

A Modular Program-Transformation Framework for Reducing Specifications to Reachability

DIRK BEYER, LMU Munich, Germany

MAREK JANKOLA, LMU Munich, Germany

MARIAN LINGSCH-ROSENFELD, LMU Munich, Germany

TIAN XIA, LMU Munich, Germany

XIYUE ZHENG, LMU Munich, Germany

Software verification is a complex problem, and verification tools need significant tuning to achieve high performance. Due to this, many verifiers choose to specialize on reachability properties, or invest the time to implement known transformations from the given specification to reachability on their internal representations. To improve this situation, we provide transformations as stand-alone components, modifying the input program instead of the internal representation, enabling their usage as a preprocessing step by other verifiers. This way, we separate two concerns: improving the performance of reachability analyses and implementing efficient transformations of arbitrary specifications to reachability. We implement the transformations in a framework that is based on *instrumentation automata*, inspired by the BLAST query language. In our initial study, we support three important concrete specifications for C programs: *termination*, *no-overflow*, and *memory cleanup*. Moreover, we discuss the broader expressiveness of our framework and show how general liveness properties can be transformed to reachability. We demonstrate the effectiveness and efficiency of our transformations by comparing verifiers that support the specifications natively with verifiers for reachability applied on the transformed programs. The results are very promising: Our transformations can extend existing verifiers to be effective on specifications that they do not support natively, and that the efficiency is often similar to verifiers that natively support the considered specifications.

CCS Concepts: • **Software and its engineering** → **Formal software verification**; *Formal methods*; • **Theory of computation** → *Verification by model checking*; *Program reasoning*.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Formal Verification, Model Checking, Software Verification, Program Analysis, Specification, Monitoring, Specification Reduction, Reachability

1 Introduction

Software verification is the problem to decide, for a given program P and specification φ , whether the program P satisfies its specification φ , in short: $P \models \varphi$. Due to the complexity of the problem, verification tools need significant tuning to achieve high performance. Because of this, many verifiers choose to specialize on reachability properties or invest time to implement known transformations from given specifications to reachability on their internal representations. Considering an overview of all tools for software verification that participated in the competition on software verification (SV-COMP) [15], we see that many verification tools (more than 30) support a basic reachability property and have focused on tuning their algorithms towards best performance on such tasks. A lot fewer tools also support other specifications, such as no-overflows or termination, since adding support for these properties is a time-consuming process.

To address this issue, a software verifier can be constructed in two ways: (a) implement a verification algorithm for $P \models \varphi$ or (b) transform the problem in order to solve it using an existing algorithm. The transformation-based approach consists of two steps and assumes that an existing

Authors' Contact Information: [Dirk Beyer](mailto:Dirk.Beyer@fosy.uni-lmu.de), Institute for Informatics, LMU Munich, Munich, Germany, dirk.beyer@fosy.uni-lmu.de; [Marek Jankola](mailto:Marek.Jankola@fosy.uni-lmu.de), Institute for Informatics, LMU Munich, Munich, Germany, marek.jankola@fosy.uni-lmu.de; [Marian Lingsch-Rosenfeld](mailto:Marian.Lingsch-Rosenfeld@fosy.uni-lmu.de), Institute for Informatics, LMU Munich, Munich, Germany, marian.lingsch@fosy.uni-lmu.de; [Tian Xia](mailto:Tian.Xia@fosy.uni-lmu.de), Institute for Informatics, LMU Munich, Munich, Germany, xiatian1996cd@gmail.com; [Xiyue Zheng](mailto:Xiyue.Zheng@fosy.uni-lmu.de), Institute for Informatics, LMU Munich, Munich, Germany, xiyuezheng@outlook.com.

verifier v supports a specification φ' . In the first step, the problem $P \models \varphi$ is transformed to a problem $P' \models \varphi'$, such that $P \models \varphi$ holds if and only if $P' \models \varphi'$ holds. In the second step, the problem $P' \models \varphi'$ is solved by the existing verifier v . The transformation is also called a *reduction* from $P \models \varphi$ to $P' \models \varphi'$. Several verification tools choose to use transformations [8, 37, 46] since transformations allow for a separation of concerns: (1) implement a rich set of specifications and (2) tune the performance of specialized algorithms for one particular specification. For example, given a verifier that supports reachability, the verifier can be extended to support other specifications, like termination and no-overflow, for which a transformation to reachability is available.

Currently, every verification tool desiring to benefit from transformations needs to support further properties requires a re-implementation of the transformation. The goal of this paper is to show that it is possible (a) to construct verifiers in a *modular* way from independent components, that is, compose an ‘off-the-shelf’ transformation with an ‘off-the-shelf’ verifier, such that a transformation can be used with arbitrary verifiers for C programs to support more kinds of specifications, (b) that transformation-based approaches can be even more efficient than native support for specifications, and (c) that the standalone transformations do not necessarily lead to a performance decrease in comparison to tool-specific implementations for checking the input specification (with an internal transformation step).

To achieve this, we envision a transformation framework for software verification, in which developers write specifications at a high-level as *instrumentation automata* (*IA*), which contain instructions to monitor the program execution. They are inspired by the BLAST query language [17] and SLIC [12], which is a specification language for SLAM [13]. Both specification languages are based on monitor automata and have shown to be useful in practice, since the convenient and succinct notation of monitor automata is often easier to understand than LTL formulas. Instrumentation automata observe the state of the program in the same manner as monitor automata: they raise an error when appropriate. Monitor automata can be implemented either by instrumentation of the monitor into the program code [12, 17] or by an implicit on-the-fly product construction in which the monitor is a separate analysis component [23, 69]. Instrumentation automata are very similar to monitor automata, but they are used to instrument the monitor into the code.

To showcase our approach, we have implemented three transformations that reduce verification problems, for which the specification is to check *termination*, *memory cleanup*, or (arithmetic) *no-overflows*, to verification problems for which the specification is to check reachability. Those three kinds of specifications are important and often used, because we want programs to not hang but progress with useful computation (termination), we want the programs to free all allocated memory such that we can use the programs as components as part of other programs (memory cleanup), and we want the software to not run into undefined behavior, like signed-integer overflow, and always have values within their types (no-overflows).

In summary, the advantage of our approach is to support a clear separation of concerns, because the concern of optimizing a verification algorithm (for reachability) is now completely independent from checking whether a (non-reachability) specification is satisfied. This opens new opportunities, for example, using testing tools to check for violations of any specification that can be instrumented into the program. It is now possible to construct a fuzzing-based non-termination checker without spending any development effort on the fuzzing tool. All it takes is to develop the instrumentation automaton for our transformation framework.

Contributions. We make the following contributions:

- We propose a verifier-independent, modular transformation framework for instrumentation of C programs, such that verifiers for reachability can be used also for other specifications as well (inspired by existing approaches [17, 68]).

- We offer an implementation of our transformation framework in tool `TRANSVER`¹ that can be used to extend existing verifiers—in a black-box manner—to support more specifications without changing the code of the existing verifier.
- We conduct an experimental evaluation on a large benchmark set of C programs, which shows that we can effectively extend existing verifiers to specifications that they did not support before (RQ 1), verifiers combined with transformations are performing really well and often outperform tools specialized in verifying the original property (RQ 2, RQ 3), and it does not pay off to implement transformations inside a verifier, that is, verifiers with internal transformations are not necessarily more efficient than a composition using our transformation framework and an ‘off-the-shelf’ verifier (RQ 4).

2 Related Work

Program transformations have a wide variety of applications [62, 71]. We use the following classification of transformers in formal methods [24]: transformers that (a) simplify a model (in the same language) so that it is easier to verify, named *Reducers*, (b) convert a verification task to an equisatisfiable task with a different specification, named *Specification Transformers*, and (c) expand a model (in the same language) to record information for further analysis, called *Instrumentors*. Our approach is a specification transformer that uses an instrumentor to expand the program.

