pointer using stored call frame information. The System V application binary interface (ABI) for x86-64 makes the frame pointer optional and modern compilers, including GCC and Clang, consequently omit it by default on x86-64. This saves two instructions in the function prologue and epilogue and makes one additional register (`%rbp`) available for general-purpose use. Omitting the frame pointer precludes the need to protect the saved `%rbp` on the stack, resulting in the stack frame layout shown in Figure 1d. In this configuration, barring register spills, the function’s local variables are allocated immediately adjacent to the protected return address.

3 Methodology and Challenges

As we explain in Section 2, an often overlooked problem in validating compiler-based hardening features is test coverage and assurance of correctness. In normal application development, the codebase is finite and known; developers focus on ensuring that

all code paths within their application are tested and function correctly. Test coverage in this setting aims to exercise as many scenarios as possible within the application’s context. A compiler, in contrast, is used by countless developers to build a variety of applications. When introducing a new security feature into a compiler, developers must ensure that it operates correctly across codebases, not just a single application.

In reality, most security hardening features are tested by just a small number of regression or unit tests [4]. Even widely deployed features, such as stack canaries, can exhibit gaps that affect their effectiveness [24] as applying them to large amounts of code successfully does not necessarily establish their effectiveness; it just demonstrates the feature does not interfere with the normal operation of the code. To evaluate effectiveness, a common approach is to use vulnerable programs, i.e., known Common Vulnerability Enumerations (CVEs). However, CVE-based evaluation is limited both in scope, granularity, and scalability as proof-of-concept exploits are available for relatively few CVEs. A more systematic approach is to use a benchmark suite such as RIPE [50], Juliet [8], RIPLEMB [46] or ReciPE [26].

3.1 Goal and problem statement

The goal of our evaluation is to confirm or reject the following hypotheses:

- H_1 : The detection rates of stack canaries and the x86-64 shadow stack are consistent across different compilers.
- H_2 : The x86-64 shadow stack has comparable effectiveness to stack canaries against linear overflows, particularly in detecting return address corruption.
- H_3 : The x86-64 shadow stack exhibits better performance compared to stack canaries in real-world use cases.

To evaluate H_1 and H_2 , we use the Juliet test suite [8]. It is a collection of C/C++, C#, and Java programs with known defects organized by the corresponding CWE categories. The latest version released in 2017 covers 64099 C/C++ cases, 28942 C# cases, and 28,881 Java cases. Although the test cases in the Juliet suite are artificial, the defects in it are sourced from real-world applications, including known CVEs. Juliet is primarily intended as a benchmark for static program analysis where the structure and syntax of a program’s code are evaluated for potential defects and vulnerabilities without executing it. Nevertheless, the Juliet test cases are portable and self-contained, and the vast majority can be compiled and run on a modern x86-64 system while exhibiting behavior that triggers memory flaws at run time. Juliet is, to the best of our knowledge, the largest dataset of heterogeneous defective code samples available to date. While benchmark suites such as RIPE [50] and ReciPE [26] aim to mimic attacker behavior and vary, for instance, the target memory location that is corrupted, they rely on a low number of templates that, for stack-based overflows in particular, exhibit no variation in the stack layout of surrounding the vulnerable buffer. RIPLEMB [46] is specifically geared towards embedded system evaluation. Consequently, the Juliet C/C++ test suite is best suited for our evaluation of as it offers the largest variance in terms of test cases of the options we considered. That said, using Juliet for run-time evaluation, rather than the static analysis it was designed for, comes with a number of challenges (Section 3.2).

Table 2: Relevant CWE categories in Juliet C/C++ version 1.3.

CWE Category	# Test Cases			
	Total	Excluded	Selected	Detectable
CWE121 Stack-Based Buffer Overflow	4944	96	4848	3562
CWE122 Heap-Based Buffer Overflow	5922	192	5730	1426
CWE124 Buffer Underwrite	2048	96	1952	604
CWE194 Unexpected Sign Extension	1152	384	768	192
CWE195 Signed-to-Unsigned Conversion Error	1152	384	768	288

To evaluate H_3 , we use the SPEC CPU 2017 benchmark suite and report the results in Section 4.2, using `-O2 -march=native` for all cases, with 4 copies for rate tests, and 12 threads for speed tests (corresponding to the number of cores without simultaneous multithreading (SMT)). SMT and ASLR were disabled for all tests.

