

Search-based Trace Diagnostic

Gabriel Araujo, Ricardo Caldas, Federico Formica, Genáina Rodrigues,
Patrizio Pelliccione, *Member, IEEE*, Claudio Menghi, *Member, IEEE*



Abstract—Cyber-physical systems (CPS) development requires verifying whether system behaviors violate their requirements. This analysis often considers system behaviors expressed by execution traces and requirements expressed by signal-based temporal properties. When an execution trace violates a requirement, engineers need to solve the trace diagnostic problem: They need to understand the cause of the breach. Automated trace diagnostic techniques aim to support engineers in the trace diagnostic activity.

This paper proposes search-based trace-diagnostic (SBTD), a novel trace-diagnostic technique for CPS requirements. Unlike existing techniques, SBTD relies on evolutionary search. SBTD starts from a set of candidate diagnoses, applies an evolutionary algorithm iteratively to generate new candidate diagnoses (via mutation, recombination, and selection), and uses a fitness function to determine the qualities of these solutions. Then, a diagnostic generator step is performed to explain the cause of the trace violation. We implemented `Diagnosis`, an SBTD tool for signal-based temporal logic requirements expressed using the Hybrid Logic of Signals (HLS). We evaluated `Diagnosis` by performing 34 experiments for 17 trace-requirements combinations leading to a property violation and by assessing the effectiveness of SBTD in producing informative diagnoses and its efficiency in generating them on a time basis. Our results confirm that `Diagnosis` can produce informative diagnoses in practical time for most of our experiments (33 out of 34).

Index Terms—Diagnostics, Trace checking, Run-time verification, Temporal properties, Cyber-physical systems, Signals

1 INTRODUCTION

Cyber-physical systems (CPS) must typically satisfy requirements expressed using *signal-based temporal properties* [1], [2]. Signal-based temporal properties are a convenient tool to express CPS requirements: They specify how the system should behave over time and rely on signals. Signals are

entities capturing the values assumed by the system variables over time and they can record both the software and physical dynamics of the CPS under analysis [2].

Developing complex CPS requires engineers to test their systems to search for requirements violations. Many testing techniques (e.g., [3]–[10]), compared by existing competitions (e.g., [11]), rely on *trace-checking* to assess whether a trace that records the system behavior for a specific input leads to a requirement violation. For example, `ThEodorE` [12] is a trace-checking tool that supports requirements expressed using the Hybrid Logic of Signals (HLS) [2], an expressive logic to capture CPS requirements. Trace-checking techniques typically consider a trace and a property representing a requirement and return a Boolean verdict: *True* if the trace satisfies the requirement, and *False* otherwise. If the trace satisfies the requirement, testing tools automatically generate new test cases searching for a test case that violates the requirement. In the opposite case, engineers need to inspect the trace to understand the cause of the violation.

Trace-diagnostic approaches consider a trace and a requirement violated by the trace and aim to explain why the requirement is violated. Existing approaches either isolate slices of traces explaining the requirement violation [13]–[16] or check whether traces show common behaviors that lead to the requirement violation [17]–[20]. Recent work [19] showed the applicability of the latter approach for producing diagnoses for signal-based temporal requirements. The approach requires a language-specific library of violation causes and diagnoses. Then, it explores the violation causes and diagnoses within the library, searching for an explanation for the requirement violation.

Two challenges may hamper the applicability of trace-diagnostic solutions in practical scenarios.

- Challenge C1: a library of violation causes and diagnoses is typically required and often unavailable before execution;
- Challenge C2: a valid explanation for the requirement violation within the violation causes and diagnoses might be missing from the library, i.e., none of the violation causes and diagnoses are suitable to explain the requirement violation.

This work mitigates these challenges by proposing search-based trace-diagnostic (SBTD), a novel trace-diagnostic framework for CPS. Unlike existing techniques, SBTD uses an evolutionary search approach to generate new candidate diagnoses. This automated generation enables the dynamic

The first three authors contributed equally to this paper.

G. Araujo, is with University of Brasília, Brasília, Brazil - e-mail: {frutuoso.gabriel@aluno.unb.com}

R. Caldas, is with Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden, - e-mail: {ricardo.caldas@chalmers.se}

F. Formica is with McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada - e-mail: {formica@mcmaster.ca}

G. Rodrigues is with University of Brasília, Brasília, Brazil - e-mail: {genaina@unb.br}

P. Pelliccione is with Gran Sasso Science Institute (GSSI), L'Aquila, Italy - e-mail: {patrizio.pelliccione@gssi.it}

C. Menghi is with the University of Bergamo, Bergamo, Italy and the McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada - e-mail: {claudio.menghi@unibg.it}

creation of new diagnoses and provides two benefits. First, it addresses challenge *C1* since it does not require as input a library of predefined violation causes and diagnoses. This relieves engineers from the time-consuming and error-prone definition of such a library, when it is unavailable. Second, it addresses the challenge *C2* since the dynamic generation of new diagnoses mitigates the risk of ending the trace-diagnostic procedure with no valid explanation for the requirement violation. We defined *Diagnosis*, which is an instance of SBTD that considers properties modeled using the Hybrid Logic of Signals (HLS) [2].

We evaluated our solution by performing 34 experiments involving 17 trace-requirements combinations that led to a property violation coming from *three* different systems: Two from the automotive domain, and one from the robotic domain. We assess the effectiveness of our solution (**RQ1**), i.e., the capability of *Diagnosis* to produce informative diagnoses, and its efficiency (**RQ2**), i.e., the time required to produce these diagnoses. Our results show that *Diagnosis* can produce informative diagnoses within a practical time (47 hours) for most of our experiments (33 out of 34). For the remaining experiment (1 out of 34), the tool could not produce a diagnosis within the time budget (five days). Taking several hours (or a few days) to complete the trace-diagnostic activity is acceptable in many industrial applications (e.g., satellites [21]) where product development requires years to complete.

To summarize, our contributions are as follows:

- search-based trace-diagnostic (SBTD), a novel trace-diagnostic technique for CPS based on evolutionary search (Section 3);
- an SBTD framework that supports properties expressed using the HLS (Section 4);
- the implementation of our SBTD framework, namely *Diagnosis*, which is publicly available;
- an extensive empirical evaluation of our solution (Section 5).

Our paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents our running example from the automotive domain. Section 3 introduces SBTD. Section 4 presents our SBTD framework for HLS. Section 5 evaluates our contribution. Section 6 reflects on our findings. Section 7 discusses related work. Section 8 presents our conclusions.

2 MOTIVATING EXAMPLE

Our running example concerns a vehicle that should follow a trajectory while avoiding obstacles, such as the one presented in Figure 1. The solid and the dashed lines represent the trajectory to be followed and the actual trajectory of the car, respectively.

Engineers specify the requirements of the system using HLS. Figure 2 presents the grammar of HLS from [2], where symbol “|” separates alternatives, TV is a set of timestamp variables, IV is a set of index variables, RV is a set of real-valued variables, and S is a set of signal variables.¹ An HLS *formula* (non-terminal p) is a relational expression over terms, a Boolean expression over formulae, or quantified




Figure 1: Example of failure-revealing scenario.

<i>Formula</i>	$p ::= tm_1 \oplus tm_2 \mid \text{not } p \mid p_1 \ominus p_2$ $\mid \triangleright \tau \text{ in } I_T \text{ such that } p$ $\mid \triangleright \sigma \text{ in } I_J \text{ such that } p$ $\mid \triangleright \rho \text{ such that } p$
<i>Term</i>	$tm ::= tt \mid vt \mid it$
<i>Time Term</i>	$tt ::= \tau \mid t \mid \mathbf{i2t}(it) \mid tt_1 \odot tt_2$
<i>Index Term</i>	$it ::= \sigma \mid j \mid \mathbf{t2i}(tt) \mid it_1 \odot it_2$
<i>Value Term</i>	$vt ::= \rho \mid x \mid (s \ @i \ it) \mid (s \ @t \ tt) \mid vt_1 \odot vt_2$

$t, x \in \mathbb{R}, j \in \mathbb{N}^+, I_T \subseteq \mathbb{R}, I_J \subseteq \mathbb{N}^+, \tau \in TV, \sigma \in IV, \rho \in RV, s \in S$
 $\odot \in \{+, -, *, /\}$;
 $\oplus \in \{>, <, \leq, \geq, =, \neq\}$
 $\ominus \in \{\text{or, and, implies}\}$
 $\triangleright \in \{\text{exists, forall}\}$.

Figure 2: Syntax of HLS.

formulae. Quantified formulae support quantification over timestamp variables ($\triangleright \tau \text{ in } I_T [\dots]$), over index variables ($\triangleright \sigma \text{ in } I_J [\dots]$), or over real-valued variables ($\triangleright \rho [\dots]$), where \triangleright represents the existential (**exists**) or universal (**forall**) quantifier. A *term* (non-terminal tm) is a *time term*, an *index term*, or a *value term*. A *time term* (non-terminal tt) is a timestamp variable τ , a literal denoting a value t , the value returned by the operator **i2t** (“index to timestamp”), or an arithmetic expression over these entities. An *index term* (non-terminal it) is an index variable σ , a literal denoting a value j , the value returned by the operator **t2i** (“time to index”), or an arithmetic expression over these entities. A *value term* (non-terminal vt) is a real-valued variable ρ , a literal denoting a value x , the value of a signal returned by the operators **@i** (“at index”) and **@t** (“at timestamp”), or an arithmetic expression over these entities.

Using HLS, engineers specify the requirement ϕ of the vehicle:

$$\phi ::= \text{forall } \tau_0 \text{ in } [0, \infty) \text{ such that}$$

$$(d_pos_x \ @t (\tau_0) - v_pos_x \ @t (\tau_0)) < 20 \text{ cm and}$$

$$d2obs \ @t (\tau_0) > 50 \text{ cm}$$

This requirement ϕ specifies that, for every time instant τ_0 from the beginning (time 0) to the end (∞) of the simulation, the two following conditions should hold:

- 1) the difference $(d_pos_x \ @t (\tau_0) - v_pos_x \ @t (\tau_0))$ between the desired position (d_pos_x) and the actual

1. We slightly revisited the presentation of the grammar to include derived operators (e.g., **forall**, **and**).

v_pos_x	-0.15	-0.16	5.66	11.87	17.49	19.31
d_pos_x	-0.15	-0.16	7.86	14.56	19.09	19.31
d2obs	6.05	7.05	0.007	2.23	8.44	8.15
timestamp	0	1.0	5.0	11.0	12.5	15.0
position	0	1	2	3	4	5

Record r_2

Figure 3: A fragment of an execution trace for our case study.

vehicle position (v_pos_x) in the x-axis at time τ_0 is lower than a threshold value (20cm), and

- the Euclidean distance ($d2obs$) between the vehicle's border and the obstacle's border is greater than the threshold value (50cm).