There are *reducers* that remove complicated language constructs, for example, by sequentializing concurrent programs [43, 50], by using shadow memory [51, 72], by reducing the program to a simplified syntax [37, 60], or by merging multiple loops into one single loop [3, 4]. There are also reducers that focus on improving the performance of the verification process, replacing program constructs (for example, loops) by constructs that are easier to verify [25, 26, 44, 52, 55, 70]. Sometimes they use information from run-time verification to ease the static analysis [32].

Specifications transformers convert a problem $P \models \varphi$ to a problem $P' \models \varphi'$. This makes it possible to use algorithms for the verification of φ' to also verify φ [21, 30, 31, 35, 46, 66–68, 73]. Specifications transformers are also used for testing, in order to transform a program and a coverage specification to another program and coverage specification, such that existing tools for test generation or test-suite analysis can be used [47, 48]. Our work focuses on this kind of program transformation. We improve over existing works by two aspects: modularity and generality. Outputting a modified C program makes the application of any C verifier that supports reachability effortless. Moreover, we demonstrate that our framework supports transformations of multiple properties.

Instrumentors are used to add code to the program that is used to collect information for further analysis. A recently proposed instrumentation approach [6] can speed up the verification of programs containing operations over arrays using ghost variables and rewriting rules. The two main differences between our and the mentioned approach are (a) that we transform the task from other specifications to reachability specifications, and the above-mentioned approach transforms programs with extended quantifiers in assertions to programs with simpler assertions and (b) the ordering of instrumentation. The approach [6] provides a set of rewrite rules that are applied based on the syntax of the program. Under some conditions, the instrumentations can only introduce false errors but will not miss the errors that were in the original program (soundness). Therefore, the approach tries multiple orderings of the application of the rewriting rules. Then, if a counterexample is found, they follow the counterexample-guided abstraction refinement (CEGAR) approach to try different orders of the rewriting rules. Our instrumentation framework monitors the syntax of the program and also semantic structures. For example, the termination transformation would not be correct if we cannot monitor loops implied by recursive calls of functions or goto jumps. Moreover,

¹<https://gitlab.com/sosy-lab/software/transver>




Fig. 1. An example program (left) with a corresponding CFA (right)

the instrumentation automata provide an implicit ordering of the instrumentation. Hence, we construct only one instrumented program and do not need to refine it based on counterexamples.

Other approaches use instrumentors to express the verification goal as part of the program to be verified. This has been studied for a variety of applications. One such example is in the context of verification witnesses [7, 18] in the case of MetaVal [28], which creates a product of the witness and the program. Another example is proof-carrying code [59], where the proof is embedded into the program. Furthermore, adding the specification into the program allows for its run-time monitoring [38, 54, 61].

3 Background

Control-Flow Automata (CFA). We model the control-flow of C programs as *control-flow automaton* [20]. A CFA is a tuple (L, l_0, G) , where L is a finite set of locations (or nodes), $l_0 \in L$ is the initial location and $G \subseteq L \times Opt \times L$ is a set of edges between locations, which represent the operations in the program. We consider the following special functions; `nondet()` which returns a nondeterministic value and `assert(π)` describes a safety condition π on the variables that should always hold at its location. In the case of memory-cleanup transformation, we also allow calls to the standard memory-allocation functions `malloc`, `calloc`, `realloc` and `free`. Figure 1 shows an example of a program and a corresponding CFA. In practice, we also store the information about type of variables and expressions used on the edges of CFA. In this paper, a *state* of a program is a mapping of the variables to values.

We assume that the CFA is constructed from a C program such that every edge contains at most a single operation as is done by CPACHECKER [23].

Specifications. One of the most prominent specification languages for behavioral properties is linear-time temporal logic (LTL) [65]. One standard way to implement a model checker for LTL is to transform the LTL formula into a Büchi automaton and check the product of its complement and the model of the implementation for emptiness. Several transformation tools that transform specifications from LTL to Büchi automata are available (e.g., Spot [42] and LTL2BA [45]). There are also model checkers that offer to write down specifications directly as monitor automata, such as BLAST [22] with the BLAST query language [17] or SLAM with its specification language SLIC.

In the International Competition on Software Verification (SVCOMP) [15] tools compete in verifying multiple practical LTL properties². Table 1 lists the properties from SV-COMP, for which

²<https://sv-comp.sosy-lab.org/2024/rules.php>

Table 1. Specifications considered in this work

Specification	Explanation
<i>reachability</i>	No execution of the program violates condition π at the location with operation <code>assert(π)</code> .
<i>no-overflow</i>	No execution of the program produces a signed integer result of an operation whose value is outside the range of the C type <code>int</code> .
<i>termination</i>	Every execution of the program eventually terminates.
<i>memory cleanup</i>	No execution of the program allocates a pointer and then finishes without freeing it, or frees the same pointer twice.
<i>explicit liveness</i>	Every infinite execution of the program satisfies π at the location with <code>assert_live(π)</code> infinitely often.

we demonstrate transformations within our framework in Sect. 5. Coming back to LTL, there are two important subclasses of LTL formulas: *safety* and *liveness*. Any LTL formula can be decomposed into a conjunction of subformulas of these types [64]. Furthermore it has been shown even liveness properties, an important subclass of LTL properties, can be reduced to safety [68]. Therefore, if a verifier supports general safety specifications, in principle it can verify any LTL formula.

Safety properties hold for every reachable state in every execution. They are violated if there is a reachable state that violates this property. In SV-COMP the most general version of this property is reachability. It is a very modular property, since one can explicitly encode multiple properties as assertions. Therefore, it is very natural to express other specifications as reachability. Further reasons to reduce specifications to this property is the high interest in reachability by the software verification [15], hardware verification [34, 57], and automated testing community [5, 14, 33].

Liveness properties describe desirable properties on states that should be satisfied by every infinite execution infinitely often. A liveness property is violated if there exists an infinite execution that, from some point, never satisfies the specified property on the states. The main example of this property in SV-COMP is termination. However, SV-COMP does not introduce a general liveness property similar to reachability for safety. Therefore, we define *explicit liveness* that expresses the conditions on the states explicitly with special labels similar to `assert` for reachability. While liveness properties may appear more complex than safety properties, they can be reduced to them for any finite system [68]. We show, how to perform such transformation in our framework in Sect. 6. Therefore it is feasible for verifiers to concentrate on safety properties and use the transformation to verify liveness properties.

4 Transformation Framework

Figure 2 presents the workflow of our transformation framework. It takes as an input a program P and a specification φ . The user first needs to formalize the property in the context of instrumentation automata (IA) and implement it inside CPACHECKER, marked by the blue arrow. We show how to do the formalization for three properties in Sect. 5. The framework then transforms the program P into an equivalent CFA C and combines it with the IA \mathcal{A} to obtain a new CFA C' using the sequentialization operator \otimes . Finally, the resulting CFA C' is used to instrument the original program P with the instrumentation operator \uplus preserving the structure of the original program as much as possible.




Fig. 2. Workflow of the program transformation

Instrumentation Automata. An instrumentation automaton specifies how an input program needs to be instrumented in order to make the original property explicit using assertions. It is inspired by the observer automata from the BLAST query language [17]. The observer automata are expressive enough for all temporal safety and liveness properties, and their syntax resembles C programs, which makes them convenient to use for software engineers. They allow syntax pattern matching of the operations used in a given C program followed up by the corresponding event actions or assertions. To be able to transform more complex properties, we allow the pattern matching over the structure of the CFA, which considers not only the syntax of the program but also its semantics. It enables matching on the semantic loops (implied by recursive calls or goto jumps). Therefore, we extend our modeling formalism to queries over locations in the CFA.