3.2 Challenges

We identified several challenges in using the Juliet C/C++ test suite to evaluate the effectiveness of stack canaries and the x86-64 shadow stack for stack-based overflows:

Test case selection. Not all of the 118 CWE categories covered by the Juliet test suite exhibit buffer overflow defects. To keep the compilation and run-time of tests manageable, we had to narrow down the subset of test cases to evaluate those that exhibit linear buffer overflow behavior.

Through empirical assessment, we narrow our evaluation to the five CWE categories in Table 2 which exhibit relevant defects. Although our evaluation focuses on stack-based overflows, we found that category “CWE122 Heap-Based Buffer Overflow”, despite its name, includes cases that lead to overflows in stack-based variables. The “CWE194 Unexpected Sign Extension” and “CWE 195 Signed-to-Unsigned Conversion Error” categories include tests that are relevant to our evaluation, as they involve invocations of functions such as `memcpy()` or `memmove()` with incorrect bounds.

Each test case has a “bad” version that exhibits a defect, and one or more “good” versions showing the test case with the defect patched. We exclude the “good” versions from our evaluation. Some tests have “listen” and “connect” variants that act as sources and sinks for the purposes of static analysis but are not accompanied by programs sending or receiving the required data for a fault to occur. We chose to exclude these tests as they are not fully functional. Finally, we exclude tests targeting the Win32 application programming interface (ABI) as we perform our evaluation in a Linux-based environment. The *Detectable* column in Table 2 shows the number of test cases in each category that is detectable by *either* stack canaries or the x86-64 shadow stack. We verified experimentally that the other 113 categories in the Juliet C/C++ test suite do not exhibit defects that are detectable by either of the schemes we evaluate.

Test randomness. Many Juliet test cases include an element of randomness, e.g., control-flow decisions that involve a random value, to prevent compilers from optimizing away certain code paths as dead code. Another source of randomness is ASLR employed in modern OSs, which vary both the location of program code and data segments in memory as well as the starting address of the stack and heap. For our results to be reproducible we had to disable the sources of nondeterminism in the tests, while ensuring that the compiler does not leverage optimizations that benefit from dead code removal or certain types of undefined behavior that the test cases exhibit by design.

To eliminate randomness in tests that use `srand(time(NULL))`; to set a random seed (sometimes multiple times in the program) and the `rand()` function to obtain random values used by the test we used wrapper library interposed through `LD_PRELOAD` to intercept `srand(time(NULL))`; and set a fixed seed value for the test. We also disabled ASLR via the `/proc/sys/kernel/randomize_va_space` kernel interface. A drawback of this approach is that it precludes alternate possible behaviors in some tests but makes the test results consistently reproducible across runs. We also used `env --ignore-environment` in our tests to prevent the influence of environment variables, such as `SWAYSOCK` (specific to our graphical interface) which we have seen to affect test results.

Because stack canary values are randomized by startup code part of `glibc` itself, our approach of interposing `glibc` does not affect stack canary initialization. We found that, in some test cases, the canary value itself is misinterpreted as an address as a result of the overflow, the program to crashes in either a segmentation fault (`SIGSEGV`) or a bus error (`SIGBUS`) depending on the value of the stack canary. This shortcoming could be addressed by patching `glibc` to initialize stack canaries with a fixed value, but we chose to leave the behavior as is and interpret both signals similarly, as valid values should be rare, and both cases correspond to a detection failure in our experimental setup.

Discerning test outcomes. Since both successful detection and failure to detect a buffer overflow are likely to lead to the test program crashing we need to discern between the different outcomes to be able to attribute the crash to either a stack canary check, x86-64 check, or other program crash. In order to determine the reason for the crash, we examine 1) the program output to detect whether it exhibits `*** stack smashing detected ***: terminated`, which is generated by `glibc`'s `__stack_chk_fail` function when stack-canary check fails, 2) the program trace generated using `strace` to attribute segmentation faults with `si_code=SEGV_CPERR` and `si_addr=NULL` to shadow stack violations, or 3) a zero or non-zero exit status and terminations due to `SIGSEGV`, `SIGBUS`, `SIGILL` or `SIGFPE` or as detection failures.

Sensitivity to compiler optimizations and options. Due to the self-contained nature and small size of many Juliet test cases, they are sensitive to various compiler optimizations that can alter the stack layout, e.g., change the order of stack variables, or avoid placing certain variables on the stack altogether. The optimization strategies between `GCC` and `Clang` are not identical, so to account for this variance, we need to repeat our experiments under different optimization levels across `GCC` and `Clang`.