The semantics of the background colored boxes will be defined in Section 3 and Section 4. We will use $\phi(\text{and})$, $\phi(\text{20})$, $\phi(\text{50})$ to respectively indicate the operator **and** and the values **20** and **50** contained within the yellow, red, and blue colored background boxes of the requirement ϕ .

Automotive engineers analyze if their system behaves correctly by considering a set of driving scenarios. For example, the scenario from Figure 1 represents a failure-revealing scenario in which the requirement ϕ is not satisfied: while following a desired trajectory (solid line), the course followed by the car (dashed line) causes the vehicle to reach a position ("2" labeled position) with a distance lower than 50cm from the obstacle.

Figure 3 reports a fragment of the execution trace for this driving scenario. Each position of the vehicle from Figure 1 is associated with a trace record that specifies the values assumed by the variables v_pos_x , d_pos_x , and $d2obs$, representing the actual position of the vehicle, the desired position of the vehicle, and the Euclidean distance between vehicle's and the closest obstacle's border, at different simulation times. The values assumed by the variable timestamp represent the time instant of the different trace records. For example, the trace record r_2 specifies that at time instant 5.0s, the position of the vehicle is $v_pos_x = 5.66\text{m}$, the desired position is $d_pos_x = 7.86\text{m}$, and the distance to the closest object's border is $d2obs = 0.007\text{m}$.

When engineers inspect the execution trace, they need to understand the causes of the failure. For example, for the scenario from Figure 1 and the portion of the trace in Figure 3, while following the desired trajectory, the vehicle does not ensure that the distance between the car and the obstacle is higher than 50cm, i.e., at time instant 5.0s the distance is 7mm. Obtaining these explanations is usually challenging; requirements (e.g., expressed in HLS [2] or SB-TempPsy-DSL [19]) typically rely on many temporal operators and may have a complex structure. The goal of SBTd is to support engineers in automatically producing diagnostic information that can be useful for understanding the causes of the failure by relying on a search-based trace-diagnostic approach.

3 SEARCH-BASED TRACE-DIAGNOSTIC

Figure 4 presents an overview of SBTd. The input of SBTd is a trace-requirement combination ($\langle \pi, \phi \rangle$) made by a require-




Figure 4: The search-based trace-diagnostic framework.

ment formalized as a property (ϕ) unsatisfied over the trace (π) and a time budget (b). SBTd either successfully returns a diagnosis d or informs the user that it could not find a diagnosis within the available budget. SBTd works in three steps:

- The *Generator of Mutations* step generates a set Ψ of candidate mutated requirements from a (set of) requirement(s). Our SBTd framework generates mutated requirements with high similarity with the original requirement ϕ which can more likely be informative in explaining the cause of the violation. For example, given the requirement formalized as ϕ of our running example from Section 2, the generator synthesizes the following mutated requirement ϕ' by changing the value $\phi(\text{50})$ reported within the blue colored background box (50cm) into 45cm.

$$\phi' ::= \text{forall } \tau_0 \text{ in } [0, \infty) \text{ such that}$$

$$(d_pos_x @t(\tau_0) - v_pos_x @t(\tau_0)) < \text{20 cm}$$

$$\text{and } d2obs @t(\tau_0) > \text{45 cm}$$

- The *Trace-Checker* step receives a set of mutated requirements Ψ and checks whether each mutated requirement is satisfied or violated by the trace π rendering a set of pairs each associating a trace-requirement combination with a Boolean value indicating whether the requirement is satisfied or violated over the corresponding trace. Considering our running example, when the trace-checker evaluates the mutated requirement ϕ' , it detects that the trace π satisfies the requirement ϕ' and produces the pair $\{\langle \pi, \phi' \rangle, True\}$. The *Trace Checker* component produces a set Δ of pairs $\{\langle \pi, \phi' \rangle, v\}$ made by the trace π , the mutated requirement ϕ' , and the corresponding trace checking verdict v . However, to run the *Diagnostic Generator* step, it is necessary to have at least a certain number of satisfied and violated requirements within the set Δ , such that the *Diagnostic Generator* can produce an informative diagnosis. Therefore, the *Generator of Mutations* and the *Trace-Checker* are executed iteratively and the set Δ is augmented with the newly generated pairs until (at least) a certain number of satisfied and violated requirements are present.

- The *Diagnostic Generator* step analyzes the requirement ϕ and the pairs containing the trace-checking verdicts of the mutated requirements (e.g., $\{\langle \pi, \phi' \rangle, True\}$) to produce a diagnosis. If it can not produce an informative diagnosis, it starts another iteration by running step 1 and by considering a new set of the mutated




Figure 5: Diagnosis generated for our automotive example.²

requirements. Otherwise, it returns the diagnosis to the user.

The algorithm stops by either outputting the informative diagnosis, if found within the time budget (b), or by prompting a message indicating that SBTD could not produce a diagnosis within the time budget.

To illustrate our methodology, Figure 5 presents a decision tree (DT) as the diagnosis of our SBTD for the running example. The diagnosis highlights which sets of changes for $\phi(\text{and})$, $\phi(50)$, $\phi(20)$ can make the formula satisfied. For example, for the considered trace, to make the requirement satisfied, the developer can maintain the **and** logical operator for $\phi(\text{and})$, set a threshold value $\phi(20)$ for the difference between the desired and the actual vehicle position higher than 548.0303cm, and the threshold value $\phi(50)$ for the difference between the vehicle border and the obstacle border lower than 0.6864cm. The tool identifies the values 548.0303cm and 0.6864cm since, for the considered trace, they are respectively the maximum distance between the desired and the actual trajectory, and the minimum distance between the vehicle and the obstacle border. This information shows to the engineer that (a) the vehicle is not precisely following the desired trajectory (the difference between the desired and the actual vehicle position should be increased) to make the requirement satisfied, and (b) the vehicle is also not maintaining the distance from the obstacle (the difference between the vehicle border and the obstacle should be decreased to satisfy the requirement). However, since setting the value for the difference between the vehicle border and the obstacle to 0.6864cm makes the requirement satisfied, the diagnosis also shows that the vehicle does not collide with the obstacle. Changing the **and** logical operator into an **or** enables engineers to understand that making only one of the aforementioned changes makes the requirement satisfied.

SBTD can be customized depending on the type of diagnosis the engineers are looking for. The definition of the diagnosis influences the behavior of the Generator of Mutations and the Diagnostic Generator components. In the first place, the Generator of Mutations should generate requirements that most likely guide the search toward the generation of a suitable diagnosis. Then, the Diagnostic Generator should aggregate the pairs produced by the Trace

Checker based on the type of the desired diagnosis.

4 SEARCH-BASED TRACE DIAGNOSTIC FOR HLS

In this section, we describe an SBTD that supports requirements expressed in HLS. We present change-driven diagnosis (Section 4.1), the type of diagnosis supported by our SBTD instance. We describe the Generator of Mutations (Section 4.2), Trace-Checker (Section 4.3), and Diagnostic Generator (Section 4.4) components that support this type of diagnosis.

4.1 Change-Driven Diagnosis

Change-driven diagnosis explains requirements violations by describing which (set of) change(s) can lead to a requirement satisfied by the trace. For example, the decision tree (DT) reported in Figure 5 explains to engineers which changes applied to the requirement ϕ make it satisfied by the trace. This information helps engineers understand that, although the 50cm safety distance is violated and that the car does not follow the desired trajectory with a tolerance of 20cm, the car does not collide with the obstacle and the car deviates from the desired trajectory by a few meters: Setting the threshold value 0.68cm as safety distance between the car and the vehicle and 548.04cm as the tolerated deviation from the desired trajectory will make the requirement satisfied over the trace.

As our running example shows, engineers can select sub-portions of the requirements the changes should target. For example, for the requirement ϕ from Section 2 the red, yellow, and blue labeled boxes identify the sub-portions of the formula that the changes should refer to. The engineer is interested in how changes affect the satisfaction of the requirement, regarding: (i) the threshold distance between the desired and the actual trajectory of the car ($\phi(20)$), (ii) the threshold distance between the vehicle and the obstacle ($\phi(50)$), and (iii) the logical operator “**and**” ($\phi(\text{and})$) that relates (i) and (ii). Intuitively, changes in the distances enable engineers to understand how the distance between the desired and the actual trajectory of the car and between the vehicle and the obstacle affect requirement satisfaction; changes in the logical operator “**and**” enable engineers to understand if both clauses of the requirements are violated.

²For simplicity, in our running example, we removed the “**implies**” operator from the mutation.

Table 1: Mutation Operators: the table contains the original formula and the mutated formula

OP	Original Formula	Mutated Formula	OP	Original Formula	Mutated Formula
OP1	p	$\text{not } p$	OP9	$it_1 \odot it_2$	$it_1 \odot' it_2$
OP2	$tm_1 \oplus tm_2$	$tm_1 \oplus' tm_2$	OP10	$vt_1 \odot vt_2$	$vt_1 \odot' vt_2$
OP3	$\text{not } p$	p	OP11	t	t'
OP4	$p_1 \ominus p_2$	$p_1 \ominus' p_2$	OP12	j	j'
OP5	$\triangleright \tau \text{ in } I_T \text{ such that } p$	$\triangleright' \tau \text{ in } I_T \text{ such that } p$	OP13	x	x'
OP6	$\triangleright \sigma \text{ in } I_J \text{ such that } p$	$\triangleright' \sigma \text{ in } I_J \text{ such that } p$	OP14	$s @i it$	$s' @i it$
OP7	$\triangleright \rho \text{ such that } p$	$\triangleright' \rho \text{ such that } p$	OP15	$s @t tt$	$s' @t tt$
OP8	$tt_1 \odot tt_2$	$tt_1 \odot' tt_2$			


$\oplus' \in \{>, <, \leq, \geq, =, \neq\} \setminus \{\oplus\}$

$\ominus' \in \{\text{or, and, implies}\} \setminus \{\ominus\}$

$\odot' \in \{+, -, *, /\} \setminus \{\odot\}$;

if $\triangleright = \text{forall}$, then $\triangleright' = \text{exists}$ if $\triangleright = \text{exists}$, then $\triangleright' = \text{forall}$.

$t, t' \in \mathbb{T}$, $j, j' \in \mathbb{J}$, $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}$, $\tau \in TV$, $\sigma \in SV$, $\rho \in RV$, $s, s' \in S$.

(a) AST for the requirement ϕ of our motivating example.(b) AST for the requirement ϕ' .Figure 6: AST of an HLS requirement and its mutation obtained by applying the mutation operator **OP13** to the node with the blue background.