An *instrumentation automaton* is a tuple $(Q, q_0, Var, \delta, \alpha)$, where Q is a set of states, q_0 is an initial state, Var is a set of variables of the automaton, $\delta \subseteq Q \times PATTERNS \times Opt \times \{A, B\} \times Q$ is a transition relation, and α is a state annotation. Transition (q, ρ, op, X, p) from state q to state p specifies:

- Pattern ρ is a C expression used to match an operation on a CFA edge while allowing terms like $\$x_0$, to match variables from the CFA and then read their value in op . Similarly, as for regular expressions, we define a special pattern $.^*$ that matches any number of any symbols. For example, $\rho = .^* \$x_0 + \$x_1 .^*$; matches an expression that contains plus and it passes its operands to op . Further, special patterns $cond$ and $!cond$ match a condition and its negation in a location with branching.
- Operation op can read and write to variables from Var , but it can only read values from CFA variables matched by ρ . In particular, it can introduce assertions.
- Symbol $X \in \{A, B\}$ specifies whether the operation should be placed before (B) or after (A) the matched edge in the CFA.

The state annotation $\alpha : Q \rightarrow \{\text{true}, \text{loop_head}, \text{init}, \text{end}\}$ assigns a predicate to every state. Currently, four predicates are used: true holds for any location, loop_head is true for locations at the beginning of a loop, init is true for any initial location, and end is true for any final location and corresponds to a final `at_exit` call.

Sequentialization Operator. The sequentialization operator \otimes is responsible for taking the operations from a given IA and placing them in the indicated places in an input CFA. The operator implicitly traverses both the CFA and IA in parallel. During the traversal, it checks for states that are matched by the locations in the annotation α and inserts the operations from the transitions in the IA that are matched with the transitions in the CFA. Whenever there is a match of the transitions,

Algorithm 1 Sequentialization operator \otimes **Input:** a CFA $C = (L, l_0, G)$, an IA $\mathcal{A} = (Q, Var, \delta, q_0, \alpha)$ **Output:** CFA $C' = (L', l'_0, G')$ which can be used for the instrumentation of the original program

```

1:  $(\mathcal{A}_0, l_{init}^0), (\mathcal{A}_1, l_{init}^1), \dots, (\mathcal{A}_k, l_{init}^k) \leftarrow \text{initialize\_automata}(C, \mathcal{A});$ 
2:  $L', G' \leftarrow \{l'_0\}, \{\};$ 
3:  $\text{waitlist}, \text{finished} \leftarrow \{(l_{init}^0, q_0^0), (l_{init}^1, q_0^1), \dots, (l_{init}^k, q_0^k)\}, \{\};$ 
4: while  $\text{waitlist} \neq \emptyset$  do
5:    $(l, q^i) \leftarrow \text{waitlist.pop}();$ 
6:   if  $((l, q^i) \in \text{finished})$  then
7:     continue;
8:    $\text{finished.add}((l, q^i));$ 
9:    $\text{waitlist} \leftarrow \text{waitlist} \cup \text{succ}((l, q^i));$ 
10:  if  $\neg \alpha^i(q^i)(l) \vee \text{succ\_IA}(l, q^i) = \{\}$  then
11:     $G' \leftarrow G' \cup \{(l, \text{op}^C, l') \in G\};$ 
12:  else
13:     $G' \leftarrow G' \cup \text{NE}((l, q^i));$ 
14:     $L' \leftarrow L' \cup \{l^{new} \mid l^{new} \notin L' \wedge \exists l', \text{op}((l', \text{op}, l^{new}) \in G' \vee (l^{new}, \text{op}, l') \in G')\};$ 
15: return  $(L', l'_0, G');$ 

```

it progresses only in the IA by including all the successors of the matched transitions of a state into a waitlist. If there is no match for an edge in the CFA, the algorithm traverses only the CFA.

The sequentialization operator is realized by the procedure in [Alg. 1](#). The algorithm starts with the initialization step, where it traverses the CFA and collects additional information about the program that can be then used to construct specific instrumentation automata for a given program. For example, a transformation for termination initializes one automaton ([Fig. 6](#)) per loop in the CFA, collects all the variables used in the respective loop, and initializes one ghost variable for each. Another example is the liveness automaton ([Fig. 8](#)), which initializes one variable l'_i per each `assert_live`. Moreover, `initialize_automata` also returns a location from the CFA for each automaton, labeled as the initial location for the automaton. This optimization is used to skip parts of the CFA, for example it is used for the automaton for termination to only monitor its own loop.

The while loop in [line 4](#) traverses both the input CFA and the IA in parallel. States and all the other components from automaton \mathcal{A}_i , $0 \leq i \leq k$ are marked with i in the superscript. In one iteration, it processes one pair of a location and a state (l, q^i) .

It processes each pair (l, q^i) by first computing the new pairs locations and states that have not been visited before, as seen in [line 9](#). For this it uses the function `succ` shown in [Eq. \(2\)](#).

$$\text{succ_IA}((l, q^i)) = \{(l, p^i) \mid \exists (l, \text{op}^C, l') \in G, \exists (q^i, \rho, \text{op}^{\mathcal{A}_i}, X, p^i) \in \delta^i.\text{match}(\text{op}^C, \rho)\} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{succ}((l, q^i)) = \begin{cases} \{(l', q^i) \mid \exists (l, \text{op}, l') \in G & \text{if } \neg \alpha^i(q^i)(l) \vee \text{succ_IA}(l, q^i) = \{\} \\ \text{succ_IA}(l, q^i) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

To compute the successors using [Eq. \(2\)](#) there are two cases. In the first case, the annotation of the state does not hold for the location, or none of the outgoing edges from q^i matches an outgoing edge from l . Therefore, the algorithm progresses only in the CFA and creates new pairs of q^i with all the successors of l . In the second case, the annotation holds $\alpha^i(q^i)(l)$, and there are transitions from q^i with pattern that matches some edges from l . The case results in progressing only with

the IA and pairing all the successors of the transitions that matched some edge with l , which is expressed through the function `succ_IA` in Eq. (1).

The condition in line 10 is responsible for adding new edges into the resulting CFA. Similarly, as in the first case of successors function `succ`, if no outgoing edge is matched or the state annotation does not hold for the location, the algorithm adds all the edges from the input CFA C . In the else case, the function `NE` (new edges) presented in Eq. (4) computes all the edges that instrument the original program.

Inside the function in Eq. (4) the predicate MV (*Matched Variables*) presented in Eq. (3) is true if it the two operations match through the correct substitution of the placeholder variable. This is done by seeing if an operation op^C from a CFA edge and an operation $op^{\mathcal{A}_i}$ match. Where $op^{\mathcal{A}_i}$ is constructed by replacing wildcard placeholders in the operation $\overline{op}^{\mathcal{A}_i}$ taken from a transition in the IA with the matched variables. For example, let us assume CFA edge $(l, y = z + 42, l')$ and an IA transition $(q, . * \$x1 + \$x2.*, \text{assert}(x1 > x2), B, q')$, then $MV(y = z + 42, \text{assert}(z > 42), B)$ evaluates to true. Function `NE` uses the predicate MV to get the matched operations with replaced variables based on the pattern ρ . Further, the algorithm places the new operation after (A) or before (B) the edge in the original CFA C . It adds a new location l^{new} and either orders the operations $op^{\mathcal{A}_i}, op^C$ (A) or $op^C, op^{\mathcal{A}_i}$ (B). Lastly, the algorithm adds the new locations into C' in line 14.

$$\begin{aligned} MV(op^C, op^{\mathcal{A}_i}, X) &= \exists(q^i, \rho, \overline{op}^{\mathcal{A}_i}, X', p^i) \in \delta^i. \text{match}(op^C, \rho) \wedge \\ &X = X' \wedge \\ &op^{\mathcal{A}_i} = \text{vars}(op^C, \overline{op}^{\mathcal{A}_i}, \rho) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$NE((l, q^i)) = \bigcup_{\substack{(x, y, X) \in \\ \{(A_i, C, B), \\ (C, A_i, A)\}}} \{(l, op^x, l^{new}), (l^{new}, op^y, l') \mid (l, op^C, l') \in G \wedge MV(op^C, op^{\mathcal{A}_i}, X)\} \quad (4)$$

Instrumentation Operator. The instrumentation operator \uplus takes as an input the output CFA from the sequentialization operator and the original program. It iterates through every statement of the program and checks if there are some newly inserted operations in the corresponding CFA node. It puts them before or after the operation in the original program based on their order in the input CFA.

