CALCULATING BOUNDS ON INFORMATION LEAKAGE USING MODEL-CKECINGG TOOLS

A Thesis presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of Missouri

 $\label{eq:continuous} \mbox{In Partial Fulfillment}$ of the Requirements for the Degree $\mbox{Master of Science}$

by

JIA CHEN

Dr. Rohit Chadha, Thesis Supervisor JUL 2014

The undersigned, appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, have examined the thesis entitled:

presented by I	e Chan		
presented by Ji	a Chen,		
a candidate for	r the degree of Master of Science and hereby certify	that, i	n their
opinion, it is w	orthy of acceptance.		
-	Dr. Rohit Chadha		
-	Dr. Prasad Calyam		

Dr. Michela Becchi

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This page is where you would acknowledge all those who helped you with your academic research. This is not necessarily where you would recognize loved ones who supported you during your studies. That would be more appropriately done in an optional Dedication page. I would like to thank Professor Smith Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Vestibulum eu tellus. Nullam et odio eget sapien porttitor interdum. Donec vel ante. Maecenas in sem a nunc viverra hendrerit. Quisque ut massa quis pede blandit pharetra.

Pellentesque sed ligula sit amet ligula scelerisque sagittis. Nulla adipiscing tellus at pede. Cras id nunc vel diam congue dictum. Donec a nulla nec eros ornare consequat. Nullam quis orci. Nam adipiscing, erat in congue pellentesque, dolor eros euismod quam, a egestas mauris magna varius justo.

Sed eu sem et lorem blandit volutpat. Duis pulvinar, arcu quis suscipit convallis, ante elit auctor dui, in fermentum diam velit a mauris. In risus odio, consectetuer quis, ullamcorper in, rutrum ut, metus.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A	CKN	IOWLEDGMENTS	ii						
LI	LIST OF TABLES								
LI	LIST OF FIGURES								
ABSTRACT									
\mathbf{C}	HAP	TER							
1	Intr	roduction	1						
2	$Th\epsilon$	eory background	2						
	2.1	Min-entropy	2						
	2.2	Information leak	2						
	2.3	Two intuitive solutions	2						
		2.3.1 Double loop and counter	3						
		2.3.2 Single loop and table	4						
3	Exp	periment with Getafix	5						
	3.1	Getafix	6						
	3.2	The converter	6						
	3.3	Tests and results	7						
		3.3.1 Sanity check	7						
4	Mo	notonic programs	8						
5	Summary and concluding remarks								

APPENDIX

\mathbf{A}	Title of first appendix		
	A.1	Section title	10
		A.1.1 Subsection title	10
Bl	BIBLIOGRAPHY		
V	VITA		

LIST OF TABLES

Table

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

ABSTRACT

This is the abstract of your dissertation project. It should not exceed one page.

Introduction

Introduce the reader to the current problem that you wish to solve, and why anyone should care about it.

Theory background

2.1 Min-entropy

The introduction counts as chapter 1. This page shows how the bulk of your thesis will be organized: through chapters and sections. Here is a citation.[?]

2.2 Information leak

2.3 Two intuitive solutions

To count the number of outputs of a program, we come up with two approaches: Put the program in a double loop and count the number of outputs, or iterate through all input values and record the outputs in a table. The first approach is time-consuming, while the second one is space-consuming.

2.3.1 Double loop and counter

In algorithm 1, for each possible output value, we iterate through the input range to see if an input can result in this output. If we hit such an input, counter increases and the code breaks out of the inner loop to continue testing the next possible output value. After the double loop finishes, the value of OCounter is the number of outputs of program P.

Algorithm 1 Calculate the number of outputs using double loop.

```
S \leftarrow 0
O \leftarrow 0
SIn \leftarrow 0
OOut \leftarrow 0
OCounter \leftarrow 0
SMax \leftarrow 1 << bitLength - 1
OMax \leftarrow 1 << bitLength - 1
for O = 0 to OMax do
  for S = 0 to SMax do
     SIn \leftarrow S
     OOut \leftarrow P(SIn) // the program P takes SIn as input
     if OOut = O then
        OCounter \leftarrow OCounter + 1
       break
     end if
  end for
end for
```

In algorithm 1, we declared seven variables, and all of them requires bitLength bits except for OCounter which is bitLength + 1 bits. The total memory usage for variables is $7 \times bitLength + 1$ at O(bitLength). As with execution time, we assume program P takes time t(P) to execute, and the total execution time for the double loop when break is never reached is $2^{bitLength} \times 2^{bitLength} \times t(P)$ at $(2^{O(bitLength)})$.

