

Pick Your Contexts Well: Understanding Object-Sensitivity

The Making of a Precise and Scalable Pointer Analysis

Yannis Smaragdakis - University of Massachusetts, Amherst and University of Athens

Martin Bravenboer - LogicBlox Inc.

Ondřej Lhoták - University of Waterloo

Context Sensitivity

Call Site sensitivity vs Object Sensitivity

Object Sensitivity

```
class A {  
    void foo(Object o) {...}  
}  
class Client{  
    void bar(A a1,A a2){  
        ...  
        a1.foo(someobj1);  
        ...  
        a2.foo(someobj2);  
    }  
}
```

General Framework for context-sensitive analyses

precision vs performance

General Framework for context-sensitive analyses

precision vs performance

Context - HContext

General Framework for context-sensitive analyses

precision vs performance

Context - HContext

Framework functions:

- Record (object is created)
- Merge (method invocation)

Full Object Sensitivity

- Original object sensitivity
- Allocation site of receiver object + allocation site of the receiver's object allocator object + ...
- Framework
 - $\text{Context} = \text{HContext} = \text{Lab}^n$
 - $\text{Record}(l, c) = \text{cons}(l, \text{first}(n - 1, c))$
 - $\text{Merge}(l, hc, c) = hc$

Plain Object Sensitivity

- Allocation site of receiver object + allocation site of caller object + allocation site of caller's caller object + ...
- Framework
 - $\text{Context} = \text{HContext} = \text{Lab}^n$
 - $\text{Record}(l, c) = \text{cons}(l, \text{first}(n - 1, c))$
 - $\text{Merge}(l, hc, c) = \text{cons}(\text{car}(hc), \text{first}(n - 1, c))$

Type Sensitivity

- Why not reduce the combinatorial explosion by reducing combinations
- Instead of allocation sites, keep types
- Just some elements of context are transformed to types by a function
T: Instr -> ClassName

Choice of Type Contexts

```
class C
{
    ...
    void m()
    {
        ...
        new A();
        ...
    }
    ...
}
```

```
class C{  
    ...  
    new A();  
    ...  
}
```

Choice of Type Contexts

- 2Type+1H
 - Dynamic Type A of the allocated object
 - Upper bound C on the dynamic type of the allocator object

```
class C{  
    ...  
    new A();  
    ...  
}
```

Choice of Type Contexts

- **2Type+1H**
 - Dynamic Type A of the allocated object
 - Upper bound C on the dynamic type of the allocator object
- **1Type1Obj+1H**
 - Dynamic Type of the receiver object
 - Upper bound on the dynamic type of the receiver object's allocator object.
 - Dynamic Type of the receiver object's allocator object
 - Upper bound on the dynamic type of the receiver object's allocator's allocator object.

Implementation

- DOOP framework
- Datalog language
- Explicit representation of relations
 - opposed to BDDs.
 - explicit is faster, but may introduce redundancy.

Evaluation

1. Full-object-sensitivity vs Plain-object-sensitivity
 - a. Is full-object-sensitivity advantageous compared to plain-object-sensitivity in terms of precision and performance?

Evaluation

1. Full-object-sensitivity vs Plain-object-sensitivity
 - a. Is full-object-sensitivity advantageous compared to plain-object-sensitivity in terms of precision and performance?
2. Importance of Type Context Choice
 - a. Does the definition of the functions matter?

Evaluation

1. Full-object-sensitivity vs Plain-object-sensitivity
 - a. Is full-object-sensitivity advantageous compared to plain-object-sensitivity in terms of precision and performance?
2. Importance of Type Context Choice
 - a. Does the definition of the T function matter?
3. Type-sensitive precision and performance
 - a. Does type-sensitive achieve higher scalability than regular object-sensitive analyses while maintaining most of the precision?

Evaluation

- 64 bit machine
- quad core
- 24GB RAM
- DaCapo benchmark programs.