Example. Consider the program from Fig. 1 and the property "If the execution of a program does at least one iteration of the loop, the value of x will always be at most 136". The property can be formalized as an instrumentation automaton Fig. 3a. Applying the sequentialization operator to the IA Fig. 3a and the CFA from Fig. 1 produces the CFA Fig. 3b. The function `initeliaz_automata` returns the same IA as there is nothing to be initialized in this example. It then initialize `waitlist` with the only pair (l_1, q_0) . The most important explored pairs are (l_1, q_0) , (l_6, q_1) and (l_6, q_2) as they are the only pairs for which the annotation α holds. For example, let us focus on the edge $(l_6, [x < 127], l_7)$ and the transition from q_1 to q_2 . $MV([x < 127], \text{looped} = 1; A)$ is satisfied because the edge matches pattern `cond`, therefore `new_edges` $((l_6, q_1)) = \{(l_6, [x < 127], l_6^{new}), (l_6^{new}, \text{looped} = 1; l_7)\}$ The output program after \uplus applied on the CFA in Fig. 3b and the original program from Fig. 1 results in Fig. 4.




Fig. 3. An example IA (left) and the corresponding CFA after sequentialization with the CFA from Fig. 1 (right)

```

1  int main(void) {
2    int looped = 0; // added
3    unsigned int x = nondet();
4    x = x * x;
5    int y = 1;
6    assert(x >= 0);
7
8    while (x < 127) {
9      looped = 1; // added
10     x = x + y;
11     y = y + 1;
12   }
13   assert(x <= 136 || looped == 0); // added
14 }



```

Fig. 4. An example of an instrumented program

5 Specifications as Instrumentation Automata


To study the performance of reachability analyzers when applied to different specifications, we focus our experiments to the transformation of three specifications from SV-COMP [15]. This section shows how to formalize them as IA.

No-Overflow. According to SV-COMP, the specification *no-overflow* is violated by a given program if there exists an execution of the program that executes an operation with a signed-integer result, but the resulting value does not fit within the range of the signed integer. To simplify the instrumentation, let us assume that a program consists only of signed integer variables and, at most, one arithmetic operation per line. In our implementation, we enforce these assumptions with CPACHECKER [23] by tracking the types of the variables and the expressions on the edges of the CFA, and instrumenting only the operations with signed-integer results. We also decompose complex arithmetic expressions into multiple CFA edges, each containing one operation, using intermediate

Fig. 5. An excerpt of the IA for the *no-overflow* propertyFig. 6. An example of an IA for the *termination* property

results. Figure 5 shows the IA corresponding to the no-overflow specification. We display only the transition for addition since the transitions for the other operations are analogous. The automaton matches every operation and adds the corresponding condition as an `assert` before the operation. For example, before doing an addition, the result of $x_0 + x_1$ should not be larger than `INT_MAX` and if x_1 is negative, then $x_0 + x_1$ should not be smaller than `INT_MIN`. The operations together with the necessary conditions to prevent the overflows can be found listed online [1]. Assuming that we handle every arithmetic operation with the resulting type of signed integer, this transformation is sound and complete.

Termination. The representation of the *termination* property as an IA is shown in Fig. 6 and based upon the work of Schuppan and Biere [68], who propose a transformation of liveness properties to safety properties for finite systems. To find an infinite execution, the instrumentation monitors the visited states of the execution. If a state is encountered twice inside a loop, a non-terminating execution has been found. As a preprocessing step in line 1, our implementation traverses the whole CFA and initializes an automaton for each loop. For every loop, it collects all the used variables and initializes their shadow copies x'_0, \dots, x'_n . In practice, we use the information about the types of variables stored in the edges of CFA and can monitor even variables with more complex types like pointers. The loop-head of the loop is the initial location for every such automaton. Each time the loop-head is visited, the instrumented program can make a non-deterministic choice to save the state if no state has been saved before. This is performed by the operation `op`. If the state was saved previously, an assertion ensures that the current state is different. The violation of the assertion means that the execution encountered the same state twice, and hence, it can make the same non-deterministic decisions to repeat the loop infinitely often. Notice that the transformation is complete but not sound if we consider dynamic structures like linked lists because such programs can have an infinite execution without visiting the same state twice. For programs with variables of the types with finite ranges, this transformation is sound and complete.

Fig. 7. An example of an IA for the *memory cleanup* property

Memory Cleanup. Figure 7 shows an IA for this property. It nondeterministically decides to track the pointer being allocated and checks if the tracked pointer has been deallocated when the program terminates. The transition from q_0 to q_1 initializes the tracking of the pointer. The result of every memory allocating function i.e. `malloc`, `calloc` is nondeterministically assigned to the tracking pointer `ptr`. For `realloc`, we first see if the pointer being reallocated is the same as the one being tracked. If it is, we update the tracking pointer. These checks are handled by the upwards facing self-loop. When freeing memory by using `free`, we have to see if the pointer is the one currently being tracked. If it is, we set it to null i.e. we are currently not tracking any pointer. Finally, when exiting the program, demonstrated through the node q_2 , we see if the tracking pointer is null i.e. all allocated memory has been deallocated. This is handled by the edge between the nodes q_1 and q_2 . Since we handle all the relevant standard functions for memory allocation, this transformation is sound and complete.

6 Expressiveness Beyond the Presented Transformations

So far, we have shown the transformation of three practical specifications to reachability using instrumentation automata. However, the question arises of whether the framework is general enough to unite the transformations of a larger class of specifications into reachability.

In the verification community, linear-time temporal logic (LTL) [65] is one of the most prominent languages for expressing specifications. There are two important subclasses of LTL formulas: (a) safety formulas express that a desired property always holds, whereas (b) liveness formulas express that the property will eventually hold in every execution. Expressing properties from these classes is relevant because as Maretić, Dashti, and Basin [64] have shown, any LTL formula is decomposable into a conjunction of safety and liveness formulas. Therefore, supporting formulas from these classes leads to supporting full LTL. In practice, any safety LTL formula can be encoded as a reachability problem. To further reason about liveness formulas, we define an analogy to reachability in Table 1 - explicit liveness, which is a concept which has successfully been used by tools like K2 [46]. Termination is an example of liveness specification and it can be expressed as explicit liveness by just adding `assert_live` with the negation of the loop condition after every loop in the program. If the program is non-terminating, then there is at least one execution that stays infinitely inside the loop and never satisfies the `assert_live` condition. If it is terminating, it eventually ends up in the artificial state that satisfies `assert_live` and loops there infinitely.

Explicit Liveness Transformation. Figure 8 shows an instrumentation automaton for transforming explicit liveness to reachability. It utilizes the transformation proposed by Biere and Schuppan [68]. Similar to the termination automaton Fig. 6, it monitors the program for a possible




Fig. 8. An example of an IA for the *explicit liveness* property

infinite execution. However, in this case, the infinite execution must not satisfy at least one of the assert_live conditions. Such execution would violate the liveness property because there is an infinite execution of the program that never satisfies the property. The automaton introduces ghost variables for every variable in the program which are used to track an infinite execution of the program. Explicit liveness is violated if there exists an infinite execution that never satisfies at least one of the $\text{assert_live}(\pi)$ conditions. Therefore, the automaton introduces a flag l_i for every liveness assertion, and the flag is set, whenever the condition π is satisfied. This is handled by the self-loop at q_1 . If there exists an execution that visits the same state twice and does not satisfy all of the assertions, the property is violated. This is captured by the assert on the self-loop in q_2 . Since both transitions from q_0 match an initial edge in the input CFA, they can look for edges with assert_live to introduce the flags and for the loops in parallel.

7 Evaluation

The evaluation of our approach addresses the following research questions.

RQ 1 (Modularity): To what extent do the transformations make verifiers, natively supporting only reachability, competitive in the verification of unsupported properties?

RQ 2 (Effectiveness): To what extent are state-of-the-art reachability verifiers using transformation *effective* compared to state-of-the-art verifiers for the original specification?