To account for these variations we ran all tests with multiple compilation options. More specifically, we tested differences between the `-O2`, and `-O0` optimizations levels to ensure weaknesses are not simply optimized over, and multiple heuristics for stack canaries, shown in Table 1: stack canaries disabled, stack canaries in every function, and `-fstack-protector-strong` and `-fstack-protector` with values of 4 and 8 for `ssp-buffer-size`.

3.3 Experimental setup

We opted to use a source-based Linux distribution, in this case Gentoo Linux, to ensure that not only the test cases themselves, but also all dependencies were built with the corresponding stack canary and x86-64 shadow stack options and the correct compiler.⁵ We used GCC 13.3.1_p20240614 p1 and Clang version 18.1.8 along with Gentoo’s glibc 2.39-r6, on Gentoo’s Linux Kernel version 6.6.51-gentoo-dist-hardened (system updated on September 30 2024, 8:41 UTC). We used a Intel NUC 13 Pro Mini (NUC13ANK) with 13th Generation Raptor Lake Intel Core™ i7-1360P processor and 14 GB random access memory (RAM) available to Gentoo Linux for our experiments.

4 Evaluation and Results

In this section, we report on the results of the experiments outlined in Section 3.

4.1 Results: Detection of Linear Overflows

Figure 2 illustrates the stack canary and shadow stack results for GCC and Clang under the optimization levels `-O2` and `-O0`. We focus on “bad” versions of Juliet’s test cases as the corrected versions showed no false positives for either stack canaries or the shadow stack. All test cases show better detection rates with `-O0` compared to `-O2`, as the vulnerable code portions are often optimized away under `-O2`. Consequently, for comparison, it is more meaningful to compare the detection rates *within* a certain optimization level than the rates *across* optimization levels.

Stack canary detection rates

Clang demonstrates better detection rate with stack canaries than GCC.

Stack canary detection rates. An overall comparison of the plots in Figure 2 reveals that Clang demonstrates better detection rate with stack canaries than GCC. The `-fstack-protector-all` and `-fstack-protector-strong` options consistently outperform the `-fstack-protector` option, which is expected. The `-fstack-protector-all` option does not perform significantly better than `-fstack-protector-strong`.

⁵ `COMMON_FLAGS` is set to `-O2 -pipe -march=native -fcf-protection, profile is default/linux/amd64/23.0`.

Table 3: Geometric mean of performance degradation based on SPEC CPU 2017 results presented in Figure 3.

Protection variant	intrate	intspeed
stack canaries with “strong” heuristic (<code>-fstack-protector-strong</code>)	0.09%	0.42%
stack canaries in all functions (<code>-fstack-protector-all</code>)	2.18%	3.21%
x86-64 shadow stack	0.99%	0.40%
x86-64 shadow stack with stack canary layout using “strong” heuristic (<code>-fstack-layout-strong</code>)	1.16%	0.34%
x86-64 shadow stack with stack canary layout in all functions (<code>-fstack-layout-all</code>)	0.80%	0.25%

There is a slight difference in favor of `-fstack-protector-all` in the GCC `-O0` case. The number of tests with a stack canary detection with `-fno-stack-protector` is nonzero, because some C library functions, such as `memcpy`, have stack canaries on the system, no matter the compilation options used for the test (there are 8 such GCC tests, and 6 Clang tests). We attribute the differences in detection results between GCC and Clang as follows below:

Differences in stack layout between compilers: In GCC, an array may be placed before another array, while in Clang, the same array may be placed after. This difference in stack layout can result in arrays being positioned closer to the stack canary and return addresses, depending on the compiler.

Differences in handling of `alloca()` calls with constant values: Clang treats `alloca` calls with constant values similarly to a local array declaration, optimizing the allocation accordingly. In contrast, GCC employs a dynamic implementation, which may allocate additional space, particularly at the `-O0` optimization level. This behavior can allow a buffer to overflow with a specific length without modifying the stack canary.

