

# Dynamically Discovering Likely Program Invariants to Support Program Evolution

Michael D. Ernst, Jake Cockrell, William G. Griswold, David Notkin  
(presented by David Hovemeyer for SysChat, September 13, 2002)



<http://pag.lcs.mit.edu/~mernst/pubs/invariants-tse.pdf>

<http://pag.lcs.mit.edu/daikon/>

# Outline

- Introduction
- Detecting Invariants Dynamically
  - ▷ Types of Invariants
  - ▷ Instrumentation
  - ▷ Inferring Invariants
- Using Daikon
- Applications
- Links

# Introduction

- All programs have invariants
  - ▷ Preconditions, postconditions, loop invariants
  - ▷ Establish correctness conditions
  - ▷ Useful in understanding how program works
  - ▷ Violation of invariant  $\equiv$  Bug
- Programmers generally don't write invariants explicitly
- The paper investigates the possibility of discovering invariants dynamically, based on observed program states

# Outline

- Introduction
- Detecting Invariants Dynamically
  - ▷ Types of Invariants
  - ▷ Instrumentation
  - ▷ Inferring Invariants
- Using Daikon
- Applications
- Links

# Detecting Invariants Dynamically

- Basic idea: instrument program to output values of live variables at selected program points
- Postprocess trace data to infer likely invariants based on observed values
- Automatic tool: “Daikon”
- Incomplete, unsound
  - ▷ In practice, it does find genuine and useful invariants

# Types of Invariants

Variables  $x, y, z$ , constants  $a, b, c$

- For any variable:
  - ▷  $x = a$
  - ▷  $x = \text{uninit}$
  - ▷  $x \in \{a, b, c\}$
- For single numeric variables:
  - ▷  $x \geq a, x \leq b, a \leq x \leq b$
  - ▷  $x \neq 0$
  - ▷  $x \equiv (a \bmod b), x \not\equiv (a \bmod b)$

# Types of Invariants (continued)

- For two numeric variables:
  - ▷  $y = ax + b$
  - ▷  $x < y, x \leq y, x > y, x \geq y, x = y, x \neq y$
  - ▷  $y = f(x)$  (for various functions  $f$ )
- For three numeric variables:
  - ▷  $z = ax + by + c$
  - ▷  $z = g(x, y)$  (for various functions  $g$ )
- For single sequence variables:
  - ▷ Range (min and max values)
  - ▷ Ordering (increasing, decreasing, etc.)
  - ▷ Invariants over all elements

# Types of Invariants (continued)

- For two sequence variables:
  - ▷ Elementwise linear relationship:  $y = ax + b$
  - ▷ Elementwise comparison
  - ▷ Subsequence
  - ▷ Reversal
- For sequence and number variables:
  - ▷ Membership:  $i \in s$



# Instrumentation

- At program points of interest:
  - ▷ Function entry points
  - ▷ Loop heads
  - ▷ Function exit points
- Output values of all ‘interesting’ variables
  - ▷ Scalar values (locals, globals, array subscript expressions, etc.)
  - ▷ Arrays of scalar values
  - ▷ Object addresses/ids
  - ▷ More kinds of invariants checked for numeric types

# Inferring Invariants

- All invariants can be checked quickly (no theorem proving)
  - ▷ For example: Values for  $a, b, c$  in  $z = ax + by + c$  can be found once 3 linearly independent samples for  $x, y, z$  have been encountered
- Potential invariants are discarded when falsified
- Derived Variables
  - ▷ Synthetic array subscript expressions (not occurring in source)
  - ▷ Sum of array elements
  - ▷ Number of function invocations
  - ▷ Others...

# Invariant Confidence

- To make the tool useful, invariants must be supported by statistically significant number of different values
- Daikon checks likelihood that invariant would occur by chance; lower number means increased confidence
- Invariants filtered based on a minimum confidence parameter

# Efficiency

- Efficiency of instrumentation
  - ▷ Values of tracked variables are output at each instrumentation point
  - ▷ Significant program slowdown, large amounts of trace data produced
- Efficiency of analysis
  - ▷ Potentially cubic in number of variables at any program point
  - ▷ Influenced more strongly by size of trace data

# Outline

- Introduction
- Detecting Invariants Dynamically
  - ▷ Types of Invariants
  - ▷ Instrumentation
  - ▷ Inferring Invariants
- Using Daikon
- Applications
- Links

# Using Daikon

- From the paper:
  - ▷ Found a bug in a previously-studied program with a large test suite (array bounds exceeded)
  - ▷ Revealed a condition that the test suite (with thousands of tests) did not exercise
  - ▷ Quality of detected invariants dependent on completeness of test suite

## Using Daikon (continued)

- On trivial programs, Daikon can produce gigabytes of trace data, cause slowdowns on the order of 100x, and require hours to infer invariants<sup>1</sup>
- Paper mentions that compute-bound programs typically become I/O-bound when instrumented by Daikon
- I tried it on a simple merge sort program written in Java

---

<sup>1</sup>Chadd Williams, private communication.

## Using Daikon (continued)

Merge sort results

Elements	Run time (orig)	Run time (instr)	Trace file size	Time to check
1,000	1.461 s	3.208 s	1,269,078	17.886 s
10,000	4.050 s	12.747 s	14,951,294	102.559 s
100,000	12.605 s	120.394 s	172,015,722	354.514 s

- Slowdown is not too bad for this program, but trace file size is significant
- Given the ease of producing huge trace files for simple programs, Daikon is not practical for real systems



## Using Daikon (continued)

- What can be done to detect invariants more efficiently? Paper suggests:
  - ▷ Adjust granularity of instrumentation
  - ▷ Instrument only 'interesting' parts of program
- Other ideas:
  - ▷ On-line compression of trace data
    - Gzip reduced trace file for 100,000 element merge sort by factor of 5.69
  - ▷ Decrease sampling frequency (as in Arnold, PLDI 2001)
  - ▷ Dynamically recompile code to remove instrumentation once enough data has been collected (i.e., in JVM)

# Outline

- Introduction
- Detecting Invariants Dynamically
  - ▷ Types of Invariants
  - ▷ Instrumentation
  - ▷ Inferring Invariants
- Using Daikon
- Applications
- Links

# Applications

- Paper describes use of generated invariants as aid to understanding of an undocumented program
  - ▷ A more recent paper by Nimmer and Ernst uses output of Daikon to feed ESC/Java, a static specification checker based on theorem-proving
- Recent research uses runtime failures of statically or dynamically detected invariants to detect probable bugs (anomalous behavior) [Engler et. al. SOSP 01, Hangal and Lam ICSE 2002]
  - ▷ The paper suggests this as well (including the original conference paper at ICSE 1999)

# Outline

- Introduction
- Detecting Invariants Dynamically
  - ▷ Types of Invariants
  - ▷ Instrumentation
  - ▷ Inferring Invariants
- Using Daikon
- Applications
- Links

# Links

- Ernst, et. al., *Dynamically Discovering Likely Program Invariants to Support Program Evolution*,  
<http://pag.lcs.mit.edu/~mernst/pubs/invariants-tse.pdf>
- Daikon home page: <http://pag.lcs.mit.edu/daikon/>
- Engler et. al., *Bugs as Deviant Behavior: A General Approach to Inferring Errors in Systems Code*,  
<http://www.stanford.edu/~engler/deviant-sosp-01.pdf>
- Hangal and Lam, *Tracking Down Software Bugs Using Automatic Anomaly Detection*, <http://suif.stanford.edu/papers/Diduce.pdf>