Definition 1 (Change-Driven Diagnosis). Let $\langle \pi, \phi \rangle$ be a trace-requirement combination made by a requirement (ϕ) unsatisfied over the trace (π) and $sub(\phi)$ a portion of the requirement the changes should target. A diagnosis d is a (set of) change(s) in the portion $sub(\phi)$ of the requirement ϕ that makes the requirement ϕ satisfied by π .

An in-depth perspective of the SBTB steps to generate change-driven diagnosis for HLS requirements follows.

4.2 Generator of Mutations

This component receives a (set of) requirement(s) as inputs and generates a set of mutated requirements by sequentially performing the mutation and crossover operations.

The *mutation operations* component considers an HLS requirement and changes the portions of the abstract syntax tree (AST) that refer to the sub-portions of the requirements identified by the engineers. For example, the AST for the requirement ϕ of our motivating example is presented in Figure 6a. The portions of the abstract syntax tree (AST) referring to the sub-portions of the requirements identified by the engineers are identified by colored nodes. Specifically, the nodes referring to the logical operator “and” and the threshold values 20cm and 50cm are with yellow, red, and blue background colors. The operator has to select the number of nodes to mutate between zero and the total

number of nodes of the AST. This selection is related to portions of the requirement that the engineers are interested in. Then, it uses the mutation operators from Table 1 to mutate the nodes of the AST. Depending on the specific application, engineers can specify a subset of operators to be used by the generator of mutations. Operator **OP1** mutates the HLS requirement p into its negation $\text{not } p$. Operator **OP2** mutates the relational operator \oplus by selecting another relational operator \oplus' . Operator **OP3** removes the negation operator from the HLS requirement $\text{not } p$. Operator **OP4** mutates the Boolean operator \ominus used to combine the two requirements p_1 and p_2 by selecting another Boolean operator \ominus' . The operators **OP5**, **OP6**, and **OP7** mutate the existential quantifier **exists** into the universal quantifier **forall** and vice versa. The operators **OP8**, **OP9**, and **OP10** mutate the arithmetic operator \odot by selecting another arithmetic operator \odot' . The operators **OP11**, **OP12**, and **OP13** mutate the time, index and value terms t , j , and x by selecting new values t' , j' , and x' . Finally, the operators **OP14** and **OP15** mutate the value terms $s @i it$ and $s @t tt$ into $s' @i it$ and $s' @t tt$ by selecting a new signal s' . All the mutation operators do not change the structure of the AST of the formula, but only the content of its nodes. In our running example, engineers select the operators **OP4**, that can mutate the logical operator “and”, and the operator **OP13** that can mutate the value terms representing the

threshold values 20cm and 50cm. Figure 6b presents the AST of the requirement ϕ' : An example of a mutation for the AST from Figure 6a of the requirement ϕ of our running example where the operator **OP13** replaces the value “50cm” with the value “45cm”.

The *crossover operator* generates new candidate requirements by (a) selecting a pair of requirements, and (b) combining them. Next, we further explain how our algorithm selects the best pair of requirements by finding the best alignment between requirements, then, we distill how we combine the best pair of requirements by swapping corresponding nodes from the AST trees representing each requirement.

To select the best requirements pair, the crossover operator computes a fitness value for each mutated requirement. The fitness value of each mutated requirement is obtained by comparing the mutated requirement with the original requirement using the score function of a pairwise alignment algorithm, namely Smith–Waterman [22]. Therefore, the fitness value is the score of the best local alignment between requirements such that the higher the fitness the more similar the mutated requirement to the original requirement is. Our choice for rewarding the similarity between requirements is grounded in the idea that fewer, but relevant, mutations in the requirements lead to fewer interactions between term changes, and consequently reduce the effect of the confounding bias [23]. In other words, the higher the similarity between the originally violated and the mutated HLS requirements, the lower the chances of having spurious factors that could incorrectly imply causation between the term changes and the requirement satisfaction (or violation).

Figure 8 demonstrates an example of calculating the fitness value of the mutated requirement ϕ' using the score function of the Smith–Waterman algorithm. The algorithm compares the distance between the original requirement (ϕ) and the mutated requirements (ϕ'), term by term. We use the algorithm as follows³: (i) mapping terms, (ii) calculating the initial scoring matrix, and (iii) collecting the score.

(i) *Mapping terms*. The algorithm maps the terms that can be mutated from both requirements (ϕ and ϕ') enriched with a “null” element to rows and columns of a scoring matrix. For example, Figure 8 represents the scoring matrix SM associated with the requirements ϕ and ϕ' , where the terms that can be mutated in ϕ (i.e., $\phi(20)$, $\phi(\text{and})$, $\phi(50)$) and ϕ' (i.e., $\phi'(20)$, $\phi'(\text{and})$, $\phi'(45)$), are respectively reported in the headers of its rows and columns.

(ii) *Calculating the scoring matrix*. The value zero is associated with matrix cells from rows and columns labeled with the “null” elements. The values of the remaining cells are calculated according to Equation (1).

$$SM[i, j] = \max \begin{cases} SM[i-1, j-1] + s(\phi_i, \phi'_j) \\ SM[i-1, j] + W \\ SM[i, j-1] + W \\ 0 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

The equation specifies that the value of the scoring matrix SM in position i, j , i.e., $SM[i, j]$, depends on the similarity score ($s(\phi_i, \phi'_j)$) of requirement ϕ in position i and requirement ϕ' in position j , with gap score (W , a.k.a. penalty gap). The gap score penalizes formulae that require swapping many terms to be aligned. We set the similarity score $s(\phi_i, \phi'_j)$ to the value 3 when the terms from the column headers i and j coincide, to the value -3 otherwise. We considered the value -2 for the gap score (W).

(iii) *Collecting the score and measuring the fitness*. The score is the highest value in the scoring matrix. In the example from Figure 8, the score is 6 from cell $SM[3, 3]$. Ultimately, we use the score as the fitness value in the following steps of the algorithm.

We implemented two selection methods that use these fitness values:

- 1) Elitism [24], [25]: selects two parents randomly between the best ten formulae following their *fitness*.
- 2) Roulette wheel [24], [25]: selects two parents based on their fitness, where the higher the *fitness*, the higher the probability of being selected.

To combine the pair of HLS requirements, we randomly select a node from the AST of the first requirement and swap it with the corresponding node of the second requirement. For example, Figure 7 presents an example of an application of the mutation operator: The mutation operator selects the sub-tree from the requirement ϕ_1 with the red node as a root (Figure 7a) and swaps it with the corresponding sub-tree from the requirement ϕ_2 (Figure 7b) leading to requirement ϕ_3 (Figure 7c). Notice that, since the mutation operators do not change the structure of the AST, all the requirements have the same structure.

Table 2 lists the set of parameters to be configured by engineers to run the SBTD framework. For example, the crossover rate (CR) is the probability of applying the crossover operator.

The *Generator of Mutations* component generates a set of candidate requirements Ψ , which are then considered by the *Trace checker* component, explained as follows.

For the generator of mutations (1), we developed a Python script (i.e., `ga.py`) that implements the algorithm from Section 4.2. We decided to implement this procedure (instead of using an external library) since this decision enables controlling the data structures used by the algorithms to represent HLS requirements. This decision simplified the implementation of the operators from Table 1 and the fitness metric from Section 4.2.


4.3 Trace-Checker

The trace checker component considers the trace π and the candidate requirements Ψ and verifies which requirements hold on π . This is done by considering each HLS requirement $\phi \in \Psi$, and by running an existing trace-checker that

3. Originally the SW algorithm computes the best local alignment to find the places where the term changes. However, for the purpose of informative diagnosis generation, we are concerned not only with the places of change but also with the domain and range of the values where the change takes place. Such step of our approach is further explained in Section 4.4.

Table 2: Configuration Parameters for our SBTD framework.

ID	Parameter	Textual Description
CR	Crossover rate	Probability of applying the crossover operator.
MR	Mutation rate	Probability of applying the mutation operator.
PS	Population size	Number of requirements considered by the SBTD framework at each iteration.
SA	Selection Algorithm	The algorithm to be chosen for the selection of the requirements (Elitism or Roulette Wheel).
PTBC	Parents to Be Chosen	Number of requirements to be considered as a parent when using Elitism.
MG	Max Generation	Maximum number of iterations in the SBTD.
TS	Tournament Size	Number of requirements that compete to be selected as a parent.
TCTO	Trace check time out	Maximum time allowed for trace check to check a requirement.
PGTO	Program time out	Maximum time allowed for SBTD to find the requested solution.

Figure 7: Example of application of the over operator: the requirement ϕ_3 is obtained from the requirement ϕ_1 by swapping the subtree with the root node with a red background with the corresponding subtree from the requirement ϕ_2 .

	null	$\phi(20)$	$\phi(\text{and})$	$\phi(50)$
null	0	0	0	0
$\phi'(20)$	0	3	1	0
$\phi'(\text{and})$	0	1	6	4
$\phi'(45)$	0	0	4	3

Figure 8: Example of fitness calculation using the score function of the Smith-Waterman algorithm.

can verify whether the requirement holds or not on the trace π , i.e., whether $\pi \models \phi$.

The *Trace Checker* component produces a set Δ of pairs $\{(\pi, \phi'), v\}$ made by the trace π , the mutated requirement ϕ' , and the corresponding trace checking verdict v . These pairs are fed into the *Diagnostic Generator*.

For the trace checker component (2), we used the `THEODORÉ` [12] trace-checking tool since it supports requirements expressed in HLS. `THEODORÉ` can produce three possible verdicts: “satisfied”, if the trace satisfies the requirement, “violated”, if it does not, or “unknown”, if the SMT solver used by `THEODORÉ` to solve the trace-checking problem can not deduce whether the requirement is satisfied or violated. The “unknown” verdict is returned when the underlying SMT technology used by the solver can not produce results for some specific instances of the problem [2]. Therefore, the diagnostic generator component will also create leaves labeled with the “unknown” verdict to explain cases where the trace-checker could not produce any verdict.

1	<code>forall tau_0 in I_T such that p, [0, infinity), and, <, +, ..., satisfied</code>
2	<code>forall tau_0 in I_T such that p, [3, 5), and, >=, r, ..., violated</code>

Figure 9: Entries considered by the learning algorithm.

4.4 Diagnostic Generator

The *Diagnostic Generator* relies on two steps: (a) requirement filtering, and (b) decision-tree computation.

The *requirement filtering* step selects the requirement mutations that are more similar to the original requirement for the computation of the decision tree while ensuring that the number of satisfied and unsatisfied requirements is the same. The requirement filtering ranks the mutated properties using the score function of the Smith–Waterman algorithm (as done by the cross-over operator — Section 4.2) for selecting the requirements to be combined. Then, it selects a subset of requirement mutations with the highest fitness values. The number of selected requirement mutations is defined by the parameter *Parents to Be Chosen* (PTBC) specified by the user (see Table 2).

