

# 1 Relevance

## 1.1 Introduction

Put an intuitive idea of our definition of relevance.

**Definition 1** (Execution). *Let  $\pi$  be an error trace of length  $n$ . An execution of  $\pi$  is a sequence of states  $s_0, s_1 \dots s_n$  such that  $s_i, s_{i+1} \models T$ , where  $T$  is the transition formula of  $\pi[i]$ .*

**Definition 2** (Blocking Execution). *An execution of a trace  $\pi$  of size  $n$  is called a blocking execution, if there exists a sequence of states  $s_0, s_1 \dots s_j$  where  $i < j \leq n$  such that  $s_i, s_{i+1} \models T$  where  $T$  is the transition formula of  $\pi[i]$  and there exists an assume statement in the trace  $\pi$  at position  $j$  such that  $s_j \not\models \text{guard}(\pi[j])$*

**Definition 3** (Relevance of an assigning statement). *Let  $\pi = \langle st_1, \dots, st_n \rangle$  be an error trace of length  $n$  where  $st_i$  is an assigning statement at position  $i$  that assigns a new value to some variable  $x$ . The statement  $st_i$  is relevant if there exists an execution  $s_1, \dots s_{n+1}$  of  $\pi$  and some value  $v$  such that every execution of the trace  $\langle x := v; \pi[i+1, n] \rangle$  starting in  $s_i$  has a blocking execution.*

---

### Algorithm 1 Relevence of an assigning statement

---

```

1: procedure RELEVANCE
2:    $trace \leftarrow$  Error trace  $\pi$  of length  $n$ 
3:    $relevantStatements \leftarrow [ ]$ 
4:   for  $i = n$  to 1 do
5:      $Q \leftarrow \neg wp(false; trace(i+1, n))$ 
6:      $P \leftarrow wp(Q; trace(i)) \cap sp(true; trace(1; i-1))$ 
7:      $relevance \leftarrow \text{checkUnsatCore}(P, trace(i), Q)$ 
8:     if  $relevance = \text{"unsat"}$  and  $trace(i)$  in "unsatCore" then
9:        $relevantStatements.append(trace(i))$ 
10:  return  $relevantStatements$ 

```

---

In the algorithm , we check the relevance of a statement by checking if the triple  $(P, \pi[i], \neg Q)$  is unsatisfiable and  $\pi[i]$  is in the unsatisfiable core. We can do this by checking if  $P \not\subseteq WP(Q; \text{havoc}(x))$  .

## 1.2 Examples

Consider an error trace  $x := 1, y := 2, z := 3, \text{havoc}(z), \text{assume}(z \leq 10)$  obtained from the following program:

```

1 foo ()
2 {
3   x := 1;
4   y := 2;
5   z := 3;
6   havoc z;

```

```
7  assert(z > 10);  
8 }
```

In the example above only the havoc statement at line 6 is relevant. One might assume that the assignment statement involving  $z$  might also be relevant. But if there exists an execution  $\mathcal{E}$  of the trace, there is no assignment to  $z$  at this point such that we have a blocked execution of the subtrace from this assignment onwards starting with a state taken from the execution  $\mathcal{E}$  just before the assignment  $z := 3$ .

Consider another example:

```
1  foo()  
2  {  
3    y := 7;  
4    havoc x;  
5    assert(x >= 0 && y >= 0);  
6  }
```

Only *havoc*( $x$ ) is relevant since there is no assignment to  $y$  in line 3 that can make an existing execution of the error trace blocking.

(more examples to follow)

**Theorem 1** (Equivalence of relevance). *Let  $\pi = \langle st_1, \dots, st_i, \dots, st_n \rangle$  be an error trace of length  $n$  and  $\pi[i]$  be an assigning statement at position  $i$ , which assigns a new value to some variable  $x$ . Let  $P = \neg WP(\text{False}; \pi[i, n]) \cap SP(\text{True}; \pi[1, i-1])$  be a set of bireachable states at position  $i$  and  $Q = \neg WP(\text{False}; \pi[i+1, n])$  be the coreachable states at position  $i+1$ . The statement  $\pi[i]$  is relevant iff:*

$$P \not\subseteq WP(Q, \text{havoc}(x))$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be the domain of the variable  $x$ .