RQ 3 (Efficiency): To what extent are state-of-the-art reachability verifiers using transformation *efficient* compared to state-of-the-art verifiers for the original specification?

RQ 4 (No Degradation): Is there a difference in the performance of a verifier when the program transformation is done on the input program level instead of during the analysis?

The proposed research questions aim to divide the evaluation into three parts to provide the answers for our initial motivation. First, RQ 1 aims to show the modularity of our approach i.e. can verifiers supporting only reachability be adapted to verify other properties without additional engineering effort? Second, RQ 2 and RQ 3 aim to evaluate whether the fine-tuned reachability analyses of the best-performing tools can be as effective and efficient as the state-of-the-art verifiers of the original properties. This supports our motivation for the clear separation of concerns. It

Table 2. Tools used in the experiments

Tool	reachability	no-overflow	memory cleanup	termination
CPACHECKER [9]	✓	✓	✓	✓
UAUTOMIZER [49]	✓	✓	✓	✓
UTAIPAN [40]	✓	✓	✗	✗
2LS [56]	✓	✗	✗	✓
PREDATORHP [63]	✓	✗	✓	✗
SYMBIOTIC [53]	✓	✓	✓	✓
THETA [11]	✓	✗	✗	✗
EMERGENTHETA [10]	✓	✗	✗	✗
CPV [36]	✓	✗	✗	✗

suffices to improve the reachability analysis to perform well for multiple specifications. Last, RQ 4 evaluates, whether encoding the transformation directly into a C program loses performance when compared to the encoding of the transformation inside the verification algorithm.

While the transformations for no-overflow and termination significantly simplify the implementation of the specification in the tool. For memory cleanup the verifiers need to handle memory allocation and deallocation correctly even with the transformation. Therefore, we only answer RQ 2 and RQ 3 for memcleanup. Since the tools used as reachability analyzers in RQ 1 do not support any of the tasks even in their original form. We also exclude RQ 4 since there is no internal transformation of memcleanup inside CPACHECKER.

Benchmark Dataset. To answer the proposed research questions, we use a subset with 890 tasks for no-overflow, a subset with 386 tasks for termination, and the full set with 41 tasks for memory-cleanup of SV-Benchmarks at its SV-COMP24 version [16], the largest dataset of C programs with their verification verdicts for multiple properties. The chosen subset for termination and no-overflow removes programs containing structures, and arrays, since our current implementation does not support them.

Tools Used. Table 2 lists all the sound³ and open-source⁴ tools with their supported properties that we used in our experiments. All those tools participated in SV-COMP 2024 [15] and scored among the best in their respective category. We used the version submitted to SV-COMP 2024 in our comparison. We denote our verifier compositions with transformation to reachability by adding *-R* to the verifier’s name, for example, CPV-R means that we applied the transformation and then the reachability analysis of CPV.

Benchmark Environment. For conducting our evaluation, we use BENCHEXEC to ensure reliable benchmarking [27]. All benchmarks are performed on machines with an Intel Xeon E5-1230 CPU (4 physical cores with 2 processing units each), 33 GB of RAM, and running Ubuntu 22.04 as operating system. Each verification task is executed with resource limits similar to the ones used in SV-COMP, i.e., 900 s of CPU time, 15 GB of memory, and 1 physical core (2 processing units)⁵.

³We removed PROTON [58] from the comparison, even though it performed best in the termination track of SV-COMP 2024, because it performs known unsound guessing if a non-termination argument is not found.

⁴VERIABSL [39] and VERIABS [2] performed very well in the reachability category but are not open-source.

⁵SV-COMP 2024 used 2 physical cores (4 processing units).





Fig. 9. Quantile plots for (a) no-overflow and (b) termination tasks showing verifiers not supporting the property natively on the transformed tasks

7.1 RQ 1: Modularity

Since our approach produces transformed C programs, it directly allows any verifier for C programs that supports reachability, to also analyze other specifications. We consider three verifiers from SV-COMP 2024: CPV, THETA and EMERGENTHETA, which support only reachability. Figures 9a and 9b compare these tools against the third-best tool in the no-overflow category and the termination category of SV-COMP 2024, respectively. We choose the third-best tool, since they are still competitive i.e. are unlikely to contain bugs but are also comparable to the ranking of the tools supporting reachability in that category.

For no-overflow, EMERGENTHETA-R was 226 tasks behind CPACHECKER, and for termination, CPV-R was only 155 tasks behind 2LS. The tools supporting only reachability could solve roughly half of the tasks that the third best-performing tool could solve in the respective category. Notable is that CPV was 5th, THETA was 18th, and EMERGENTHETA was 20th for reachability in SV-COMP24 [15]. This means that even though they did not perform as well as the best performing verifiers in the reachability category, they can still be relatively successful in the verification of other specifications.

Our transformation framework makes it possible for reachability verifiers to successfully support properties which they do not natively support and to be competitive in verifying them.

7.2 RQ 2: Effectiveness

In order to RQ 2, we compare the performance of the tools on the transformed and the original tasks.

No-Overflow. As Table 3 shows, UTAIPAN and UAUTOMIZER were able to provide 692 (78%) and 676 (76%) correct results, respectively. We observe only a slight degradation in the numbers of the solved tasks if UAUTOMIZER is applied as a reachability analyzer - 654 (73%). Thanks to the modularity of the approach, CPACHECKER as a reachability analyzer was able to find 88 more proofs and 15 more alarms than its integrated no-overflow analysis. Moreover, it solved only 2 tasks less than the second-best tool UAUTOMIZER. We inspected all incorrect results and concluded that they were not caused by our transformation, since the other reachability analyzers were able to solve them correctly. It is expected that reachability and no-overflow algorithms are conceptually similar as they are both safety properties. However, the transformation allows us to use other algorithms like K-Induction [41] for reachability which leads to the increase in the performance for CPACHECKER. In

Table 3. Summary of the results for transformed 890 no-overflow tasks

Tools	(#Tasks)	UAUTOMIZER	UTAIPAN	CPACHECKER	UAUTOMIZER-R	CPACHECKER-R
Correct	890	676	692	571	654	674
Proofs	615	426	441	353	438	441
Alarms	275	250	251	218	216	233
Incorrect		0	0	0	2	8
Proofs		0	0	0	2	4
Alarms		0	0	0	0	4

Table 4. Summary of the results for transformed 386 termination tasks

Results	(#tasks)	UAUTOMIZER	2LS	UAUTOMIZER-R	CPACHECKER-R
Correct	386	305	262	327	126
Proofs	309	246	192	259	60
Alarms	77	59	70	68	66

this particular case the difference is likely due to the overflow analysis of CPACHECKER being based on predicate analysis and the reachability analysis being a portfolio approach including K-Induction, predicate analysis and value analysis.

Termination. Table 4 shows the results for termination. UAUTOMIZER as a reachability analyzer performs the best among all the tools. It was able to solve 327 (85 %) of the tasks, and provide 13 more proofs and 9 more alarms than UAUTOMIZER as the termination analyzer. In contrast to no-overflow, where the performance gain could be attributed to the used algorithms, the difference in the performance for termination is more likely due to the conceptual differences between the verification approaches, because the algorithms developed to analyze termination are usually very different from the algorithms for reachability.

Notably, our evaluation dataset contained 403 tasks in the beginning. However, thanks to the transformation framework, we have found that 17 of these tasks contained undefined behavior in the form of signed-integer overflows. Since the termination behavior is not defined in this case, we had to remove them from the comparison. A merge request⁶ with the detailed description was created to remove the currently wrong expected verdict for termination.

Memory-Cleanup. Table 5 shows the results of the comparison of the tools on the transformed memory cleanup tasks. The results show no large discrepancy between the different tools. Since the dataset consists of only 41 tasks it is difficult to draw a general conclusion from the results. However, it is notable that CPACHECKER-R could outperform UAUTOMIZER in this case and that it is close to the performance of PREDATORHP which is a verifier specializing in memory analysis. The wrong verdict produced by CPACHECKER-R is due to its incomplete handling of function pointers.