Evaluation

| | | insensitive | 1obj | 1obj+H | 2plain+1H | 2full+1H |
|-------|--|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | call-graph edges | 43055 | -559 | -1216 | -1129 | -368 |
| | reachable methods | 5758 | -29 | -37 | -62 | -21 |
| | total reachable virtual call sites | 27823 | -128 | -96 | -272 | -139 |
| | total polymorphic call sites | 1326 | -38 | -22 | -38 | -68 |
| andr | application reachable virtual call sites | 16393 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -9 |
| | application polymorphic call sites | 851 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | total reachable casts | 1038 | -14 | -15 | -33 | -6 |
| | total casts that may fail | 844 | -136 | -94 | -144 | -64 |
| | application reachable casts | 308 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1 |
| | application casts that may fail | 262 | -8 | -38 | -66 | -23 |
| | average var-points-to | 216.71 | 24.7 | 15.1 | 8.5 | 8.2 |
| | average application var-points-to | 327.27 | 20.8 | 15.3 | 8.8 | 8.5 |
| | call-graph edges | 44930 | -1239 | -2063 | -2287 | -765 |
| | reachable methods | 8502 | -76 | -87 | -115 | -53 |
| | total reachable virtual call sites | 23944 | -233 | -327 | -368 | -172 |
| | total polymorphic call sites | 1218 | -90 | -24 | -83 | -119 |
| chart | application reachable virtual call sites | 3649 | 0 | -8 | -47 | -12 |
| | application polymorphic call sites | 110 | -4 | -13 | -10 | -4 |
| | total reachable casts | 1728 | -22 | -38 | -58 | -7 |
| | total casts that may fail | 1457 | -182 | -252 | -164 | -120 |
| | application reachable casts | 232 | 0 | -4 | -21 | -1 |
| | application casts that may fail | 196 | -17 | -64 | -32 | -38 |
| | average var-points-to | 98.35 | 36.0 | 20.1 | 9.4 | 6.7 |
| | average application var-points-to | 55.35 | 27.2 | 14.4 | 5.0 | 2.8 |

Evaluation

| | | insensitive | 1obj | 1obj+H | 2plain+1H | 2full+1H |
|---------|---|-------------|--------|--------|---------------|--------------|
| antlr | time (sec) | 86.5 | 134.0 | 427.4 | 236.9 | 161.1 |
| | context-sensitive callgraph edges (thousands) | | 1,484 | 966 | 1,428 | 2,458 |
| | context-sensitive var-points-to (thousands) | 13,143 | 8,147 | 49,237 | 24,980 | 9,279 |
| chart | time (sec) | 72.2 | 380.2 | 1199.2 | 2496.0 | 688.2 |
| | context-sensitive callgraph edges (thousands) | | 1,463 | 1,087 | 9,564 | 7,469 |
| | context-sensitive var-points-to (thousands) | 7,054 | 19,942 | 83,354 | 107,221 | 22,854 |
| eclipse | time (sec) | 67.2 | 228.0 | 826.0 | 502.0 | 480.4 |
| | context-sensitive callgraph edges (thousands) | | 1,921 | 1,278 | 2,103 | 5,341 |
| | context-sensitive var-points-to (thousands) | 5,754 | 9,962 | 64,586 | 65,435 | 22,574 |
| luindex | time (sec) | 37.9 | 63.2 | 179.3 | 123.9 | 124.3 |
| | context-sensitive callgraph edges (thousands) | | 384 | 324 | 779 | 1,227 |
| | context-sensitive var-points-to (thousands) | 2,737 | 2,781 | 16,968 | 9,576 | 5,072 |
| pmd | time (sec) | 57.7 | 120.0 | 293.7 | 392.6 | 160.0 |
| | context-sensitive callgraph edges (thousands) | | 553 | 418 | 3,610 | 1,614 |
| | context-sensitive var-points-to (thousands) | 4,392 | 5,314 | 24,902 | 35,628 | 6,770 |

