More Course Overview: Models, Tests, Bugs, and Symbols

Homework 1 coming up

- By January 29 Pick one 2-hour slot on https://tinyurl.com/CS621HW1SignUp
- The slots go from February 1 to 8
- The assignment will take place entirely during the slot

What is Homework 1?

- You will get an opportunity to analyze several real-world defects and debug them.
- You'll use modern tools to help understand and fix errors.
- The assignment will be a guided one-on-one session.

Last time

What did we talk about?

Static analysis

- Using the source code to improve a program
- Manual code reviews and inspections
- Automatic inference of properties, proving

Improve the software quality

Dynamic analysis

- Using the program executions to improve the program
- Manual with debuggers, etc.
- Automatic inference over logged behavior
- Does not need source code or even binaries

Improve the software quality



As we go over each topic...

- Think whether this sounds interesting
- Think about what kind of a tool you could make that uses this
- You are all programmers: think about things you've done while programming that were hard, and how these kinds of analysis might make it easier

Model checking

- I actually meant:
 - Model checking
 - Model inference
 - Model simulation

Model inference

problem:

I have a system (or a log of executions). I want a small, descriptive model of what the system does.

Model can be used to **understand** the system, debug, detect anomalies, document.

[74.15.155.103 [06/Jan/2011:07:24:13] "GET HTTP/1.1 /check-out.php" [21.15.232.201 [06/Jan/2011:07:24:19] "GET HTTP/1.1 /check-out.php" [31.15.232.201 [06/Jan/2011:07:25:33] "GET HTTP/1.1 /nvalid-coupon.php" [47.15.155.103 [06/Jan/2011:07:28:43] "GET HTTP/1.1 /nvalid-coupon.php" [57.15.155.109 [06/Jan/2011:07:28:43] "GET HTTP/1.1 /check-out.php" [67.15.155.199 [06/Jan/2011:07:28:43] "GET HTTP/1.1 /check-out.php" [74.15.155.103 [06/Jan/2011:07:29:02] "GET HTTP/1.1 /check-out.php" [74.15.155.103 [06/Jan/2011:07:30:22] "GET HTTP/1.1 /check-out.php" [81.15.232.201 [06/Jan/2011:07:30:25] "GET HTTP/1.1 /check-out.php" [15.15.232.201 [06/Jan/2011:07:30:25] "GET HTTP/1.1 /check-out.php" [13.15.232.201 [06/Jan/2011:07:31:20] "GET HTTP/1.1 /check-out.php"

Logs are hard to read

Model inference

• First, parse out the executions

 $\mathsf{check}\mathsf{-}\mathsf{out} \not\rightarrow \mathsf{valid}\mathsf{-}\mathsf{coupon} \not\rightarrow \mathsf{check}\mathsf{-}\mathsf{out} \not\rightarrow \mathsf{reduce}\mathsf{-}\mathsf{price} \not\rightarrow \mathsf{get}\mathsf{-}\mathsf{credit}\mathsf{-}\mathsf{card}$

 $\mathsf{check}\mathsf{-}\mathsf{out} \not\rightarrow \mathsf{invalid}\mathsf{-}\mathsf{coupon} \not\rightarrow \mathsf{check}\mathsf{-}\mathsf{out} \not\rightarrow \mathsf{reduce}\mathsf{-}\mathsf{price} \not\rightarrow \mathsf{get}\mathsf{-}\mathsf{credit}\mathsf{-}\mathsf{card}$

check-out \rightarrow get-credit-card

• ...hard to understand



So what's the magic?

- Lots of ways to do it:
 - Try merging the executions into a small model
 - Mine properties then build a model from the properties alone
 - Use static or dynamic analysis to determine what events can legally take place after others

K-Tails

- let's use k=1 as an example
- merge two states if their name is the same
- (k=2 means merge two states if their name, and all the states to which they have transitions are "the same")
- and so on for larger k





Mutation testing

- · Evaluate the tests
 - not the program!
 - not a type of testing!
 - does not improve a program directly; improves tests!

Mutation

- Take a program
- Create a mutant with one or a few small changes:
 - change a + to a —
 - add/subtract 1 somewhere
 - increment/decrement a loop counter
 - delete a line
 - insert a line from one place in another
- Repeat to create many mutants

Why create mutants?

- Suppose you have a program and a test suite
- All the tests pass
- What does that mean about your program?
- 1. Program is correct
- 2. Tests only test parts of the program that are correct and the rest, who knows
- 3. Tests and program may be written by the same person, using the same *implicit* assumptions

Let's write some tests

// returns the factorial of the input n
int factorial (int n) {
 if (n <= 0)
 return 1;
 if (n == 1)
 return 1;
 else
 return n * factorial(n-1);
}</pre>

OK, so how do we test the tests?

- Run the tests on the main program
- Run the tests on the mutants

 what if the tests pass?

Mutation testing evaluates the tests

- If a test "kills a mutant" then that's a good test
- If some mutants aren't killed, the test suite is lacking
- Solution: write more tests!
- Is it OK to write more tests until all mutants are killed and then stop?

Consider this mutant

```
// returns the factorial of the input n
int factorial (int n) {
    if (n <= 0)</pre>
```

```
return 1;
if (n == 1)
return 1;
else
return n * factorial(n+1);
}
```

Consider this mutant

// returns the factorial of the input n
int factorial (int n) {
 if (n <= 2)
 return 1;
 if (n == 1)
 return 1;
 else
 return n * factorial(n-1);
}</pre>

// returns the factorial of the input n int factorial (int n) { if (n == 0) return 1; if (n == 1) return 1; else return n * factorial(n-1); }

Bug localization

• Narrowing down the most likely place to contain a bug





Minimizing via binary search SELECT_NAME="priority" NULTIPLE_SIZE-7> X <SELECT_NAME="priority" NULTIPLE_SIZE-7> X <SELECT_NAME="priorit • 57 test to simplify the 896 line HTML input to the "<SELECT>" tag that SIZE=7> V SIZE=7> V SIZE=7> V SIZE=7> X SIZE=7> V causes the crash SELECT_NAME SELECT_NAME SELECT NA Each character is relevant (as shown from SELEC SELECT SELECT line 20 to 26) SELECT SELECT Only removes deltas ELECT SELECT from the failing test 7> V 7> V 7> V 7> V SELECT SELE SELECT

Impact analysis

- Run the code on passing test cases
- Run the code on failing test cases
- Keep track of which lines execute
- Lines that executes only on passing test cases are OK. So are lines that execute on both.
- Lines that only execute on failing test cases are suspicious.

What else can you do to localize a bug?

Regressions: suppose a test used to pass and now fails.

- consider the latest changes
- do delta debugging on the changes

Can we automatically fix bugs?

Take a program that passes most test cases and fails one or two, and tweak it

 write (tweak) a very similar program (with minimal change) that passes all the tests [see Weimer et al., Automatically Finding Patches Using Genetic Programming, ICSE 2009]

localizing and auto-fixing: great project areas

Symbolic execution

- "Think" about the code, rather than execute it, but execute it anyway. But don't use numbers. Just think about the numbers.
- Clear, right?



Why symbolic execution?

- A different way to reasoning about the code
- Can determine what parts are reachable and under what conditions
- Can be compared to developers' expectations about those conditions
- Can be used to document
 - For example, "this method can only be called if x>0" or "this method throws an exception is pts == null"