” $\Rightarrow$ ”

If  $\pi[i]$  is relevant, then

$$P \not\subseteq WP(Q; \text{havoc}(x))$$

Obviously all the transitions from the states in  $WP(Q; \text{havoc}(x))$  ends up in  $Q$ . Relevancy of  $\pi[i]$  implies that there is a state in  $s \in P$  such that there is a transition from  $s$  to  $\neg Q$ . That would mean:

$$P \not\subseteq WP(Q; \text{havoc}(x))$$

” $\Leftarrow$ ”

$\pi[i]$  is relevant, if:

$$P \not\subseteq WP(Q; \text{havoc}(x))$$

We know that  $WP(Q; \text{havoc}(x))$  is the set of states from which all transitions end up in  $Q$ . The above non implication shows the existence of a state  $s$  in  $P$  such that  $s \notin WP(Q; \text{havoc}(x))$  from which there is a transition to  $\neg Q$ . This shows the existence of a value  $v \in \mathcal{D}$  that we can assign to  $x$  such that if we replace  $\pi[i]$  with  $x := v$ , then every execution is becoming blocking. Also, from our assumption, it is clear that there exists an execution till  $P$ , since  $P$  is not empty.  $\square$

## 2 Comparison with other approaches

### 2.1 Error Invariants [1]

Consider the following example:

```
1 foo()
2 {
3   x := 7;
4   x := 7;
5   assert(x > 10);
6 }
```

According to our algorithm, only line number 4 is relevant since only at this location there exists an assignment to  $x$  such that the trace from here on is getting blocked. But at line 3, no such assignment exists. According to the approach using error invariants, the assignment at line 4 is not relevant since this statement have no effect on the error invariant and the error invariant remains the same (inductive error invariant).

Intuitively, it is not so helpful for the user if line 3 is marked relevant. Because even if that line is *\*fixed\**, the program is still ending up in an error state. However, fixing line 4 also fixes the program.

Consider another example:

```
1 foo()
2 {
3   x := x + y;
4   x := x + z;
5   y := y + z;
6   assert(x >= 0);
7 }
```

According to our algorithm, only the second assignment to  $x$  is relevant for the error, since an assignment to  $x$  at this point can make an existing execution for the rest of the trace blocking. On the first look it seems that the assignment at line 3 should also be relevant, because it can make an existing execution blocking for the rest of the trace but we can always assign  $z$  such a value that it can override the effect of the assignment at line 3 and make the execution unblocking again.

The error invariant algorithm is not smart enough to recognize that and it says that both of the assigning statements to  $x$  are relevant. Since it bases its judgement on changing error invariants which are changing after line 3 and 4 both.

We however believe that our result is more helpful to the user since changing this one line can fix the error in the program.

### 2.2 Flow Sensitive Fault localization [3]

In the paper flow sensitive fault localization, the authors try to take into account the control flow of the program and propose a flow sensitive error localization technique which, they hope, not only explain the cause of the error but also

explain why the statements leading to the error were executed. They do this by modifying the so called *error trace formula* to something which they call a *flow sensitive error trace formula*. An error trace formula is just a conjunction of the trace formula of the error trace together with the error precondition and the correctness assertion. Information about the relevant statements can be obtained from the proof of unsatisfiability of the error trace formula. There are however serious shortcomings with this approach of finding relevant statements to begin with.

The flow sensitive error trace formula is a modification of the error trace formula, such that it now keeps track of dependencies between statements and the branching conditions that are relevant for the reachability of these statements in the control flow graph of the program.

The main focus of the authors here is on finding the relevant assume statements and the statements that cause the guard of the relevant assume statements to hold. We on the other hand only focus on the statements that cause the state of the program to change and do not analyse assume statements directly.

## 3 Previous/Failed approaches:

### 3.1 Replace with havoc and an assume is restrictive

#### 3.1.1 Approach

In this approach, we said that we replace an assignment with a havoc and if some assume in the trace is becoming restrictive then the assignment statement is becoming restrictive. What was the criteria for the havoc again ?