Differences in stack canary options: With the options providing larger function coverage for stack canaries outperforming the weaker heuristics.

x86-64 shadow stack detection rates. When the x86-64 shadow stack is enabled without stack canaries present, its detection rates exceeds those of stack canaries in the `-O2` case for both GCC and Clang, but the `-O0` results are reversed with the best performing stack canary options (`-fstack-protector-all` and `-fstack-protector-strong`) detecting more overflows than the x86-64 shadow stack for both GCC and Clang. Considering all compilation options, there are 1217 tests that the x86-64 shadow stack detects successfully that stack canaries do not, and 163 tests that stack canaries detect that the x86-64 shadow stack does not.

x86-64 shadow stack detection rates

The x86-64 shadow stack does not consistently outperform stack canaries.






Figure 2: Comparison of Juliet test results by compiler, optimization level, and options. The *stack canaries* bars show the detection rates for different stack canary options (indicated in the legend) with the x86-64 shadow stack disabled. The *x86-64 SHSTK* bars show the detection rate for the x86-64 shadow stack separately, and when combined with different stack canary options (indicated in the legend). The *x86-64 SHSTK with canary layout* bars show the detection rate for the proof-of-concept options discussed in Section 5 for Clang -O0 and -O2 configurations. The left axis shows the number of test cases with detections, while the right axis shows the percentage of detected cases relative to the *Selected* test cases shown in Table 2. Raw values are available in Table 4 and Table 5 in the Appendix.



(a) Results on the intrate benchmarks.



(b) Results on the intspeed benchmarks.

Figure 3: Relative performance degradation for SPEC CPU 2017 benchmarks normalized to the baseline with x86-64 shadow stack and stack canaries disabled. The bars for the `-fstack-layout` family of compiler flags show the performance for the proof-of-concept x86-64 shadow stack instrumentation discussed in Section 5.

4.2 Results: Performance

We evaluate the performance impact of different stack canary implementations and the x86-64 shadow stack using the SPEC CPU 2017 intrate and intspeed benchmarks. For the performance evaluation we focus on the `-fstack-protector-strong` and `-fstack-protector-all` options as these outperformed the other `-fstack-protector` variants in the detection of linear overflows experiments (Section 4.1). To improve the consistency of result, we disabled ASLR and SMT. All benchmarks were compiled using Clang compiler with optimization level `-O2` and `-march=native`. We exclude the `548.exchange2_r` benchmark as it is written in Fortran and not supported by Clang.

Table 3 gives an overview of the performance results and Figure 3 shows the relative performance degradation introduced by the different options on individual intspeed and intrate benchmarks. Overall we found that the `-fstack-protector-strong` options degraded performance the least ($\approx 0.09\%$ on rate and $\approx 0.42\%$ on speed) and `-fstack-protector-all` the most ($\approx 2.18\%$ on rate and $\approx 3.21\%$ on speed). The x86-64 shadow stack falls between these stack canary variants by degrading performance by $\approx 0.99\%$ on rate and $\approx 0.40\%$ on speed.

4.3 Conclusions from Evaluation

In Section 3 we set out to confirm or reject our hypotheses:

- H_1 : The detection rates of stack canaries and the x86-64 shadow stack are consistent across different compilers.
- H_2 : The x86-64 shadow stack has comparable effectiveness to stack canaries against linear overflows, particularly in detecting return address corruption.
- H_3 : The x86-64 shadow stack exhibits better performance compared to stack canaries in real-world use cases.

Our conclusions, based on the above evaluation of detection and performance is:

- H_1 : Rejected \times Our results show that different options exhibit different detection rates across compilers.
- H_2 : Rejected \times The x86-64 shadow stack does not consistently outperform stack canaries in terms of detection rates.
- H_3 : Rejected \times We measured consistently larger performance impacts for the x86-64 shadow stack compared to `-fstack-protector-strong` in our benchmarks.

This outcome prompted us to consider whether we could augment the x86-64 shadow stack instrumentation to improve its detection accuracy based on the observation that the substantial differences in overflow detection with stack canaries between compilers are due to differences in stack allocation layout.

5 Improving the x86-64 shadow stack detection accuracy

To improve the x86-64 shadow stack detection accuracy, we implemented a modification to the Clang compiler that apply the stack layouts changes implied by the

`-fstack-protector` family of options without enabling the stack canary instrumentation and checks. To achieve this, we reuse the analyses passes that the stack canary instrumentation uses, but remove the generation of the failure path, check, and stack canary allocation. These simple changes result in a `-fstack-layout` family of options that make local allocations ordered by the rules described in Section 2.2, with large arrays and structures containing large arrays closer to the return address than small arrays and variables. We re-evaluate x86-64 shadow stack detection accuracy when combined with the new `-fstack-layout` family of options. The results for Clang with `-O0` and `-O2` are shown in Figure 2. They show a consistent improvement in x86-64 shadow stack detection accuracy when combined with the new options. We also repeated the performance benchmarks using the x86-64 shadow stack when combined with `-fstack-layout-strong` and report to result in Table 3 and Figure 3. We found the x86-64 shadow stack with `-fstack-layout-strong` and `-fstack-layout-all` to have comparable performance to that the conventional x86-64 shadow stack.