For the no-overflow tasks, the performance of reachability analyzers is comparable to the verifiers that natively support it. For termination, the performance is better in some cases. For memory cleanup, some tools perform better than others in both directions.

⁶https://gitlab.com/sosy-lab/benchmarking/sv-benchmarks/-/merge_requests/1543

Table 5. Summary of the results for transformed 41 Memory Cleanup tasks

Tools	(#tasks)	PREDATORHP	SYMBIOTIC	UAUTOMIZER	UAUTOMIZER-R	CPACHECKER-R
Correct results	41	35	39	27	24	33
proofs	2	1	2	0	0	0
alarms	39	34	37	27	24	33
Incorrect results		0	0	0	0	1
proofs		0	0	0	0	0
alarms		0	0	0	0	1




Fig. 10. Quantile plots for (a) no-overflow and (b) termination tasks comparing verifiers on the original and transformed tasks

7.3 RQ3: Efficiency

No-Overflow. Figure 10a shows that there are no significant differences in the efficiency of the approaches for the `ULTIMATE` tools. The difference in efficiency between `CPACHECKER` and `CPACHECKER-R` is due to the fact that the former uses only predicate analysis, while, thanks to the flexibility gained by the transformation, we can now also use `CPACHECKER-R` with its sequential portfolio of reachability analyses; the switch from one analysis to the next is clearly visible in the quantile plot as a bend of the graph at around 100 s.

Termination. Figure 10b shows a comparison for `UAUTOMIZER` and `2LS`, which were 2nd and 3rd in SV-COMP 2024. `2LS` consumes the least amount of CPU time, which is expected since the other tools are Java-based and have a long startup time due to the JVM. However `2LS` cannot solve as many tasks as `UAUTOMIZER` and `UAUTOMIZER-R`. For `UAUTOMIZER`, there is a significant improvement in effectiveness when using transformation, but the efficiency does not change much.

Memory-Cleanup. Figure 11 shows the quantile plot for the correct results of the memory cleanup tasks. The plot shows that there is no large discrepancy between tools, accounting for around 10 seconds of JVM startup time for `UAUTOMIZER` and `CPACHECKER`, at the beginning but the discrepancy increases for tasks requiring a longer run-time. This is to be expected since the transformation introduces a nondeterministic choice for each allocation making task more difficult. Due to the small size of the dataset, it is difficult to draw a general conclusion from the results.




Fig. 11. Quantile plot for all correct results on memcleanup tasks

Verifying the transformed programs with reachability is as efficient as verifying the original programs against the original specification in many cases.

7.4 RQ 4: No Degradation

Some of the verifiers internally transform various properties to reachability. They usually do it by instrumenting their intermediate representation of an input program or by reflecting the assertion checks in their analyzing algorithm. There are two algorithms in `CPACHECKER` doing the latter. We compare how costly it is when we encode these checks as assertions in the input program instead of doing the checks during the analysis. Figure 12 shows the CPU time in seconds for correctly solved tasks by both approaches. Notably, there was an increase in the amount of solved tasks for both properties when using the reachability analysis.

For termination (+), both approaches used bounded model checking [29] as the reachability algorithm. It usually solves the task very quickly or does not solve it at all. We can see that for most of the tasks, there is an overhead between 1-20 seconds if we represent the specification in the input program which is not too much in relation to the 900 seconds time limit. There were a few outliers, where the reachability analysis took approximately 100 seconds more.

For no-overflow (×), both approaches used predicate analysis [19] as the reachability algorithm. The sample of commonly solved tasks is much larger than for termination. For most of the tasks, there is no clear overhead in either direction. There are a few outliers in both directions with significant overheads.

We do not observe any clear degradation of efficiency when transforming no-overflow to reachability in the input program. For termination, in most cases, the overhead is relatively small. In sum, the transformation inside the verifier does not provide significant boost in the performance.

7.5 Threats to Validity

Internal Validity. We used the benchmarking framework `BENCHEXEC` [27] to run the experiments, which uses the most modern Linux features for reliable benchmarking. This tool also makes sure to never run two different executions on the same physical core, to avoid interference of shared computing resources. On the other hand, the implementation of the transformations may contain bugs, which could lead to incorrect results. However, we checked all the incorrect results in our experiments and none of them were caused by the transformation.




Fig. 12. Comparison of the CPU time of CPAchecker when transforming the properties internally and when doing the transformation in the input program for no-overflow and termination tasks

External Validity. The conclusions about the benefit of the transformations might not hold for other programs and other verifiers. However, we evaluated on state-of-the-art verifiers and a large benchmark set, which reduces this risk. Furthermore, we considered only three popular specifications, and it could be that the benefits described are different for other specifications.

8 Conclusion

Developing a tool for software verification is challenging and requires a large engineering effort. The effort is even larger for supporting various specifications. Verification tools sometimes use internal transformations to mitigate the development time. However, these transformations are usually not modular and have to be done separately for every verifier, and for each specification. Our contribution offers a new modular framework that separates the concern of a reachability algorithm from supporting other specifications. We demonstrated how the framework works by implementing the transformations for three interesting specifications.

We showed that the construction of new verifiers by the transformation followed by reachability analysis is usually also efficient and effective, and can compete with (and sometimes outperform) state-of-the-art verifiers for no-overflow and termination analysis. Furthermore, our approach enabled tools like CPV or THETA to be competitive in the verification of properties that they do not natively support so far. Lastly, we did not observe a significant degradation in the performance when we transformed the input program instead of the intermediate representation or changed the analyzing algorithm.

Future Work. Currently, only three transformations have been implemented in the framework. In the future, we plan to extend the set of provided instrumentation automata to contain more specifications, and the framework to support more kinds of specifications, for example, memory safety and the sequentialization of concurrency.

In the future, we plan to implement an interface for user-defined instrumentation automata. This would make it easier to add new specifications and transformations to the framework and compare the performance of different transformations for the same property.

Data-Availability Statement. TransVer is open-source and can be found under <https://gitlab.com/sosy-lab/software/transver>.

Funding Statement. This project was funded in part by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) – 378803395 (ConVeY),