**Definition 4** (Restrictivness of a statement). *Let  $pre$  be a state formula,  $\pi$  a trace and  $i$  a position such that  $\pi[i]$  is an assume statement. We call the assume statement  $\pi[i]$  restrictive iff :*

$$SP(\pi[0, i - 1], pre) \not\models guard(\pi[i])$$

**Definition 5** (Relevance of a statement). *Let  $\pi$  be an error trace and  $\pi[i]$  be an assignment statement at position  $i$  having the form  $x := t$ , where  $x$  is a variable and  $t$  is an expression. Let  $\pi'$  be the trace which is obtained by replacing  $\pi[i]$  by  $havoc(x)$ . Let  $\Psi$  be the error precondition of  $\pi$ . The assignment statement  $\pi[i]$  is relevant if there exists some assume statement at position  $j > i$  in  $\pi'$  such that  $\pi'[j]$  is restrictive for  $\pi'$  and  $\Psi$ .*

#### 3.1.2 Example where it works

```
1 foo ()
2 {
3   x := 1;
4   y := 2;
5   z := 3;
6   assert(z > 10);
7 }
```

lines 3 and 4 are not relevant as if we replace them with havoc, no assume in the error trace is becoming restrictive. But if we replace line 5 with *havoc(z)*, then the last assume statement (*assume(z <= 10)*) is becoming restrictive. Hence the line with the assignment to  $z$  is restrictive.

#### 3.1.3 Example where it fails

```
1 foo ()
2 {
3   x := 1;
4   y := 2;
5   z := 3;
6   havoc z;
7   assert(z > 10);
8 }
```

In the above example, every statement is now relevant. If we replace any of the assigning statements with *havoc*, the trace is restrictive and not necessarily because of the replacement with havoc but because of the last *havoc(z)* statement

in the program. Hence in this program line 3 and 4 are also relevant.  
Another example where this approach fails is:

```

1 procedure main()
2 {
3   y := 42;
4   havoc x;
5   assume(x >= 0 && y >= 23);
6   assert(false);
7 }

```

Here replacing the assignment statement  $y := 42$  with  $havoc(y)$  have no effect on the restrictivness of an already restrictive error trace. Hence it should not be relevant here. However, clearly this statement have an effect on the rechability of the error.

## 3.2 Approach with blocking executions

### 3.2.1 Approach

We adopted this definition for relevance when we discovered that we should take into account the "amount" of restrictivness of an assume statement instead of just considering if it is getting restrictive or not.

**Definition 6** (Execution). *Let  $\pi$  be an error trace of length  $n$ . An execution of  $\pi$  is a sequence of states  $s_0, s_1 \dots s_n$  such that  $s_i, s_{i+1} \models T$ , where  $T$  is the transition formula of  $\pi[i]$ .*

*Let  $\epsilon$  represent the set of all possible executions of the error trace.*

**Definition 7** (Blocking Execution). *An execution of a trace  $\pi$  of size  $n$  is called a blocking execution if there exists a sequence of states  $s_0, s_1 \dots s_j$  where  $i < j \leq n$  such that  $s_i, s_{i+1} \models T[i]$ , where  $T[i]$  is the transition formula of  $\pi[i]$  and there exists an assume statement in the trace  $\pi$  at position  $j$  such that  $s_j \not\models guard(\pi[j])$ .*

**Definition 8** (Relevancy of an assignment statement). *Let  $\beta$  represent the set of all blocking executions of a trace  $\pi$ . Let there be an assignment statement of the form  $x := t$  at position  $i$ . Let  $\pi'$  represent the trace that we get after replacing  $\pi[i]$  with a havoc statement of the form  $havoc(x)$  and let  $\beta'$  represent the set of all blocking executions for  $\pi'$ .*

*We say that the assignment statement  $\pi[i]$  is relevant if the trace after the replacement has strictly more blocked executions than the trace before the replacement, i.e if  $\beta \subsetneq \beta'$ .*

### 3.2.2 Example where it works

```

1 procedure main()
2 {
3   y := 42;
4   havoc x;
5   assume(x >= 0 && y >= 23);
6   assert(false);
7 }

```

This definition now correctly says that  $y := 42$  is relevant since changing it to havoc gives us more blocking executions then before.

### 3.2.3 Example where it fails

```
1 procedure main()  
2 {  
3   y := 10;  
4   havoc x;  
5   assume(x > 0);  
6 }
```

In this example, the statement  $y := 10$  clearly have nothing to do with error. But changing it to havoc gives us more blocking executions then before and according to this defintion, it is wrongly marked as relevant too.

## References

- [1] E.Ermis, M. Schaf, and T. Wies. Error Invariants. In FM'12, pages 338–353. Springer, 2012.
- [2] M. Schaf, D. Schawrtz, T. Wies. Explaining Inconsistent Code. In Joint meeting of the European Software Engineering conference and the Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/FSE'13, pages: 521 - 531, Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation. August 18-26,2013
- [3] J. Christ, E. Ermis, M. Schaf, and T. Wies. Flow-sensitive fault localization. In VMCAI, volume 7737, pages 189–208, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013. Springer