The *decision-tree* computation works in two steps: *Data Preparation* and *Learning*

Data Preparation – Before running our learning technique, we have to prepare our data. Specifically, we have to represent the AST of each requirement in a format that is processable by a learning technique. We remark that the generator of mutations creates properties by not changing the structure of the AST.

Learning – The learning algorithm processes the input file and classifies the requirements based on the trace-checking verdict (satisfied or violated). We run J48 [26], a widely used ML algorithm [27] that generates decision trees that classify training data. Figure 5 illustrates an example of a resulting decision tree where $\phi(\text{and})$ is the root node of the tree since splitting the $\phi(\text{and})$ operator renders a bigger information gain than a split in $\phi(50)$, $\phi(20)$. Leaf nodes (*True*, *False*) are labeled with the frequency of whether the selected term results in the verdict.

For the diagnostic generator component (3), we used the Java implementation of the C4.5 algorithm [26] available in Weka [28]. We selected the C4.5 algorithm, since it is a widely used learning algorithm for decision trees [27], and Weka, since it is a well-known library of machine learning algorithms [29].

5 EVALUATION

Our evaluation assesses how SBTD can identify the correct cause for violated requirements. To this end, we consider two research questions:

RQ1: How *effective* is SBTD in producing informative diagnoses? (Section 5.2)

To answer this question, we assess how useful the diagnoses produced by SBTD are in detecting the causes of the violations of the requirements.

RQ2: How *efficient* is SBTD in producing informative diagnoses? (Section 5.3)

To answer this question, we assess the time required by SBTD to produce the diagnoses and assess the execution time of the components from Section 4.

To answer our questions we used `Diagnosis` as an instance of an SBTD framework. Our answers are based on the following: benchmark, experimental settings, and tool configuration of `Diagnosis`. Our `Diagnosis` tool has been implemented and is publicly available [30]. An Appendix with a complete analysis of each experiment is also publicly available on Zenodo [31].

5.1 Experiment Setting and Tool Configuration

We considered 17 trace-requirement combinations, made by a trace and a requirement violated by the trace. Out of these combinations, 16 trace-requirement combinations were generated by considering 16 requirements from the ARCH 2023 Competition [11], an international SBST competition for Simulink models. The remaining trace-requirement combination was generated from a recent example from Zhao et al. [32] concerning a robot that should follow a trajectory while avoiding collisions.

The trace-requirement combinations from the ARCH 2023 Competition [11] were extracted from the replication package of two of the tools that participated in the competition (`ARISTEO` [3] and `AThENA-S` [4], [33]), and by considering a trace that violates the requirement that was returned by one of the tools. The traces have a large number of records ($min=1594$, $max=10001$, $Avg=6565.3$, $StdDev=2656.9$). Table 3 contains a textual description of the requirements

we considered in our evaluation. The column ID reports the identifier from the ARCH 2023 competition. Out of the seven models used in the competition, we considered only the Automatic Transmission (AT) and Chasing Cars (CC) since they have the highest number of requirements. The requirement identifiers from the AT and CC models start with “AT” and “CC”. For the robotic scenario, we considered one trace-requirement combination (RR). The requirement [34] specifies that the robot should follow a desired trajectory while avoiding collisions.

Since the requirements from the ARCH competition are formalized in Signal Temporal Logic (STL) [35], and `Diagnosis` supports HLS, we proposed an alternative specification of the requirements in HLS. Table 4 contains the HLS formalization for the requirements from Table 3. Since HLS is more expressive than STL [2], all the requirements could be expressed in HLS.

For each trace-requirement combination, we defined the terms from the requirements that should be considered to understand the causes of the violations. The parts of the requirements and their formalization considered to understand the cause of the violations are colored in Table 3 and Table 4. We performed two experiments for each trace-requirement combination, considering different subsets of terms to be mutated. The two columns of Table 6 report the subset of terms considered for each trace-requirement combination. Considering two subsets of terms to be mutated for each trace-requirement combination led to 34 experiments (17×2) marked in Table 6 with the identifiers *exp1*, *exp2*, ..., *exp34*. The mutation operators to be used for each experiment and the value ranges to be considered to mutate the values of the real-valued variables are reported in Table 6. For example, for the requirement AT1 and experiment *exp1* the tool operator considered the mutation operator **OP13** for changing AT1(120) with threshold values of [100, 140]mph; for experiment *exp2* the operator considered the mutation operators **OP11**, with value ranges of [0, 10]s for AT1(0) and [10, 30]s for AT1(20), and **OP13**, with value range of [100, 140]mph for AT1(120).

To answer the research questions of the evaluation, we configured `Diagnosis` as detailed in Table 5. We set 0.95 as a value for the crossover rate (CR) as done in a recent work [36]. Unlike Nunez et al. [36], who considered 0.10 as a value for the mutation rate (MR), we selected 0.90 to favor the generation of new mutations. The population size is set to 50 properties. We used the roulette wheel as a selection algorithm (SA), as done in a recent work [37]. We set 10 as a value for the parents to be chosen (PTBC) parameter. We set the value of the population size (50) for the tournament size (TS). The maximum number of generations (MG) is configured to stop the search when `Diagnosis` finds 1000 satisfied over the trace. We set a timeout of one hour for the trace-checking activity (TCTO). `Diagnosis` stops if it can not produce a diagnosis within five days (PGTO).

We executed experiments on a large computing platform with 1109 nodes, 64 cores, memory 249G or 2057500M, CPU 2 x AMD Rome 7532 2.40 GHz 256M cache L3.

Table 3: Requirements from our benchmark.

ID	Textual description
AT1	The vehicle’s speed (v) shall be lower than 120 <i>mph</i> ($v \leq 120\text{mph}$) within [0 , 20]s.
AT2	The engine speed (ω) shall be lower than 4750 <i>rpm</i> ($\omega \leq 4750\text{rpm}$) within [0 , 10]s.
AT51	If the transmission enters Gear 1 within the time interval [0 , 30]s, it shall remain in that gear for the next 2.5 s.
AT52	If the transmission enters Gear 2 within the time interval [0 , 30]s, it shall remain in that gear for the next 2.5 s.
AT53	If the transmission enters Gear 3 within the time interval [0 , 30]s, it shall remain in that gear for the next 2.5 s.
AT54	If the transmission enters Gear 4 within the time interval [0 , 30]s, it shall remain in that gear for the next 2.5 s.
AT6a	If the engine speed is lower than 3000 <i>rpm</i> within [0, 30]s, then the vehicle speed shall be lower than 35 <i>mph</i> within [0, 4]s.
AT6b	If the engine speed is lower than 3000 <i>rpm</i> within [0, 30]s, then the vehicle speed shall be lower than 50 <i>mph</i> within [0, 8]s.
AT6c	If the engine speed is lower than 3000 <i>rpm</i> within [0, 30]s, then the vehicle speed shall be lower than 65 <i>mph</i> within [0, 20]s.
AT6abc	The requirements AT6a, AT6b, and AT6c shall be simultaneously satisfied. (Same mutation parameters as AT6c)
CC1	Car 5 shall always be at most 40 m ahead of car 4 within [0 , 100]s
CC2	Within [0 , 70]s, car 5 shall be at least 15 m ahead of car 4 at least once for the next [0 , 30]s.
CC3	At all times within [0, 80]s, for the next 20s, car 2 shall always precede car 1 by at most 20m, or car 5 shall precede car 4 by 40m at least once.
CC4	At all times within [0, 65]s, at least once in the next 30s, car 5 shall always be at least 8 m ahead of car 4 for the next 5s.
CC5	Within [0, 72]s, at least once in the next 8s, if car 2 precedes car 1 by more than 9 m for 5s, then car 5 shall precede car 4 by more than 9 m in the next 15s.
CCx	Within [0 , 50]s, all cars shall always be at least 7.5 m ahead of the car immediately behind it. (The mutation operator is applied only for the distance between cars 4 and 5).
RR	From the beginning (time 0) to the end (∞) of the simulation, the following two conditions should hold: the difference ($d_{\text{pos}_x} @ t(\tau_0) - v_{\text{pos}_x} @ t(\tau_0)$) between the desired position (d_{pos_x}) and the actual robot position (v_{pos_x}) in the x-axis at time τ_0 is lower than a threshold value (20 cm), and the Euclidean distance (d_{obs}) between the robot’s border and the obstacle’s border is greater than the threshold value (50 cm).

5.2 Effectiveness (RQ1)

Our research hypothesis is that SBTD is effective in producing informative diagnoses. We assessed how effective SBTD is in producing informative diagnoses to validate our hypothesis. We compare diagnostics produced using *Diagnosis* to the causes that led to requirement violation, according to an expert.

Methodology. We compared diagnostics and predictions to answer whether SBTD is effective. *Diagnosis* generated diagnostics, an expert synthesized predictions for the requirements from Table 3. The comparison results from experiments with mutated operators, according to valid ranges.

The participants of the experiment were two authors of this paper, one playing the role of the *Diagnosis* tool operator and the other playing the role of the *expert*. The two authors did not exchange information about the experiments during the experimental set. The experimental set followed two steps: (i) cause derivation and (ii) diagnostics and prediction comparison. The experimental set is summarized in Table 6, which maps requirement IDs to independent variables (namely Operators), and valid ranges exercised in each experiment. The colored background in Table 6 maps terms from the Table 3 to mutated operators.

(i) *Cause Derivation.* The *tool operator* and the *expert* worked separately to derive the causes of the violated requirements. The *tool operator* configured *Diagnosis* using the configuration parameters in Table 5. As a result, the *tool operator* collected one decision tree for each experiment. For example, Figure 10a reports the diagnosis for the experiment *exp1* that considers the impact of the value AT1(120) on

the satisfaction of the requirement AT1. The decision tree shows that setting the value of AT1(120) higher and lower than 120.006093 respectively makes the property satisfied or violated since the signal reaches the value 120.006093. Note that the DT leaves contain the same number (1013) of satisfied and unsatisfied requirements since the requirement filtering step ensures that the number of satisfied and unsatisfied requirements is the same.

The *expert* analyzed the violated requirement according to their experience and manually synthesized a prediction. To synthesize the prediction the expert also plotted the trace and tried to reverse-engineer the cause of the violation and express it as a DT. For example, Figure 10b reports the prediction for the experiment *exp1*. Note that, for this example, since the expert can inspect the trace, they can identify the exact condition (>120.022620) that turns the property from violated to satisfied.