References

- [1] [n.d.]. INT32-C. Ensure that operations on signed integers do not result in overflow. <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/display/c/INT32-C.+Ensure+that+operations+on+signed+integers+do+not+result+in+overflow>. [Accessed 28-08-2024].
- [2] M. Afzal, A. Asia, A. Chauhan, B. Chimdyalwar, P. Darke, A. Datar, S. Kumar, and R. Venkatesh. 2019. VERIABS: Verification by Abstraction and Test Generation. In *Proc. ASE. IEEE*, 1138–1141. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE.2019.00121>
- [3] A. V. Aho, R. Sethi, and J. D. Ullman. 1986. *Compilers: Principles, Techniques, and Tools*. Addison-Wesley. ISBN: 978-0-201-10088-4 <https://www.worldcat.org/isbn/978-0-201-10088-4>
- [4] J. Alglave, A. F. Donaldson, D. Kröning, and M. Tautschnig. 2011. Making Software Verification Tools Really Work. In *Proc. ATVA (LNCS 6996)*. Springer, 28–42. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-24372-1_3
- [5] K. M. Alshmrany, M. Aldughaim, A. Bhayat, and L. C. Cordeiro. 2021. FuSEBMC: An energy-efficient test generator for finding security vulnerabilities in C programs. In *Proc. TAP*. Springer, 85–105. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-79379-1_6
- [6] Jesper Amilon, Zafer Esen, Dilian Gurov, Christian Lidström, and Philipp Rümmer. 2023. Automatic Program Instrumentation for Automatic Verification. In *Proc. CAV*. 281–304. ISBN: 978-3-031-37709-9
- [7] P. Ayaziová, D. Beyer, M. Lingsch-Rosenfeld, M. Spiessl, and J. Strejček. 2024. Software Verification Witnesses 2.0. In *Proc. SPIN*. Springer.
- [8] D. Baier, D. Beyer, P.-C. Chien, M.-C. Jakobs, M. Jankola, M. Kettl, N.-Z. Lee, T. Lemberger, M. Lingsch-Rosenfeld, H. Wachowitz, and P. Wendler. 2024. Software Verification with CPACHECKER 3.0: Tutorial and User Guide. In *Proc. FM (LNCS 14934)*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-71177-0_30
- [9] D. Baier, D. Beyer, P.-C. Chien, M. Jankola, M. Kettl, N.-Z. Lee, T. Lemberger, M. Lingsch-Rosenfeld, M. Spiessl, H. Wachowitz, and P. Wendler. 2024. CPACHECKER 2.3 with Strategy Selection (Competition Contribution). In *Proc. TACAS (3) (LNCS 14572)*. Springer, 359–364. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57256-2_21
- [10] L. Bajczi, D. Szekeres, M. Mondok, Z. Ádám, M. Somorjai, C. Telbisz, M. Dobos-Kovács, and V. Molnár. 2024. EMERGEN-THETA: Verification Beyond Abstraction Refinement (Competition Contribution). In *Proc. TACAS (3) (LNCS 14572)*. Springer, 371–375. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57256-2_23
- [11] L. Bajczi, C. Telbisz, M. Somorjai, Z. Ádám, M. Dobos-Kovács, D. Szekeres, M. Mondok, and V. Molnár. 2024. THETA: Abstraction Based Techniques for Verifying Concurrency (Competition Contribution). In *Proc. TACAS (3) (LNCS 14572)*. Springer, 412–417. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57256-2_30
- [12] T. Ball and S. K. Rajamani. 2002. *SLIC: A Specification Language for Interface Checking (of C)*. Technical Report MSR-TR-2001-21. Microsoft Research. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/slic-a-specification-language-for-interface-checking-of-c/>
- [13] T. Ball and S. K. Rajamani. 2002. The SLAM project: Debugging System Software via Static Analysis. In *Proc. POPL*. ACM, 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1145/503272.503274>
- [14] D. Beyer. 2024. Automatic Testing of C Programs: Test-Comp 2024. In *TBA*. Springer.
- [15] D. Beyer. 2024. State of the Art in Software Verification and Witness Validation: SV-COMP 2024. In *Proc. TACAS (3) (LNCS 14572)*. Springer, 299–329. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57256-2_15
- [16] D. Beyer. 2024. SV-Benchmarks: Benchmark Set for Software Verification (SV-COMP 2024). Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10669723>
- [17] D. Beyer, A. J. Chlipala, T. A. Henzinger, R. Jhala, and R. Majumdar. 2004. The BLAST Query Language for Software Verification. In *Proc. SAS (LNCS 3148)*. Springer, 2–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-27864-1_2
- [18] D. Beyer, M. Dangel, D. Dietsch, M. Heizmann, T. Lemberger, and M. Tautschnig. 2022. Verification Witnesses. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.* 31, 4 (2022), 57:1–57:69. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3477579>
- [19] D. Beyer, M. Dangel, and P. Wendler. 2018. A Unifying View on SMT-Based Software Verification. *J. Autom. Reasoning* 60, 3 (2018), 299–335. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10817-017-9432-6>
- [20] D. Beyer, S. Gulwani, and D. Schmidt. 2018. Combining Model Checking and Data-Flow Analysis. In *Handbook of Model Checking*. Springer, 493–540. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-10575-8_16
- [21] D. Beyer, T. A. Henzinger, R. Jhala, and R. Majumdar. 2005. Checking Memory Safety with BLAST. In *Proc. FASE (LNCS 3442)*. Springer, 2–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-31984-9_2
- [22] D. Beyer, T. A. Henzinger, R. Jhala, and R. Majumdar. 2007. The Software Model Checker BLAST. *Int. J. Softw. Tools Technol. Transfer* 9, 5-6 (2007), 505–525. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10009-007-0044-z>
- [23] D. Beyer and M. E. Keremoglu. 2011. CPACHECKER: A Tool for Configurable Software Verification. In *Proc. CAV (LNCS 6806)*. Springer, 184–190. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-22110-1_16
- [24] D. Beyer and N.-Z. Lee. 2024. The Transformation Game: Joining Forces for Verification. Springer. https://www.sosy-lab.org/research/pub/2024-Katoen60.The_Transformation_Game_Joining_Forces_for_Verification.pdf
- [25] D. Beyer, M. Lingsch-Rosenfeld, and M. Spiessl. 2022. A Unifying Approach for Control-Flow-Based Loop Abstraction. In *Proc. SEFM (LNCS 13550)*. Springer, 3–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-17108-6_1

- [26] D. Beyer, M. Lingsch-Rosenfeld, and M. Spiessl. 2023. CEGAR-PT: A Tool for Abstraction by Program Transformation. In *Proc. ASE. IEEE*, 2078–2081. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE56229.2023.00215>
- [27] D. Beyer, S. Löwe, and P. Wendler. 2019. Reliable Benchmarking: Requirements and Solutions. *Int. J. Softw. Tools Technol. Transfer* 21, 1 (2019), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10009-017-0469-y>
- [28] D. Beyer and M. Spiessl. 2020. METAVAL: Witness Validation via Verification. In *Proc. CAV (LNCS 12225)*. Springer, 165–177. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53291-8_10
- [29] Armin Biere, Alessandro Cimatti, Edmund M. Clarke, Ofer Strichman, and Yunshan Zhu. 2003. Bounded model checking. *Advances in Computers* 58 (2003), 117–148. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2458\(03\)58003-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2458(03)58003-2)
- [30] Lionel Blatter, Nikolai Kosmatov, Pascale Le Gall, and Virgile Prevosto. 2017. RPP: Automatic Proof of Relational Properties by Self-composition. In *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*. 391–397. ISBN: 978-3-662-54577-5
- [31] Lionel Blatter, Nikolai Kosmatov, Pascale Le Gall, Virgile Prevosto, and Guillaume Petiot. 2018. Static and Dynamic Verification of Relational Properties on Self-composed C Code. In *Tests and Proofs*. 44–62. ISBN: 978-3-319-92994-1
- [32] Eric Bodden and Laurie Hendren. 2012. The Clara framework for hybrid tpestate analysis. *International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer* 14, 3 (01 Jun 2012), 307–326. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10009-010-0183-5>
- [33] M. Böhme, V.-T. Pham, and A. Roychoudhury. 2016. Coverage-Based Greybox Fuzzing as Markov Chain. In *Proc. SIGSAC*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1032–1043. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2976749.2978428>
- [34] A. R. Bradley. 2011. SAT-Based model checking without unrolling. In *Proc. VMCAI (LNCS 6538)*. Springer, 70–87. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-18275-4_7
- [35] M. Chalupa, J. Strejček, and M. Vitovská. 2018. Joint Forces for Memory Safety Checking. In *Proc. SPIN*. Springer, 115–132. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-94111-0_7
- [36] P.-C. Chien and N.-Z. Lee. 2024. CPV: A Circuit-Based Program Verifier (Competition Contribution). In *Proc. TACAS (3) (LNCS 14572)*. Springer, 365–370. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57256-2_22
- [37] E. M. Clarke, D. Kröning, and F. Lerdau. 2004. A Tool for Checking ANSI-C Programs. In *Proc. TACAS (LNCS 2988)*. Springer, 168–176. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-24730-2_15
- [38] J. Condit, M. Harren, S. McPeak, G. C. Necula, and W. Weimer. 2003. CCURED in the real world. In *Proc. PLDI*. ACM, 232–244.
- [39] P. Darke, B. Chimdyalwar, S. Agrawal, R. Venkatesh, S. Chakraborty, and S. Kumar. 2023. VERIABS L: Scalable Verification by Abstraction and Strategy Prediction (Competition Contribution). In *Proc. TACAS (2) (LNCS 13994)*. Springer, 588–593. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-30820-8_41
- [40] D. Dietsch, M. Heizmann, D. Klumpp, F. Schüssele, and A. Podelski. 2023. ULTIMATE TAIPAN 2023 (Competition Contribution). In *Proc. TACAS (2) (LNCS 13994)*. Springer, 582–587. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-30820-8_40
- [41] A. F. Donaldson, L. Haller, D. Kröning, and P. Rümmer. 2011. Software Verification Using k-Induction. In *Proc. SAS (LNCS 6887)*. Springer, 351–368. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-23702-7_26
- [42] Alexandre Duret-Lutz and Denis Poirinaud. 2004. SPOT: An Extensible Model Checking Library Using Transition-Based Generalized Büchi Automata. In *Proc. MASCOTS*. IEEE, 76–83. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MASCOT.2004.1348184>
- [43] Bernd Fischer, Omar Inverso, and Gennaro Parlato. 2013. CSEQ: A concurrency pre-processor for sequential C verification tools. In *Proc. ASE. IEEE*, 710–713. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE.2013.6693139>
- [44] F. Frohn. 2020. A Calculus for Modular Loop Acceleration. In *Proc. TACAS (1) (LNCS 12078)*. Springer, 58–76. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45190-5_4
- [45] Paul Gastin and Denis Oddoux. 2001. Fast LTL to Büchi Automata Translation. In *Proc. CAV*. Springer, 53–65. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-44585-4_6
- [46] A. Griggio and M. Jonáš. 2023. KRATOS2: An SMT-Based Model Checker for Imperative Programs. In *Proc. CAV*. Springer, 423–436. ISBN: 978-3-031-37708-2 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-37709-9_20
- [47] Mark Harman. 2018. We Need a Testability Transformation Semantics. In *Proc. SEFM (LNCS 10886)*. Springer, 3–17. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92970-5_1
- [48] M. Harman, L. Hu, R. M. Hierons, J. Wegener, H. Sthamer, A. Baresel, and M. Roper. 2004. Testability Transformation. *IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng.* 30, 1 (2004), 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2004.1265732>
- [49] M. Heizmann, M. Bentele, D. Dietsch, X. Jiang, D. Klumpp, F. Schüssele, and A. Podelski. 2024. Ultimate Automizer and the Abstraction of Bitwise Operations (Competition Contribution). In *Proc. TACAS (3) (LNCS 14572)*. Springer, 418–423. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57256-2_31
- [50] Omar Inverso, T. L. Nguyen, Bernd Fischer, S. La Torre, and Gennaro Parlato. 2015. LAZY-CSEQ: A Context-Bounded Model Checking Tool for Multi-threaded C Programs. In *Proc. ASE. IEEE*, 807–812. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE.2015.108>
- [51] Arvid Jakobsson, Nikolai Kosmatov, and Julien Signoles. 2015. Fast as a shadow, expressive as a tree: hybrid memory monitoring for C. In *Proceedings of the 30th Annual ACM Symposium on Applied Computing (SAC '15)*. ACM, 1765–1772. ISBN: 9781450331968 <https://doi.org/10.1145/2695664.2695815>