Evaluation

| | | 1obj+H | 1type1obj+1H | | | | 1obj+H | 1type1obj+1H | |
|-------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------|----------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| | | | bad context | good context | | | | bad context | good context |
| antlr | call-graph edges | 41280 | -329 | -1124 | xalan | call-graph edges | 35908 | -408 | -1290 |
| | reachable meths | 5692 | -3 | -78 | | reachable meths | 7237 | -2 | -86 |
| | reachable v-calls | 27599 | -2 | -404 | | reachable v-calls | 19828 | -2 | -389 |
| | poly v-calls | 1266 | -51 | -27 | | poly v-calls | 1175 | -52 | -51 |
| | reach. v-calls in app | 16393 | 0 | -9 | | reach. v-calls in app | 7709 | 0 | 0 |
| | poly v-calls in app | 851 | 0 | 0 | | poly v-calls in app | 726 | -2 | -6 |
| | reachable casts | 1009 | -1 | -38 | | reachable casts | 1264 | -1 | -37 |
| | casts that may fail | 614 | -4 | -157 | | casts that may fail | 668 | -5 | -123 |
| | reach. casts in app | 308 | 0 | -1 | | reach. casts in app | 501 | 0 | 0 |
| | casts in app may fail | 216 | 0 | -61 | | casts in app may fail | 250 | -4 | -23 |
| | avg var-points-to | 15.14 | 10.62 | 8.19 | | avg var-points-to | 14.94 | 14.03 | 9.57 |
| | avg app var-points-to | 15.25 | 9.02 | 8.51 | | avg app var-points-to | 15.73 | 15.14 | 11.58 |
| | time (sec) | 427.4 | 376.7 | 114.2 | | time (sec) | 979.9 | 4398.9 | 831.0 |
| | c-s callgraph edge (K) | 965 | 816 | 960 | | c-s callgraph edge (K) | 936 | 4915 | 2580 |
| | c-s var-points-to (K) | 49237 | 43030 | 7459 | | c-s var-points-to (K) | 96021 | 163916 | 38205 |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Evaluation

| | | 1obj+H | 2type +1H | 1type 1obj+1H | 2full +1H | | | 1obj+H | 2type +1H | 1type 1obj+1H | 2full +1H |
|-------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|
| antlr | call-graph edges | 41280 | -1401 | -52 | -44 | jython | call-graph edges | 30370 | -2091 | | |
| | reachable meths | 5692 | -77 | -4 | -2 | | reachable meths | 5754 | -118 | | |
| | reachable v-calls | 27599 | -405 | -1 | -5 | | reachable v-calls | 16057 | -830 | | |
| | poly v-calls | 1266 | -70 | -8 | -28 | | poly v-calls | 768 | -71 | | |
| | reach.v-calls in app | 16393 | -9 | 0 | 0 | | reach. v-calls in app | 7146 | -492 | | |
| | poly v-calls in app | 851 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | poly v-calls in app | 422 | 0 | | |
| | reachable casts | 1009 | -39 | 0 | 0 | | reachable casts | 1272 | -18 | | |
| | casts that may fail | 614 | -104 | -57 | -47 | | casts that may fail | 741 | -11 | | |
| | reach. casts in app | 308 | -1 | 0 | 0 | | reach. casts in app | 677 | 0 | | |
| | app casts may fail | 216 | -53 | -8 | -28 | | casts in app may fail | 445 | 17 | | |
| | avg var-points-to | 15.1 | 23.0 | 8.2 | 8.2 | | avg var-points-to | 21.2 | 19.1 | | |
| | avg app v-points-to | 15.3 | 41.7 | 8.5 | 8.5 | | avg app var-points-to | 30.7 | 31.4 | | |
| | time (sec) | 427.4 | 78.8 | 114.2 | 161.1 | | time (sec) | 1215.7 | 2107.6 | | |
| | c-s callgraph edge (K) | 966 | 512 | 960 | 2,458 | | c-s callgraph edge (K) | 923 | 4,399 | | |
| | c-s var-points-to (K) | 49,237 | 4,029 | 7,459 | 9,279 | | c-s var-points-to (K) | 110,113 | 53,552 | | |

Conclusions

Good choice of context...

- is more precise
 - smaller points-to sets
- yields much faster implementation
 - often 2x or more
- 2Type+1H has the best trade-of between precision and performance