(ii) *Diagnostics and Prediction Comparison.* We compared the diagnostics (*tool operator*’s decision trees) and the predictions (*expert*’s decision trees).

For our experiments, the DT produced by the tool operator and the expert can be significantly different: values can be considered in multiple orders and be split various times by each decision tree. Therefore, to compare these DTs we use an empirical approach inspired by the approach presented by Gaaloul et al. [38] originally used to compare software assumptions. The approach requires generating a set of properties by considering 101 assignments for each numerical value mutated by the SBTD algorithm. For example, for *exp2* a set of properties is generated by considering 101 assignments for each variables: for AT1(0) values from

Table 4: HLS formalization for the requirements from Table 3.

ID	HLS formalization
AT1	$\text{forall } \tau_0 \text{ in } [0, 20] \text{ such that } v@t(\tau_0) \leq 120.$
AT2	$\text{forall } \tau_0 \text{ in } [0, 10] \text{ such that } \omega@t(\tau_0) \leq 4750.$
AT51	$\text{forall } \sigma_0 \text{ in } [t2i(0)+1, t2i(30)] \text{ such that } ((\text{gear}@i(\sigma_0-1) \neq 1) \text{ and } (\text{gear}@i(\sigma_0) = 1)) \text{ implies } (\text{forall } \tau_0 \text{ in } [i2t(\sigma_0), i2t(\sigma_0)+2.5] \text{ such that } (\text{gear}@t(\tau_0) = 1)).$
AT52	$\text{forall } \sigma_0 \text{ in } [t2i(0)+1, t2i(30)] \text{ such that } ((\text{gear}@i(\sigma_0-1) \neq 2) \text{ and } (\text{gear}@i(\sigma_0) = 2)) \text{ implies } (\text{forall } \tau_0 \text{ in } [i2t(\sigma_0), i2t(\sigma_0)+2.5] \text{ such that } (\text{gear}@t(\tau_0) = 2)).$
AT53	$\text{forall } \sigma_0 \text{ in } [t2i(0)+1, t2i(30)] \text{ such that } ((\text{gear}@i(\sigma_0-1) \neq 3) \text{ and } (\text{gear}@i(\sigma_0) = 3)) \text{ implies } (\text{forall } \tau_0 \text{ in } [i2t(\sigma_0), i2t(\sigma_0)+2.5] \text{ such that } (\text{gear}@t(\tau_0) = 3)).$
AT54	$\text{forall } \sigma_0 \text{ in } [t2i(0)+1, t2i(30)] \text{ such that } ((\text{gear}@i(\sigma_0-1) \neq 4) \text{ and } (\text{gear}@i(\sigma_0) = 4)) \text{ implies } (\text{forall } \tau_0 \text{ in } [i2t(\sigma_0), i2t(\sigma_0)+2.5] \text{ such that } (\text{gear}@t(\tau_0) = 4)).$
AT6a	$(\text{forall } \tau_0 \text{ in } [0, 30] \text{ such that } \omega@t(\tau_0) < 3000) \text{ implies } (\text{forall } \tau_1 \text{ in } [0, 4] \text{ such that } v@t(\tau_1) < 35).$
AT6b	$(\text{forall } \tau_0 \text{ in } [0, 30] \text{ such that } \omega@t(\tau_0) < 3000) \text{ implies } (\text{forall } \tau_1 \text{ in } [0, 8] \text{ such that } v@t(\tau_1) < 50).$
AT6c	$(\text{forall } \tau_0 \text{ in } [0, 30] \text{ such that } \omega@t(\tau_0) < 3000) \text{ implies } (\text{forall } \tau_1 \text{ in } [0, 20] \text{ such that } v@t(\tau_1) < 65).$
AT6abc	$((\text{forall } \tau_0 \text{ in } [0, 30] \text{ such that } \omega@t(\tau_0) < 3000) \text{ implies } (\text{forall } \tau_1 \text{ in } [0, 4] \text{ such that } v@t(\tau_1) < 35)) \text{ and } ((\text{forall } \tau_2 \text{ in } [0, 30] \text{ such that } \omega@t(\tau_2) < 3000) \text{ implies } (\text{forall } \tau_3 \text{ in } [0, 8] \text{ such that } v@t(\tau_3) < 50)) \text{ and } ((\text{forall } \tau_4 \text{ in } [0, 30] \text{ such that } \omega@t(\tau_4) < 3000) \text{ implies } (\text{forall } \tau_5 \text{ in } [0, 20] \text{ such that } v@t(\tau_5) < 65)).$
CC1	$\text{forall } \tau_0 \text{ in } [0, 100] \text{ such that } ((y5@t(\tau_0) - y4@t(\tau_0)) \leq 40).$
CC2	$\text{forall } \tau_0 \text{ in } [0, 70] \text{ such that } (\text{exists } \tau_1 \text{ in } [\tau_0+0, \tau_0+30] \text{ such that } ((y5@t(\tau_1) - y4@t(\tau_1)) > 15)).$
CC3	$\text{forall } \tau_0 \text{ in } [0, 80] \text{ such that } ((\text{forall } \tau_1 \text{ in } [\tau_0, \tau_0+20] \text{ such that } ((y2@t(\tau_1) - y1@t(\tau_1)) < 20)) \text{ or } (\text{exists } \tau_2 \text{ in } [\tau_0, \tau_0+20] \text{ such that } ((y5@t(\tau_2) - y4@t(\tau_2)) > 40))).$
CC4	$\text{forall } \tau_0 \text{ in } [0, 65] \text{ such that } (\text{exists } \tau_1 \text{ in } [\tau_0, \tau_0+30] \text{ such that } (\text{forall } \tau_2 \text{ in } [\tau_1, \tau_1+5] \text{ such that } ((y5@t(\tau_2) - y4@t(\tau_2)) > 8))).$
CC5	$\text{forall } \tau_0 \text{ in } [0, 72] \text{ such that } (\text{exists } \tau_1 \text{ in } [\tau_0, \tau_0+8] \text{ such that } ((\text{forall } \tau_2 \text{ in } [\tau_1, \tau_1+5] \text{ such that } ((y2@t(\tau_2) - y1@t(\tau_2)) > 9)) \text{ implies } (\text{forall } \tau_3 \text{ in } [\tau_1+5, \tau_1+20] \text{ such that } ((y5@t(\tau_3) - y4@t(\tau_3)) > 9))).$
CCx	$(\text{forall } \tau_0 \text{ in } [0, 50] \text{ such that } ((y5@t(\tau_0) - y4@t(\tau_0)) > 7.5)) \text{ and } (\text{forall } \tau_1 \text{ in } [0, 50] \text{ such that } ((y4@t(\tau_1) - y3@t(\tau_1)) > 7.5)) \text{ and } (\text{forall } \tau_2 \text{ in } [0, 50] \text{ such that } ((y3@t(\tau_2) - y2@t(\tau_2)) > 7.5)) \text{ and } (\text{forall } \tau_3 \text{ in } [0, 50] \text{ such that } ((y2@t(\tau_3) - y1@t(\tau_3)) > 7.5)).$
RR	$\text{forall } \tau_0 \text{ in } [0, \infty] \text{ such that } ((d_pos_x@t(\tau_0) - v_pos_x@t(\tau_0)) < 20 \text{ and } d2obs@t(\tau_0) > 50).$

Figure 10: Diagnostic and prediction for the experiment *exp1*.

Table 5: Values for the configuration parameters of Diagnosis from Table 2.

Parameter	Value	Parameter	Value
CR	0.95	PTBC	10
MR	0.90	MG	1000 satisfied prop.
PS	50	TS	50
TCTO	1 hour	SA	Roulette Wheel
PGTO	5 days		

0 to 10 with increments of 0.1, for AT1(20) values from 10 to 30 with increments of 0.2, and for AT1(120) values from 100 to 140 with increments of 0.4. Considering the combinations of these values leads to a total of 1 030 301 properties. When the mutations also involved logical operators (e.g., *exp26*) this procedure was replicated for all the possible assignments of the logical operators. For example, for *exp26*

the procedure assigned CC3(**forall**), CC3(**forall**), CC3(**and**) to both {**forall**, **forall**, **and**}, {**forall**, **forall**, **or**}, and {**forall**, **exists**, **and**}, and all the remaining combinations of logical operators. For each property, we assessed whether the property was expected to be satisfied or violated according to the DTs produced by the tool operator and the expert. This was done by assessing whether the leaf of the DT associated with that formula was labeled with a *True* or a *False* value. A true positive (TP) is when the property is satisfied according to both the DTs (the one from the tool operator and the one from the expert). A true negative (TN) is when the property is violated according to both DTs. A false positive (FP) is when the property is satisfied by the DT returned by the tool operator and violated by the one produced by the expert. Finally, a false negative (FN) is when the property is violated by the DT returned by the tool operator and satisfied by the one produced by the expert. We analyzed the precision and

Table 6: Mutation operators (Operators) and ranges for the value terms (Ranges) of each experiment (Exp).

Req. ID	Exp.	Operators	Valid Range	Exp.	Operators	Valid Range
AT1	exp1	OP13	[100,140]mph	exp2	OP11, OP11, OP13	[0,10]s, [10,30]s, [100,140]mph
AT2	exp3	OP13	[4700,4800]rpm	exp4	OP11, OP11, OP13	[0,5]s, [5,15]s, [4700,4800]rpm
AT51	exp5	OP11	[0,5]s	exp6	OP11, OP11, OP11	[0,15]s, [15,45]s, [0,5]s
AT52	exp7	OP11	[0,5]s	exp8	OP11, OP11, OP11	[0,15]s, [15,45]s, [0,5]s
AT53	exp9	OP11	[0,5]s	exp10	OP11, OP11, OP11	[0,15]s, [15,45]s, [0,5]s
AT54	exp11	OP11	[0,5]s	exp12	OP11, OP11, OP11	[0,15]s, [15,45]s, [0,5]s
AT6a	exp13*†	OP13, OP13	[2800,3200]rpm, [30,40]mph	exp14*†	OP11, OP13, OP11, OP13	[20,40]s, [2800,3200]rpm, [2,6]s, [30,40]mph
AT6b	exp15*†	OP13, OP13	[2800,3200]rpm, [40,60]mph	exp16*†	OP11, OP13, OP11, OP13	[20,40]s, [2800,3200]rpm, [4,12]s, [40,60]mph
AT6c	exp17*†	OP13, OP13	[2800,3200]rpm, [50,80]mph	exp18*†	OP11, OP13, OP11, OP13	[20,40]s, [2800,3200]rpm, [15,25]s, [50,80]mph
AT6abc	exp19*†	OP13, OP13	[2800,3200]rpm, [50,80]mph	exp20*†	OP11, OP13, OP11, OP13	[20,40]s, [2800,3200]rpm, [15,25]s, [50,80]mph
CC1	exp21†	OP13	[30,50]m	exp22†	OP11, OP11, OP13	[0,50]s, [50,100]s, [30,50]m
CC2	exp23*†	OP11	[0,20]s	exp24*†	OP11, OP11, OP13	[0,20]s, [0,10]s, [12,18]m
CC3	exp25*	OP5	{forall,exists}	exp26*	OP5, OP5, OP4	{forall,exists}, {forall,exists}, {and,or}
CC4	exp27*†	OP13	[6,10]m	exp28*†	OP5, OP5, OP13	{forall,exists}, {forall,exists}, [6,10]m
CC5	exp29*†	OP13, OP13	[7,11]m, [7,11]m	exp30*†	OP2, OP13, OP2, OP13	{>, <}, [7,11]m, {>, <}, [7,11]m
CCx	exp31†	OP13	[5,10]m	exp32†	OP11, OP11, OP13	[0,25]s, [25,75]s, [5,10]m
RR	exp33	OP13, OP4	[500,700]cm, {and,or,implies}	exp34	OP13, OP4, OP13	[500,700]cm, {and,or}, [0,2.5]cm

recall of the method.