- [52] B. Jeannot, P. Schrammel, and S. Sankaranarayanan. 2014. Abstract acceleration of general linear loops. In *Proc. POPL*. ACM, 529–540. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2535838.2535843>
- [53] M. Jonáš, K. Kumor, J. Novák, J. Sedláček, M. Trtík, L. Zaoral, P. Ayaziová, and J. Strejček. 2024. SYMBIOTIC 10: Lazy Memory Initialization and Compact Symbolic Execution (Competition Contribution). In *Proc. TACAS (3) (LNCS 14572)*. Springer, 406–411. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57256-2_29
- [54] S. Julien. 2022. E-ACSL: Executable ANSI/ISO C Specification Language. Available at <http://frama-c.com/download/e-acsl/e-acsl.pdf>.
- [55] K. Madhukar, B. Wachter, D. Kröning, M. Lewis, and M. K. Srivas. 2015. Accelerating Invariant Generation. In *Proc. FMCAD*. IEEE, 105–111.
- [56] V. Malík, P. Schrammel, T. Vojnar, and F. Nečas. 2023. 2LS: Arrays and Loop Unwinding (Competition Contribution). In *Proc. TACAS (2) (LNCS 13994)*. Springer, 529–534. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-30820-8_31
- [57] K. L. McMillan. 2003. Interpolation and SAT-Based Model Checking. In *Proc. CAV (LNCS 2725)*. Springer, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-45069-6_1
- [58] R. Metta, H. Karmarkar, K. Madhukar, R. Venkatesh, and S. Chakraborty. 2024. PROTON: Probes for Non-termination and Termination (Competition Contribution). In *Proc. TACAS (3) (LNCS 14572)*. Springer, 393–398. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57256-2_27
- [59] G. C. Necula. 1997. Proof-Carrying Code. In *Proc. POPL*. ACM, 106–119. <https://doi.org/10.1145/263699.263712>
- [60] G. C. Necula, S. McPeak, S. P. Rahul, and W. Weimer. 2002. CIL: Intermediate Language and Tools for Analysis and Transformation of C Programs. In *Proc. CC (LNCS 2304)*. Springer, 213–228. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45937-5_16
- [61] G. C. Necula, S. McPeak, and W. Weimer. 2002. CCURED: Type-Safe Retrofitting of Legacy Code. In *Proc. POPL*. ACM, 128–139. <https://doi.org/10.1145/503272.503286>
- [62] Helmuth Partsch and Ralf Steinbrüggen. 1983. Program Transformation Systems. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 15, 3 (1983), 199–236. <https://doi.org/10.1145/356914.356917>
- [63] P. Peringer, V. Šoková, and T. Vojnar. 2020. PREDATORHP Revamped (Not Only) for Interval-Sized Memory Regions and Memory Reallocation (Competition Contribution). In *Proc. TACAS (2) (LNCS 12079)*. Springer, 408–412. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45237-7_30
- [64] Grgur Petric Maretić, Mohammad Torabi Dashti, and David Basin. 2014. LTL is closed under topological closure. *Inform. Process. Lett.* 114, 8 (2014), 408–413. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipl.2014.03.001>
- [65] Nir Piterman and Amir Pnueli. 2018. Temporal Logic and Fair Discrete Systems. In *Handbook of Model Checking*. Springer, 27–73. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-10575-8_2
- [66] Virgile Robles, Nikolai Kosmatov, Virgile Prevosto, Louis Rilling, and Pascale Le Gall. 2021. Methodology for Specification and Verification of High-Level Requirements with METACSL. In *FormaliSE*. 54–67. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FormaliSE52586.2021.00012>
- [67] Virgile Robles, Nikolai Kosmatov, Virgile Prevosto, Louis Rilling, and Pascale Le Gall. 2019. METACSL: Specification and Verification of High-Level Properties. In *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*. Springer, 358–364. ISBN: 978-3-030-17462-0
- [68] Viktor Schuppan and Armin Biere. 2006. Liveness Checking as Safety Checking for Infinite State Spaces. *Electr. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.* 149, 1 (2006), 79–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcs.2005.11.018>
- [69] O. Šerý. 2009. Enhanced Property Specification and Verification in BLAST. In *Proc. FASE (LNCS 5503)*. Springer, 456–469. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-00593-0_32
- [70] J. Silverman and Z. Kincaid. 2019. Loop Summarization with Rational Vector Addition Systems. In *Proc. CAV, Part 2 (LNCS 11562)*. Springer, 97–115. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25543-5_7
- [71] Eelco Visser. 2001. A Survey of Strategies in Program Transformation Systems. In *Proc. WRS (ENTCS 57)*. Elsevier, 109–143. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-0661\(04\)00270-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-0661(04)00270-1)
- [72] Kostyantyn Vorobyov, Julien Signoles, and Nikolai Kosmatov. 2017. Shadow state encoding for efficient monitoring of block-level properties. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGPLAN International Symposium on Memory Management*. ACM, 47–58. ISBN: 9781450350440 <https://doi.org/10.1145/3092255.3092269>
- [73] Yao Zhang, Xiaofei Xie, Yi Li, Sen Chen, Cen Zhang, and Xiaohong Li. 2023. EndWatch: A Practical Method for Detecting Non-Termination in Real-World Software. In *Proc. ASE*. 686–697. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE56229.2023.00061>