Limitations In some cases, such as when a function spills callee-saved registers⁶ the stack canary is not placed right next to the return address, but also in such a way to protect any spilled register values. An option that would protect these better when the return address itself is used as a “stack canary” would be to consider these as low-risk variables, and placed further from the return address than any other variable. They would still be protected from overruns of any variable, but might be considered less protected against underflows compared to the usual stack canary case. Our current proof-of-concept implementation of the `-fstack-layout` does not alter the placement of such spilled registers.

6 Related Work

The x86-64 shadow stack, particularly Intel’s realization part of CET has seen extensive evaluation focusing on its use in CFI enforcement and its performance overhead [43,9,27]. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to evaluate its effectiveness in replacing conventional stack canaries.

Bierbaumer et al. [5] conduct a thorough evaluation of stack canary security and its relation to shadow stacks. They, however, focus on the safe stack [28], which is only available in Clang and has known compatibility issues and limitations with garbage collection, signal handling, and shared libraries[38].

Alternatives for stack canaries have been proposed before: PCan [32] proposes an Arm Pointer Authentication (PA)-based canary design that employs multiple function-specific canaries. PA is a hardware extension to the Armv8 and Armv9 ISA that principally provides backward-edge CFI, similar to shadow stacks, but operate by embedding short, hardware-generated message authentication codes, referred to as pointer authentication codes (PACs) to return addresses. The PCan proposal, however, overlooks the impact of variable reordering, which we show has a significant impact on the effectiveness of stack canaries.

⁶ `%rbx`, `%rsp`, `%rbp`, and `r12-r15` in the System V ABI [33]

The Clang community is considering proposals for BOLT-based binary analysis tools for evaluating the effectiveness of compiler-based security hardening at the binary level [4]. BOLT [39] is a post-link optimizer built on top of the LLVM framework that utilizes sample-based profiling, principally for performance improvement, but has shown out to be extensible for different types of binary analysis use cases as well. The BOLT-based analysis currently supports backward-edge CFI provided through Arm PA and stack-clash protection [38] in Clang. Binary analysis of hardening features is orthogonal to our work and is focused on validating that the instrumentation is added correctly and consistently by the compiler to the examined binaries. Validation using binary analysis will also benefit greatly from being applied to a large corpus of test cases, which is the focus of this paper.

Similar hardware functionality in other ISAs Hardware-assisted shadow stacks have, in the last decade, become commonplace in several general-purpose computer architectures. The Armv9 architecture also supports, besides PA for backward-edge CFI, a shadow stack implementation referred to as Guarded Control Stack (GCS) [14]. The RISC-V architecture has recently incorporated support for hardware shadow stacks through the *zicfiss* extensions [47]. Each of these features could be considered a candidate for replacing stack canaries. In future work, we plan to evaluate Armv8 and Armv9 PA, extending our analysis to use BOLT-based PA analysis as an additional metric.

7 Conclusion

This research explores the hypothesis that stack canaries and the x86 shadow stack are comparably effective for the detection of linear overflows and return-address corruption across compilers and optimization levels, while we expected the hardware-supported shadow stack to show better runtime performance than stack canaries. We use the Juliet test suite with the GCC and Clang compilers and the SPEC CPU 2017 benchmarks to test these hypotheses. We discover that, regarding stack canaries, compiling with Clang results in substantially better detection rates than compiling with GCC, and that detection is generally better when compiling without optimizations `-O0` in comparison to the commonly used `-O2` optimization level. For `-O2`, the shadow stack generally allows for more overflows to be detected than stack canaries; while again Clang outperforms GCC in detection rates. We believe that our findings should be investigated further by the communities maintaining Clang and GCC. Specifically, the lower-than-expected detection rates when using GCC could be an indication for one compiler being able to choose a better stack layout but may also be the result of biases in the test suite. Our experiments indicate that x86-64 shadow stack is effective in catching programming errors and we experimented with improving this effectiveness by using a stack layout normally generated for stack canaries in Clang, but without executing regular stack canary checks. We evaluate our Clang modifications with the Juliet test suite and observe detection rates substantially above those of stack-canary implementations. The performance impact of the modifications to the shadow stack seem negligible, which could make this configuration a preferable alternative to stack canaries in some use cases and on supported hardware, albeit with the limitation of return addresses being more “guessable”