Note that, the `ThEodorE` trace-checker returns that a property is violated by a trace when Z3 confirms that the logical formula generated by the trace-checker is satisfiable; It returns that the property is satisfied in the opposite case. In our case, Z3 formula contains quantifiers, we empirically observed that Z3 usually takes longer to confirm the satisfiability of the logical formula, i.e., to show that a property is violated by a trace. Therefore, for some of our experiments in which the trace-checker could return that the property was satisfied by some traces but could not provide the opposite result (marked with an asterisk "*" in Table 6), we assume the property to be violated when the Z3 solver returned "unknown" result, assuming that for these instances the Z3 solver would have returned a "satisfied" verdict with more time available. Our results confirm the validity of this hypothesis for our experiments. Finally, for some of our experiments `Diagnosis` could not generate 1000 satisfied properties (see Table 2) within five days. For those cases (marked with an asterisk "†" in Table 6 and Table 7), we run

the DT computation manually after `Diagnosis` ends.⁴

Results. Running our experiments would have required approximately 109 days. The time was reduced to five days by exploiting the parallelization facilities of our computing platform.

For 33 out of 34 experiments, the SBTD tool could produce a diagnosis within five days. The boxplot from Figure 11 presents the precision ($\frac{TP}{TP+FP}$) and recall ($\frac{TP}{TP+FN}$) of SBTD across the different experiments. SBTD shows a considerable precision ($min=90.2\%$, $max=100.0\%$, $Avg=98.9\%$, $StdDev=2.1\%$) across the different experiments showing that the value ranges for which the requirements are satisfied are confirmed by the expert. SBTD shows a considerable recall ($min=54.6\%$, $max=100.0\%$, $Avg=92.7\%$, $StdDev=12.3\%$) across the different experiments showing that SBTD can identify most of the values for which the requirements are satisfied.

For one out of 34 experiments (*exp25* — identified with a brown background in Table 6), the SBTD could not

4. For *exp26* could not create a thousand mutations since there are only eight possible mutations of the original requirement.




Figure 11: Precision and recall of SBTd across the different experiments. Diamonds depict the average, red lines are the median, and pluses depict the outliers.

produce a diagnosis within five days. For this case, the `ThEodorE` trace-checker leads to the timeout of the SBTd tool. As reported by the authors [2], [12], while supporting an expressive logic (HLS), `ThEodorE` inherits the limitations of the SMT technology used to solve the trace-checking problem, which can require considerable time to solve the satisfiability problem and terminate with an “unknown” result. Note that we assumed that an “unknown” result confirmed the violation of a property only when for some of the generated trace-requirements combinations the trace-checker could confirm that the property was satisfied by the trace. This was not the case for *exp25*, where `ThEodorE` could never produce a trace-checking verdict.

RQ1 - Effectiveness

The results show that our SBTd framework returned an accurate diagnosis for 33 out of 34 experiments. For one of our experiments, the performance limitations of the trace-checker we selected (`ThEodorE`) did not enable our SBTd framework to produce a diagnosis.

5.3 Efficiency (RQ2)

We assessed how efficient SBTd is in producing informative diagnoses as follows.

Methodology. We consider the experiments executed to answer RQ1. We recorded the time `Diagnosis`, and its components (see Section 3), required to produce the diagnoses and analyzed it.

Results. Table 7 reports the total time required by each experiment as well as the time required by the generator of mutations ①, the trace-checker ②, and the diagnostic generator ③. SBTd could produce a diagnosis within 47 hours (*min*=6.1h, *max*=46.7h, *Avg*=14.8h, *StdDev*=9.6h) for 14 experiments. This computational time is acceptable for many applications since it is negligible compared to the development time of the CPS. For 20 out of 34 experiments, SBTd could not generate 1000 satisfied requirements (see

Table 2) within five days (120h). However, as discussed in Section 5.2, forcing the computation of the DT manually leads to accurate results even with fewer satisfied properties. Finally, for experiment *exp25* (labeled with the ‘-’ character in Table 7) `Diagnosis` could not produce a diagnosis within 120h and we could not force its computation manually since `ThEodorE` did not produce a trace-checking verdict for any of the requirement mutations.

RQ2 - Efficiency

Our SBTd framework could produce a diagnosis within 47 hours for 14 of our experiments. For 20 experiments our SBTd did not terminate within five days since it could not generate 1000 satisfied requirements. However, forcing the computation of the diagnosis with fewer satisfied requirements leads to an accurate result. For one of our experiments, `Diagnosis` could not produce a diagnosis.

6 DISCUSSION AND THREATS TO VALIDITY

Our SBTd approach uses DT to express the diagnosis and inherits the limitations of this technology: The DT expresses conjunctions of conditions expressed by its node, and each node of the DT expresses a condition that only refers to one term of the formula. Therefore, we can not learn more complex relations between input signals like the quadratic relation between the upper temporal limit `AT1(20)` and the upper speed limit `AT1(120)` in *exp2*. We plan to address this limitation by considering other ML techniques (e.g., Genetic Programming) in the future.

SBTd is defined to support and complement the activity of expert designers. First, it can automatically synthesize a diagnosis without any human intervention. Second, it can also help experts by confirming their diagnostic witnesses since experts can be wrong or miss corner cases. Third, another advantage of `Diagnosis` is that its activity can be parallelized. While the expert activity is sequential and can not be parallelized, many instances of `Diagnosis` can be executed in parallel by analyzing different trace-requirements combinations. Finally, our results show that SBTd can produce accurate results in a few days. Engineers can wait a few days for an informative diagnosis in many practical scenarios (e.g., safety-critical applications),

Internal Validity. We compared the diagnosis produced by `Diagnosis` with the one proposed by an expert. We remark that our expert has extensive knowledge about our benchmark models. Therefore, it is likely that they are producing accurate diagnoses.

For RQ1, the metric used to compare the DTs produced by the tool and the expert could threaten the internal validity of our results. For experiments in which only one value was mutated, we could have computed the error between the values identified by the expert and the tool as a metric for success. However, this metric would not apply to experiments with multiple values. Our approach enables us to consider these two cases seamlessly.

For RQ1 and RQ2, the values selected for the configuration parameters of our tool (Table 2) threaten the internal validity of our results. For example, the maximum number

Table 7: Time required by our SBTB tool to extract the diagnosis.

ID	Exp.	Tool (total)	Tool ①	Tool ②	Tool ③	Exp.	Tool (total)	Tool ①	Tool ②	Tool ③
AT1	<i>exp1</i>	11.6h	10.5min	11.4h	5.09s	<i>exp2</i>	8.8h	11.5min	8.6h	6.12s
AT2	<i>exp3</i>	7.9h	10.6min	7.7h	6.52s	<i>exp4</i>	6.1h	11.7min	5.9h	6.42s
AT51	<i>exp5</i>	12.5h	18.8min	12.2h	6.17s	<i>exp6</i>	16.1h	20.7min	15.7h	6.67s
AT52	<i>exp7</i>	12.5h	25.1min	12.3h	5.71s	<i>exp8</i>	46.7h	1.63h	45.0h	6.13s
AT53	<i>exp9</i>	22.1h	14.8min	21.9h	6.89s	<i>exp10</i>	13.0h	21.0min	12.7h	7.40s
AT54	<i>exp11</i>	16.5h	17.2min	16.2h	6.02s	<i>exp12</i>	11.5h	14.3min	11.2h	7.74s
AT6a	<i>exp13</i> [†]	120.0h	10.26s	111.3h	1.31s	<i>exp14</i> [†]	120.0h	4.15s	108.6h	2.34s
AT6b	<i>exp15</i> [†]	120.0h	3.56s	111.3h	2.02s	<i>exp16</i> [†]	120.0h	4.89s	105.0h	2.52s
AT6c	<i>exp17</i> [†]	120.0h	5.15s	104.0h	2.17s	<i>exp18</i> [†]	120.0h	3.87s	112.3h	2.50s
AT6abc	<i>exp19</i> [†]	120.0h	10.08s	118.6h	2.37s	<i>exp20</i> [†]	120.0h	19.29s	115.1h	2.95s
CC1	<i>exp21</i> [†]	120.0h	14.10s	113.8h	1.55s	<i>exp22</i> [†]	120.0h	32.85s	114.8h	2.84s
CC2	<i>exp23</i> [†]	120.0h	19.28s	117.3h	2.42s	<i>exp24</i> [†]	120.0h	5.86s	112.5h	2.19s
CC3	<i>exp25</i> [†]	120.0h	0.44s	81.5h	-	<i>exp26</i>	120.0h	0.44s	81.5h	1.24s
CC4	<i>exp27</i> [†]	120.0h	4.27s	91.9h	1.97s	<i>exp28</i> [†]	120.0h	3.75s	107.0h	2.06s
CC5	<i>exp29</i> [†]	120.0h	0.52s	92.9h	1.93s	<i>exp30</i> [†]	120.0h	2.21s	101.3h	2.32s
CCx	<i>exp31</i> [†]	120.0h	3.29s	106.5h	1.96s	<i>exp32</i> [†]	120.0h	2.1min	119.2h	2.69s
RR	<i>exp33</i>	6.4h	6.7min	6.2h	0.12s	<i>exp34</i>	4.6h	1.53min	4.6h	7.70s

of generations (MG) and the usage of the J48 algorithm could have threatened the precision and recall of the SBTB procedure. To have a ballpark estimation of considering a lower value for MG on our results, we repeated *exp2* and *exp4* by setting the value of MG to 100 (instead of 1000). The precision and recall (RQ1) of the SBTB procedure for MG equal 1000 and 100 are comparable: for *exp2* changed respectively from 98.6% and 97.6% (MG=1000) to 96.4% and 89.8% (MG=100), for *exp4* changed respectively from 98.9% and 100.0% (MG=1000) to 100.0% and 100.0% (MG=100). The computation time (RQ2) of the SBTB procedure for *exp2* changed from 8.78h (MG=1000) to 1.12h (MG=100). The computation time (RQ2) of the SBTB procedure for *exp4* changed from 6.16h (MG=1000) to 0.86h (MG=100). While our experiments provide the results for a specific configuration (defined by selecting configuration values from the literature), in practice, engineers should configure the SBTB tool depending on their domain-specific needs and the desired precision and recall.