2.3.2 Single loop and table

In algorithm 2, we create a table with size equal to the maximum number of possible outputs (1 << bitLength), and we use its indices as output values. OHit[O] = 1 means O is an output for program P. When a 0 turns to 1, we increase OCounter. After the loop, the value of OCounter is the number of outputs by program P.

Algorithm 2 Calculate the number of outputs using single loop and a table. $S \leftarrow 0$ $O \leftarrow 0$ $SIn \leftarrow 0$ $OOut \leftarrow 0$ $OCounter \leftarrow 0$ $SMax \leftarrow 1 << bitLength - 1$ $OMax \leftarrow 1 << bitLength - 1$ $OHit[OMax + 1] \leftarrow [0]$ for S = 0 to SMax do $SIn \leftarrow S$ $OOut \leftarrow P(SIn)$ // the program P takes SIn as input if OHit[OOut] = 0 then $OCounter \leftarrow OCounter + 1$ $OHit[OOut] \leftarrow 1$ end if end for

In algorithm 2 except for the array we have 7 variables using $7 \times bitLength + 1$ memory. The array OHit[] is of size $bitLength \times bitLength$ making a total of $bitLength^2 + 7 \times bitLength + 1$ at $O(bitLength^2)$. As with execution time, we assume program P takes time t(P) to execute, and the execution time for the single loop is $2^{bitLength} \times t(P)$ at $(2^{O(bitLength)})$.

Experiment with Getafix

We want to use model-checking tools to see if we can reduce the time requirement

of algorithm 1. Specifically, we choose the reachability property (why and what other

property are there) and append algorithm 3 to the end of algorithm 1. The statement

within the if statement has a label. Although the exact statement following that

label is irrelevant, reaching this line means OCounter satisfies the constrains in the

condition block.

We experimented on several model-checking tools, including Interproc from [1],

Berkeley Lazy Abstraction Software Verification Tool(Blast) from [2] and Getafix

from [3]. We can not get correct reachability results from Interproc and Blast, so we

shift our focus on Getafix.

Algorithm 3 Determine if *OCounter* meets certain constrains.

if value of *OCounter* meets certain constrains then

reach: OCounter // a label followed by a statement

end if

5

3.1 Getafix

Getafix is a symbolic model checker for Boolean programs implemented in [3]. Getafix only supports reachability check. It translates sequential and concurrent Boolean programs into Boolean formulae and uses the model-checker Mucke to solve the reachability problem symbolically using Boolean Decision Diagrams [4].

3.2 The converter

Input for Getafix are boolean programs, meaning it only supports boolean variables which can be either 0 or 1. We represent our problem in decimal, thus we need to translate it into boolean form. We implemented a converter to automate this process. The converter has three components, a parser, a built-in function generator and a piece of script which calls the first two components and assemble the output file.

Input to the parser is the decimal code file and the desired bit length. Output of the parser is its corresponding binary program which follows the syntax of Getafix input file. First we define the syntax of input code to the parser and second we create the parser using flex and bison. The parser scans the input code and builds a syntax tree. Then the parser prints the syntax tree as a binary program. The parser has three points worth noting:

1. When printing the output code, the parser "stretches" each variable and literal into its binary form. Assume the desired bit length is bitLength. We split each variable into bitLength variables by copying the name of the variable bitLength

- 3.3 Tests and results
- 3.3.1 Sanity check

Monotonic programs

Some paragraph text follows. Some paragraph text follows.

Summary and concluding remarks

Congratulations on completing your dissertation.

Appendix A

Title of first appendix

A.1 Section title

Here is some additional information which would have detracted from the point being made in the main article.

A.1.1 Subsection title

This section even has subtitles

Bibliography

- [1] Interproc, 2011.
- [2] MTC (models and theory of computation): BLAST project, 2008.
- [3] Salvatore La Torre, Madhusudan Parthasarathy, and Gennaro Parlato. Analyzing recursive programs using a fixed-point calculus. In *Proceedings of the 2009 ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, PLDI '09, page 211222, New York, NY, USA, 2009. ACM.
- [4] Getafix boolean program checker, 2009.

VITA

This is a summary of your *professional* life, and should be written appropriately. This can be written in the following order: where your where born, what undergraduate university you graduated from, if you received a masters, and which institution you graduated from with your PhD (University of Missouri). You can describe when you began research with your current advisor.

In another paragraph, you could say if/when you were married, what the name of your kids are, and what your plans are for after graduation if you choose. Take a look at other vita's from other dissertations for examples.