than random stack canaries. We acknowledge that our evaluation does not enable us to make strong claims regarding the security of the different configurations as the Juliet test suite is not designed to test exploitation methods. Our results further demonstrate that stack-protector implementations have impact on code generation beyond inserting a canary value in the function prologue and epilogue. They also influence stack ordering between different arrays and impact the overall stack layout. This insight suggests that similar considerations should be applied to other return address-protection mechanisms, such as Arm PA, to ensure comprehensive coverage and security.

Acknowledgements

We want to thank Kristof Beyls, William Huhn, Siddhesh Poyarekar and Niklas Lindskog for reviewing an earlier version of this paper. This research is partially funded by the CyberExcellence programme of the Walloon Region, Belgium (grant 2110186).

References

1. Abadi, M. et al.: Control-flow integrity. In: CCS '05 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1102120.1102165>
2. Anderson, J.P.: Computer Security Technology Planning Study Volume 1 - Executive Summary. Tech. Rep. AD-758 206, James P. Anderson and Co. (Oct 1972), <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/citations/AD0758206>
3. Bendersky, E.: Stack frame layout on x86-64. Eli Bendersky's website (Sep 2011), <https://eli.thegreenplace.net/2011/09/06/stack-frame-layout-on-x86-64>
4. Beyls, K.: [RFC] BOLT-based binary analysis tool to verify correctness of security hardening. LLVM Discussion Forums (Apr 2024), <https://discourse.llvm.org/t/78148>
5. Bierbaumer, B. et al.: Smashing the Stack Protector for Fun and Profit. In: Janczewski, L.J., Kutylowski, M. (eds.) ICT Systems Security and Privacy Protection, SEC '18, vol. 529, pp. 293–306. Springer International Publishing (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-99828-2_21
6. Bittau, A. et al.: Hacking Blind. In: S&P '14 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2014.22>
7. Bletsch, T. et al.: Jump-oriented programming: A new class of code-reuse attack. In: ASI-ACCS '11 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1966913.1966919>
8. Boland, T., Black, P.E.: Juliet 1.1 C/C++ and Java Test Suite. *Computer* **45**(10), 88–90 (Oct 2012). <https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2012.345>
9. Burow, N. et al.: Control-Flow Integrity: Precision, Security, and Performance. *ACM Computing Surveys* **50**(1), 1–33 (Jan 2018). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3054924>
10. Burow, N., Zhang, X., Payer, M.: SoK: Shining Light on Shadow Stacks. In: S&P '19 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2019.00076>
11. Cheng, L. et al.: Exploitation Techniques and Defenses for Data-Oriented Attacks. In: SecDev '19 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SecDev.2019.00022>
12. Citizen Lab: BLASTPASS: NSO Group iPhone Zero-Click, Zero-Day Exploit Captured in the Wild. Tech. rep., Citizen Lab, University of Toronto (Sep 2023), <https://citizenlab.ca/2023/09/blastpass-nso-group-iphone-zero-click-zero-day-exploit-captured-in-the-wild/>
13. Corbet, J.: Shadow stacks for user space. LWN.net (Feb 2022), <https://lwn.net/Articles/885220/>