We selected `ThEodorE` as a trace-checking tool to implement our methodology since it supports complex signal logic specifications. Our experimentation confirms some of the limitations regarding the efficiency of this tool [2]. Specifically, in some of our experiments (e.g., *exp17*, *exp23*, *exp29*), the trace-checker could not provide a verdict within the allotted time. For these cases, the problem was the size of the instance the SMT solver had to consider. In the future, we plan to extend our framework to consider other trace-checking tools. Other trace-checkers (e.g., `dp-Taliro` [39]) are more efficient, but support less expressive languages.

The DTs defined by the experts threaten the internal validity of our results. First, we used the DTs provided by the expert as a ground truth. However, we are not sure that the prediction provided by the expert is correct. The only way to have a correct prediction would have been to verify all the possible requirements with a trace-checker. However, this is impossible since (a) the properties are defined on real numbers (and therefore are infinite), and (b) considering a large subset of properties would have been computationally demanding (e.g., for *exp9* running the trace-checking tool for all the 1030301 properties would have required more than a

year). Second, other engineers could have defined other DTs for our case studies. However, for experiments concerning requirements expressing invariants where a single value is to be considered in the diagnostic activity the procedure followed by the expert is not subjective: The expert defined the DTs by extracting the minimum and maximum values assumed by the signals. For the other requirements, the opinion of the expert penalizes our research. Our expert knows the models from which the traces are obtained and has inspected the traces. However, our expert is not the developer of these models and their opinion about the diagnosis may not be correct. Therefore, when there are mispredictions from the expert (i.e., false positives and false negatives) the expert could be wrong and the tool may produce the correct answer. Considering the opinions of other experts may reduce the number of false positives and negatives in our study.

The selection of HLS could threaten the internal validity of our results. Considering other languages (e.g., `SB-TemPsy-DSL` [1], `Restricted Signals First Order Logic` [40]) for specifying the requirements could lead to different results.

Although the *Generator of Mutations* is a stochastic algorithm that could provide different running times every run, we could not run our experiment multiple times due to limited computational resources. Running our experiment would have required approximately 109 days (reduced to five days by exploiting the parallelization facilities of our computing platform). However, running our experiments for different models and requirements mitigates this threat.

External Validity. The set of trace-requirement combinations we considered in our experiments could threaten the external validity of our results as considering other trace-requirement combinations may lead to different results. However, the requirements of our benchmark refer to different case studies and use different logical operators.

Overfitting and hyperparameter tuning could threaten the external validity of our results, i.e., the same configuration applied to other benchmarks could produce different results. However, our configuration is not experiment-specific: It is shared across all of our experiments including

different models and requirements. Moreover, through the fitness function, we select the parameters that are more likely to explain the cause of the requirement violation across different models of our experiments. Through the informative diagnosis cycle, we identify the ranges of those parameters that are crucial for one to reason why the various requirements were violated. However, due to the stochastic nature of our process, the diagnosis cycle is not guaranteed to find an optimal solution.

7 RELATED WORK

Property violations are typically explained by exploiting some notion of causality (e.g., [15], [18], [41]) to extrapolate the causes of the failure (e.g., an event A is said to be a cause of event B if, had A not happened then B would not have happened). These causes typically refer to portions of (a) the trace (e.g., portions of the trace), or (b) the property (e.g., portions of the property) responsible for the violation.

Approaches that extrapolate information coming from the *trace* typically isolate slices of the traces that contain the causes for the property violation (e.g., [13]–[16], [18], [42]). Other approaches explain the property violation by checking for traces showing common behaviors that lead to the satisfaction and violation of the property (e.g., [17], [20]). Unlike these approaches, *Diagnosis* explains the violation by describing how mutations applied to the property lead to its satisfaction or violation.

Approaches that extrapolate information coming from the *property* (e.g., [19], [43]) typically exploit its structure to provide viable diagnoses. For example, pattern-based diagnostic approaches (e.g., [19]), enrich trace-checking verdicts (i.e., [1]) by exploiting the syntactical structure of the property (i.e., the patterns used to define the property of interest) to compute viable diagnoses. These approaches require engineers to define a predefined set of possible violation causes and corresponding diagnoses upfront or assume a library of violation causes and corresponding diagnoses to be available. Unlike these approaches, *Diagnosis* relies on a novel evolutionary approach that can dynamically generate new diagnoses by applying the mutation and cross-over operators.

Approaches that can explain property violations are also common within the context of model-checking. Most of the existing approaches (e.g., [44]–[50]) are based on deductive reasoning techniques that start from some initial assertions examine how logical operators support the conclusion that the property is violated. Other approaches extract information from the model (e.g., model slices) to explain the model-checking verdict (e.g., [43], [51]–[59]). Explainability was also studied in the context of anomaly detection (see [60] for a recent survey). Recent work also considered how to explain spurious failures detected by test case generation frameworks [61] and via feature engineering [62]. Unlike these approaches, *Diagnosis* produces informative diagnosis in the context of the trace-checking problem domain, a significantly different problem. Additionally, *Diagnosis* relies on an evolutionary approach.

8 CONCLUSION

In this paper we proposed a search-based trace-diagnostic (SBTD) technique to support engineers understanding the cause of violation of CPS requirements. The technique starts from a set of candidate diagnoses and iteratively applies an evolutionary algorithm that exploits mutation, recombination, and selection to generate new candidate diagnoses. A fitness function determines the qualities of the identified solutions. The technique is implemented in a tool named *Diagnosis*, which takes as input signal-based temporal logic requirements expressed using the Hybrid Logic of Signals (HLS). *Diagnosis* is evaluated with respect to *effectiveness* and *efficiency* in producing informative diagnosis. The results of the evaluation, which considers 17 trace-requirements combinations leading to a property violation, confirm that *Diagnosis* can produce informative diagnoses within a practical time.

In future work, we plan to experiment on different case studies, e.g., in the space domain, to check the generality of *Diagnosis*, as well as to better assess its effectiveness and efficiency. We plan also to experiment with languages different from HLS, like SB-TemPsy-DSL or Restricted Signals First-Order Logic, to check to what extent the results in this paper will be confirmed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part by project SERICS (PE00000014) under the NRRP MUR program funded by the EU - NGEU, by the European Union - Next Generation EU. “Sustainable Mobility Center (Centro Nazionale per la Mobilità Sostenibile - CNMS)”, M4C2 - Investment 1.4, Project Code CN_00000023, and by project SERICS (PE00000014) under the NRRP MUR program funded by the EU - NGEU. This work is also supported by the Wallenberg AI, Autonomous Systems and Software Program (WASP) funded by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation. In addition, the work is partially supported by the PNRR MUR project VITALITY (ECS00000041), Spoke 2 ASTRA - “Advanced Space Technologies and Research Alliance”, of the PNRR MUR project CHANGES (PE00000020), Spoke 5 “Science and Technologies for Sustainable Diagnostics of Cultural Heritage”, the PRIN project P2022RSW5W - Robo-Chor: Robot Choreography, the PRIN project 2022JKA4SL - HALO: etHical-aware AdjustabLe autOnomous systems, the European Center Agri-BioSERV (SERvices for AGRIfood and BIOMedicine market), and of the MUR (Italy) Department of Excellence 2023 - 2027 for GSSI. The work of P. Pelliccione was also partially supported by the Centre of EXcellence on Connected, Geo-Localized and Cybersecure Vehicles (EX-Emerge), funded by the Italian Government under CIPE resolution n. 70/2017 (Aug. 7, 2017). The work of Genáina Rodrigues was financed in part by FAPDF under Call 04/2021 and CNPq process 313215/2021-9. This work was enabled in part by support provided by Compute Ontario (computeontario.ca) and the Digital Research Alliance of Canada (alliancecan.ca).

DATA AVAILABILITY

A complete replication package containing the traces, the Decision Trees, and the tool is publicly available [30].