14. Corbet, J.: Shadow stacks for 64-bit Arm systems. LWN.net (Aug 2023), <https://lwn.net/Articles/940403/>
15. Cowan, C. et al.: StackGuard: Automatic Adaptive Detection and Prevention of Buffer-Overflow Attacks. In: USENIX Security '98 (1998), <https://www.usenix.org/legacy/publications/library/proceedings/sec98/cowan.html>
16. CrowdStrike: External Technical Root Cause Analysis — Channel File 291. Tech. rep. (Aug 2024), <https://www.crowdstrike.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/Channel-File-291-Incident-Root-Cause-Analysis-08.06.2024.pdf>
17. Erlingsson, Ú., Younan, Y., Piessens, F.: Low-Level Software Security by Example. In: Stavroulakis, P., Stamp, M. (eds.) Handbook of Information and Communication Security, pp. 633–658. Springer Berlin Heidelberg (2010). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-04117-4_30
18. Etoh, H., Yoda, K.: ProPolice: Protecting from stack-smashing attacks. Tech. Rep. RT0371, IBM Research (Jul 2000), <https://dominoweb.draco.res.ibm.com/reports/rt0371.pdf>
19. Evans, I. et al.: Control Jujutsu: On the Weaknesses of Fine-Grained Control Flow Integrity. In: CCS '15 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2810103.2813646>
20. Google: An update on Memory Safety in Chrome. Google Security Blog (Sep 2021), <https://security.googleblog.com/2021/09/an-update-on-memory-safety-in-chrome.html>
21. Google: Safer with Google: Advancing Memory Safety. Google Security Blog (Oct 2024), <https://security.googleblog.com/2024/10/safer-with-google-advancing-memory.html>
22. Guelton, S., Poyarekar, S.: Use compiler flags for stack protection in GCC and Clang. Red Hat Developer Blog (May 2022), <https://developers.redhat.com/articles/2022/06/02/use-compiler-flags-stack-protection-gcc-and-clang#>
23. Hawkes, B.: Exploiting OpenBSD (2006), https://2006.ruxcon.org/files/2006/hawkes_openbsd.pdf
24. Hebb, T.: CVE-2023-4039: GCC's -fstack-protector fails to guard dynamic stack allocations on ARM64. Meta Red Team X Blog (Sep 2023), <https://rtx.meta.security/mitigation/2023/09/12/CVE-2023-4039.html>
25. Hu, H. et al.: Data-Oriented Programming: On the Expressiveness of Non-control Data Attacks. In: S&P '16 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2016.62>
26. Jiang, Y. et al.: ReCIPE: Revisiting the Evaluation of Memory Error Defenses. In: ASIACCS '22 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3488932.3524127>
27. Kucab, M., Boryło, P., Chołda, P.: Performance Impact of Control Flow Enforcement Technology (CET). In: ICIN '22 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICIN53892.2022.9758089>
28. Kuznetsov, V. et al.: Code-pointer integrity. In: The Continuing Arms Race: Code-Reuse Attacks and Defenses, vol. 18, pp. 81–116. ACM and Morgan & Claypool (Mar 2018), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3129743.3129748>
29. Larabel, M.: Intel Shadow Stack Finally Merged For Linux 6.6. Phoronix (Aug 2023), <https://www.phoronix.com/news/Intel-Shadow-Stack-Linux-6.6>
30. Larabel, M.: Glibc Updated For Recent Linux CET Shadow Stack Support. Phoronix (Jan 2024), <https://www.phoronix.com/news/Glibc-Intel-CET-Shadow-Stack>
31. Levy, E.: Smashing the Stack For Fun and Profit. :: Phrack Magazine :: 7(49) (Nov 1996), <https://phrack.org/issues/49/14.html>
32. Liljestrand, H. et al.: Protecting the stack with PACed canaries. In: SysTEX '19 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3342559.3365336>