The replication package will be made available on Zenodo upon acceptance.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Boufaied, C. Menghi, D. Bianculli, L. Briand, and Y. I. Parache, "Trace-checking signal-based temporal properties: A model-driven approach," in *International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. IEEE/ACM, 2020, pp. 1004–1015.
- [2] C. Menghi, E. Viganò, D. Bianculli, and L. C. Briand, "Trace-checking CPS properties: Bridging the cyber-physical gap," in *International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE/ACM, 2021, pp. 847–859.
- [3] C. Menghi, S. Nejati, L. Briand, and Y. Isasi Parache, "Approximation-refinement testing of compute-intensive cyber-physical models: An approach based on system identification," in *International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE / ACM, 2020, p. 372–384.
- [4] F. Formica, F. Tony, and C. Menghi, "Search-based software testing driven by automatically generated and manually defined fitness functions," *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, vol. 33, no. 2, 2023.
- [5] M. Waga, "Falsification of cyber-physical systems with robustness-guided black-box checking," in *International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control (HSCC)*. ACM, 2020, paper 11.
- [6] Z. Zhang, D. Lyu, P. Arcaini, L. Ma, I. Hasuo, and J. Zhao, "Effective Hybrid System Falsification Using Monte Carlo Tree Search Guided by QB-Robustness," in *Computer Aided Verification*. Springer, 2021, pp. 595–618.
- [7] (2023 [Online], April) NNFal. <https://gitlab.com/Atanukundu/NNFal>.
- [8] J. Peltomäki and I. Porres, "Requirement falsification for cyber-physical systems using generative models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.20493*, 2023.
- [9] Y. Annpureddy, C. Liu, G. Fainekos, and S. Sankaranarayanan, "S-TaLiRo: A tool for temporal logic falsification for hybrid systems," in *International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*. Springer, 2011, pp. 254–257.
- [10] Q. Thibeault, J. Anderson, A. Chandratre, G. Pedrielli, and G. Fainekos, "PSY-TaLiRo: A Python Toolbox for Search-Based Test Generation for Cyber-Physical Systems," in *Formal Methods for Industrial Critical Systems*. Springer, 2021, pp. 223–231.
- [11] C. Menghi, P. Arcaini, W. Baptista, G. Ernst, G. Fainekos, F. Formica, S. Gon, T. Khandait, A. Kundu, G. Pedrielli et al., "Arch-comp 2023 category report: Falsification," in *International Workshop on Applied Verification of Continuous and Hybrid Systems (ARCH23)*, vol. 96, 2023, pp. 151–169.
- [12] C. Menghi, E. Viganò, D. Bianculli, and L. C. Briand, "Theodore: A trace checker for cps properties," in *2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering: Companion Proceedings (ICSE-Companion)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 183–184.
- [13] T. Ferrère, O. Maler, and D. Ničković, "Trace diagnostics using temporal implicants," in *International Symposium on Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis*. Springer, 2015, pp. 241–258.
- [14] S. Mukherjee and P. Dasgupta, "Computing minimal debugging windows in failure traces of ams assertions," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, vol. 31, no. 11, pp. 1776–1781, 2012.
- [15] I. Beer, S. Ben-David, H. Chockler, A. Orni, and R. Trefler, "Explaining counterexamples using causality," *Formal Methods in System Design*, vol. 40, pp. 20–40, 2012.
- [16] D. Ničković, O. Lebeltel, O. Maler, T. Ferrère, and D. Ulus, "Amt 2.0: qualitative and quantitative trace analysis with extended signal temporal logic," *International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer*, vol. 22, pp. 741–758, 2020.
- [17] J. H. Dawes and G. Reger, "Explaining violations of properties in control-flow temporal logic," in *International Conference on Runtime Verification (RV)*. Springer, 2019, pp. 202–220.
- [18] W. Dou, D. Bianculli, and L. Briand, "Model-driven trace diagnostics for pattern-based temporal specifications," in *International Conference on Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems*, ser. MODELS. ACM/IEEE, 2018, p. 278–288.
- [19] C. Boufaied, C. Menghi, D. Bianculli, and L. C. Briand, "Trace diagnostics for signal-based temporal properties," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 49, no. 5, pp. 3131–3154, 2023.
- [20] Q. Luo, Y. Zhang, C. Lee, D. Jin, P. O. Meredith, T. F. Şerbănuță, and G. Roşu, "Rv-monitor: Efficient parametric runtime verification with simultaneous properties," in *International Conference on Runtime Verification (RV)*. Springer, 2014, pp. 285–300.
- [21] "OHb prime contractor for development and assembly of the LEO-PNT navigation demonstration satellites," <https://www.ohb.de/en/news/ohb-prime-contractor-for-development-and-assembly-of-the-leo-pnt-navigation-demonstration-satellites#:~:text=The%20timetable%20for%20the%20mission,and%20immediately%20go%20into%20operation,> accessed: 2024-06-21.
- [22] T. Smith and M. Waterman, "Identification of common molecular subsequences," *Journal of Molecular Biology*, vol. 147, no. 1, pp. 195–197, 1981.
- [23] J. Pearl, "Statistics and causal inference: A review," *Test*, vol. 12, pp. 281–345, 2003.
- [24] T. M. Mitchell, "Machine learning and data mining," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 42, no. 11, pp. 30–36, 1999.
- [25] D. E. Goldberg, "Genetic and evolutionary algorithms come of age," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 113–120, 1994.
- [26] J. R. Quinlan, *C4. 5: programs for machine learning*. Elsevier, 2014.
- [27] I. H. Witten and E. Frank, "Data mining: practical machine learning tools and techniques with java implementations," *ACM SIGMOD Record*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 76–77, 2002.
- [28] M. Hall, E. Frank, G. Holmes, B. Pfahringer, P. Reutemann, and I. H. Witten, "The weka data mining software: an update," *ACM SIGKDD explorations newsletter*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 10–18, 2009.
- [29] I. H. Witten, E. Frank, M. A. Hall, C. J. Pal, and M. Data, "Practical machine learning tools and techniques," in *Data mining*, vol. 2, no. 4. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier, 2005, pp. 403–413.
- [30] (2024 [Online], January) Diagnosis. <https://github.com/Gastd/ga-hls/tree/main>.
- [31] (2024 [Online], June) Appendix: Tool vs Prediction. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12520834>.
- [32] X.-W. Zhao, Z.-H. Guan, J. Li, X.-H. Zhang, and C.-Y. Chen, "Flocking of multi-agent nonholonomic systems with unknown leader dynamics and relative measurements," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 27, no. 17, pp. 3685–3702, 2017.
- [33] F. Formica, M. M. Mahboob, M. Askarpour, and C. Menghi, "AThENA-S: a Testing Tool for Simulink Models Driven by Software Requirements and Domain Expertise," in *Companion Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on the Foundations of Software Engineering (FSE Companion '24)*. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2024.
- [34] C. W. Reynolds, "Flocks, herds and schools: A distributed behavioral model," in *Proceedings of the 14th Annual Conference on Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques*, ser. SIGGRAPH '87. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 1987, p. 25–34.
- [35] O. Maler and D. Nickovic, "Monitoring temporal properties of continuous signals," in *Formal Techniques, Modelling and Analysis of Timed and Fault-Tolerant Systems*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2004, pp. 152–166.
- [36] L. Nunez-Letamendia, "Fitting the control parameters of a genetic algorithm: An application to technical trading systems design," *European journal of operational research*, vol. 179, no. 3, pp. 847–868, 2007.
- [37] R. Poli, W. B. Langdon, and N. F. McPhee, *A field guide to genetic programming*. Published via <http://lulu.com> and freely available at <http://www.gp-field-guide.org.uk>, 2008, (With contributions by J. R. Koza).
- [38] K. Gaaloul, C. Menghi, S. Nejati, L. C. Briand, and Y. I. Parache, "Combining genetic programming and model checking to generate environment assumptions," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 48, no. 9, pp. 3664–3685, 2021.
- [39] G. E. Fainekos, S. Sankaranarayanan, K. Ueda, and H. Yazarel, "Verification of automotive control applications using S-TaLiRo," in *2012 American Control Conference (ACC)*, 2012, pp. 3567–3572.
- [40] C. Menghi, S. Nejati, K. Gaaloul, and L. C. Briand, "Generating automated and online test oracles for Simulink models with continuous and uncertain behaviors," in *ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2019, pp. 27–38.
- [41] M. Diehl and K. Ramirez-Amaro, "Why Did I Fail? A Causal-Based Method to Find Explanations for Robot Failures," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, pp. 1–8, 2022.
- [42] C. Stratan, J. Dawes, and D. Bianculli, "Diagnosing Violations of Time-based Properties Captured in iCFTL," in *FormalISE'24*:

- International Conference on Formal Methods in Software Engineering*. ACM, New York, United States-New York, 2024.
- [43] M. Chechik and A. Gurfinkel, “A framework for counterexample generation and exploration,” *International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer*, vol. 9, pp. 429–445, 2007.
- [44] D. Peled and L. Zuck, “From model checking to a temporal proof,” in *Model Checking Software*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2001, pp. 1–14.
- [45] A. Bernasconi, C. Menghi, P. Spoletini, L. D. Zuck, and C. Ghezzi, “From model checking to a temporal proof for partial models,” in *Software Engineering and Formal Methods*, ser. SEFM 2017. Cham: Springer, 2017, pp. 54–69.
- [46] D. Peled, A. Pnueli, and L. Zuck, “From falsification to verification,” in *FST TCS 2001: Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2001, pp. 292–304.
- [47] A. Mebsout and C. Tinelli, “Proof certificates for SMT-based model checkers for infinite-state systems,” in *2016 Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design (FMCAD)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 117–124.
- [48] D. Basin, B. N. Bhatt, and D. Traytel, “Optimal proofs for linear temporal logic on lasso words,” in *Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis*. Cham: Springer, 2018, pp. 37–55.
- [49] A. Pnueli and Y. Kesten, “A deductive proof system for ctl,” in *International Conference on Concurrency Theory*. Springer, 2002, pp. 24–40.
- [50] I. Balaban, A. Pnueli, and L. D. Zuck, “Proving the refuted: Symbolic model checkers as proof generators,” *Concurrency, Compositionality, and Correctness: Essays in Honor of Willem-Paul de Roever*, pp. 221–236, 2010.
- [51] C. Menghi, A. M. Rizzi, and A. Bernasconi, “Integrating topological proofs with model checking to instrument iterative design,” in *Fundamental Approaches to Software Engineering*, 2020, pp. 53–74.
- [52] V. Schuppan, “Towards a notion of unsatisfiable and unrealizable cores for ltl,” *Science of Computer Programming*, vol. 77, no. 7-8, pp. 908–939, 2012.
- [53] F. Hantry and M.-S. Hacid, “Handling Conflicts in Depth-First-Search for LTL Tableau to Debug Compliance Based Languages,” in *Fifth Workshop on Formal Languages and Analysis of Contract-Oriented Software (FLACOS)*. Málaga, Spain: Open Publishing Association, 2011, pp. 39–53.
- [54] G. Zheng, T. Nguyen, S. G. Brida, G. Regis, M. F. Frias, N. Aguirre, and H. Bagheri, “Flack: Counterexample-guided fault localization for alloy models,” in *2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 637–648.
- [55] T. Bochot, P. Virelizier, H. Waeselyneck, and V. Wiels, “Paths to property violation: A structural approach for analyzing counterexamples,” in *2010 IEEE 12th International Symposium on High Assurance Systems Engineering*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 74–83.
- [56] A. Griggio, M. Roveri, and S. Tonetta, “Certifying proofs for LTL model checking,” in *2018 Formal Methods in Computer Aided Design (FMCAD)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–9.
- [57] F. Funke, S. Jantsch, and C. Baier, “Farkas certificates and minimal witnesses for probabilistic reachability constraints,” in *International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*. Springer, 2020, pp. 324–345.
- [58] N. Timm, S. Gruner, M. Nxumalo, and J. Botha, “Model checking safety and liveness via k-induction and witness refinement with constraint generation,” *Science of computer programming*, vol. 200, p. 102532, 2020.
- [59] A. Gurfinkel and M. Chechik, “Proof-like counter-examples,” in *International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems (TACAS)*. Springer, 2003, pp. 160–175.
- [60] Z. Li, Y. Zhu, and M. Van Leeuwen, “A survey on explainable anomaly detection,” *Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 1–54, 2023.
- [61] B. A. Jodat, A. Chandar, S. Nejati, and M. Sabetzadeh, “Test generation strategies for building failure models and explaining spurious failures,” *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 1–32, 2024.
- [62] J. P. C. de Araujo, G. N. Rodrigues, M. Carwehl, T. Vogel, L. Grunske, R. Caldas, and P. Pelliccione, “Explainability for property violations in cyber-physical systems: An immune-inspired approach,” *IEEE Software*, 2024.