33. Lu, H. et al.: System V Application Binary Interface: AMD64 Architecture Processor Supplement (Jan 2018), <https://raw.githubusercontent.com/wiki/hjl-tools/x86-psABI/x86-64-psABI-1.0.pdf>
34. Magee, J.: [cfe-dev] What do the different stack-protector levels protect in Clang? (Apr 2017), <https://lists.llvm.org/pipermail/cfe-dev/2017-April/053662.html>
35. MSRC: A proactive approach to more secure code. Microsoft Security Response Center Blog (Jul 2019), <https://msrc.microsoft.com/blog/2019/07/a-proactive-approach-to-more-secure-code/>
36. Newsome, J.: Detecting and Preventing Control-Flow Hijacking Attacks in Commodity Software. Ph.D. thesis, Carnegie Mellon University (2008)
37. ONCD: Back to the Building Blocks: A Path Toward Secure and Measurable Software. Whitepaper, United States White House Office of the National Cyber Director (2024), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/Final-ONCD-Technical-Report.pdf>
38. OpenSSF contributors: Compiler Options Hardening Guide for C and C++. OpenSSF Best Practices Working Group (Jun 2024), <https://best.openssf.org/Compiler-Hardening-Guides/Compiler-Options-Hardening-Guide-for-C-and-C++>
39. Panchenko, M. et al.: BOLT: A practical binary optimizer for data centers and beyond. In: CGO '19 (2019)
40. Prakash, A., Yin, H.: Defeating ROP Through Denial of Stack Pivot. In: ACSAC '15 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2818000.2818023>
41. Roemer, R. et al.: Return-Oriented Programming: Systems, Languages, and Applications. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst. Secur.* **15**(1), 2:1–2:34 (Mar 2012). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2133375.2133377>
42. Shacham, H.: The geometry of innocent flesh on the bone: Return-into-libc without function calls (on the x86). In: CCS '07 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1315245.1315313>
43. Shanbhogue, V., Gupta, D., Sahita, R.: Security Analysis of Processor Instruction Set Architecture for Enforcing Control-Flow Integrity. In: HASP '19 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3337167.3337175>
44. Synopsys: Heartbleed Bug (Apr 2014), <https://heartbleed.com/>
45. Szekeres, L. et al.: SoK: Eternal War in Memory. In: S&P '13 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2013.13>
46. Tauner, S.: RИPEMB: A framework for assessing hardware-assisted software security schemes in embedded systems. In: ARES '22 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3538969.3539013>
47. Traynor, B.: The RИSC-V Instruction Set Manual Volume I: Unprivileged Architecture, Chapter 35. Control-flow Integrity (CFI) (Nov 2024), <https://github.com/riscv/riscv-isa-manual/releases/tag/riscv-isa-release-ade2bfb-2024-11-28>
48. Vindicator: Stack Shield: A "stack smashing" technique protection tool for Linux (Jan 2000), <https://www.angelfire.com/sk/stackshield/>
49. Whitney, T.: /GS (Buffer Security Check). Microsoft Learn (Mar 2021), <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/cpp/build/reference/gs-buffer-security-check?view=msvc-170>
50. Wilander, J. et al.: RИPE: Runtime intrusion prevention evaluator. In: ACSAC '11 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2076732.2076739>
51. Yu, R. et al.: Building Embedded Systems Like It's 1996. In: NDSS '22 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.14722/ndss.2022.24031>

Appendix

Table 4: Number of Juliet test cases with detections by stack canaries (STKCNRY) or the x86-64 shadow stack (SHSTK), for both for GCC and Clang with optimization levels `-O0` and `-O2`. This is represented graphically in Figure 2. Note that testing for detection by stack canaries and the shadow stack was done separately, as such, we interpreted tests detected by both (at most 12 for a given configuration) as stack canaries triggering after the shadow stack, as stack canaries aren't disabled for shadow stacks test, while the opposite is true.

Detected by	GCC				Clang			
	<code>-O0</code>		<code>-O2</code>		<code>-O0</code>		<code>-O2</code>	
	STKCNRY	SHSTK	STKCNRY	SHSTK	STKCNRY	SHSTK	STKCNRY	SHSTK
Stack canaries								
<code>-fno-stack-protector</code>	8	-	0	-	6	-	0	-
<code>-stack-protector --param=ssp-buffer-size=4</code>	1927	-	533	-	2707	-	903	-
<code>-stack-protector --param=ssp-buffer-size=8</code>	1927	-	518	-	2668	-	887	-
<code>-fstack-protector-all</code>	3017	-	899	-	4182	-	1880	-
<code>-fstack-protector-strong</code>	2991	-	899	-	4182	-	1880	-
x86-64 shadow stack								
<code>-fno-stack-protector</code>	0	2349	0	1102	0	2073	0	2069
<code>-fstack-protector --param=ssp-buffer-size=4</code>	1915	1749	533	600	2707	1095	903	1136
<code>-fstack-protector --param=ssp-buffer-size=8</code>	1915	1749	518	600	2668	1095	887	1147
<code>-fstack-protector-all</code>	3005	731	899	342	4182	499	1880	208
<code>-fstack-protector-strong</code>	2979	761	899	342	4182	499	1880	208

Table 5: Number of Juliet test cases with detections by the x86-64 shadow stack on modified Clang with optimisation levels `-O0` and `-O2` and different stack layout options. This is represented graphically in Figure 2.

x86-64 shadow stack (modified Clang) detections	<code>-O0</code>	<code>-O2</code>
<code>-fstack-layout --param=ssp-buffer-size=4</code>	2067	3051
<code>-fstack-layout --param=ssp-buffer-size=8</code>	3563	3059
<code>-fstack-layout-all</code>	4414	3185
<code>-fstack-layout-strong</code>	4114	3185