

Symbolic Execution and Fuzzing on Guava

Zekai Zhao, Junxiong Lin

1. Background

Guava is a well-known google java library that contains lots of algorithm implementation and data structure. In this report, we only focus on the testing on the data structure -- minMaxPriorityQueue.

Before we doing the practice, we already have some background about this test from my other testing class.

1. The minMaxPriorityQueue class file has been modified by others in ten places so that the source file is buggy.
2. We have written about 100 unit test cases that cover all the behavior of the priority queue, including add, offer, remove, poll, and etc. Those test cases reached a certain amount of test coverage and discovered four out of ten mutation bugs.

2. Plan

We plan to apply the symbolic execution and fuzzing on testing, applying what we learned from class to real-world problems. Symbolic execution is a method of white box testing which increases the coverage of the code, and unit test with fuzzing is a white box testing. Our goal is to find more mutation bugs. However, if the goal is not reachable, we want to at least improve the test coverage of this problem.

3. Symbolic execution

First, we can use symbolic execution to do some white-box testing. Symbolic execution is a method that can analyze a program to determine what inputs cause each part of a program to execute. It can be used as a tool to generate test cases and detect errors. We used Symbolic PathFinder to do the symbolic execution.

Using JAVA 8 and download jpf-core and jpf-symbc

`.jpf/site.properties`

`jpf-core = ${user.home}/CMU/18737/jpf-core`

`Jpf-symbc =`

`${user.home}/CMU/18737/jpf-symbc`

`extensions=${jpf-core},${jpf-symbc}`

Run a small test.

```
search started: 19-12-8 T:9:10:57
New sym int x_1_SWMINT min=-2147483648, max=2147483647
New sym int x_2_SWMINT min=-2147483648, max=2147483647
numeric PC: constraint # = 1
(x_2_SWMINT + x_1_SWMINT) != CONST_0 -> false
new PCs: total:1 sat:0 unsat:1
numeric PC: constraint # = 1
(x_2_SWMINT + x_1_SWMINT) = CONST_0 -> true
new PCs: total:2 sat:1 unsat:1
string analysis: SPC # = 0
VPC constraint # = 1
(x_2_SWMINT + x_1_SWMINT) = CONST_0
```

Since Guava has a lot of dependencies and I can only run SPF in the console, but fail to execute it in Eclipse, I modeled a simple version of MinMaxPriorityQueue. It has functions of Push(), Pop(), Contains() and Peek(). We can configure the jpf file by defining the min and max of symbolic and using symbolic.lazy=on to prune some of the choices. First, we tested a sequence of push.

```
[push(-100), push(-99), push(-98), push(-97), push(-9223372036854775808)]
[push(-100), push(-99), push(-98), push(-98), push(-9223372036854775808)]
[push(-100), push(-99), push(-99), push(-100), push(-100)]
[push(-100), push(-99), push(-99), push(-100), push(-99)]
[push(-100), push(-99), push(-99), push(-98), push(-9223372036854775808)]
[push(-100), push(-98), push(-99), push(-97)]
[push(-100), push(-98), push(-99), push(-98), push(-9223372036854775808)]
[push(-100), push(-99), push(-100), push(-99), push(-99)]
[push(-100), push(-99), push(-100), push(-99), push(-100)]
[push(-100), push(-99), push(-100), push(-98), push(-100)]
[push(-100), push(-99), push(-100), push(-98), push(-99)]
[push(-99), push(-98), push(-100), push(-100), push(-99)]
[push(-100), push(-100), push(-100), push(-100), push(-99)]
[push(-100), push(-100), push(-100), push(-99), push(-100)]
[push(-99), push(-100), push(-100), push(-99), push(-100)]
[push(-99), push(-100), push(-100), push(-99), push(-99)]
[push(-99), push(-99), push(-100), push(-100), push(-99)]
[push(-100), push(-100), push(-100), push(-99), push(-9223372036854775808)]
[push(-100), push(-100), push(-99), push(-98), push(-9223372036854775808)]
```

```
@Test
public void test143() {
    priorityqueue.push(-99);
    priorityqueue.push(-100);
    priorityqueue.push(-99);
    priorityqueue.push(-98);
    priorityqueue.push(-97);
}

@Test
public void test144() {
    priorityqueue.push(-97);
    priorityqueue.push(-100);
    priorityqueue.push(-99);
    priorityqueue.push(-98);
    priorityqueue.push(-97);
}
}

===== results
no errors detected

===== statistics
elapsed time:      80:00:01
states:           new=3411,visited=0,backtracked=3411,ends=1942
search:           maxDepth=19,constraints=0
choice generators: thread1=1,signal=0,lock=1,sharedRef=0,threadApin=0,reschedule=0), data=1469
heap:             new=1732,released=24048,maxLive=378,gcCycles=2939
instructions:     128006
max memory:       30940
loaded code:      classes=65,methods=1434

===== search finished: 19-12-9 下午 1:34
```

For the pros and cons of symbolic execution. It can explore different kinds of workflow and analysis without real execution. It can also pre-process to eliminate unsatisfiable test cases. For the disadvantages, in heap, the symbol of the exact number isn't really related to the process and lack of documentation and it needs pruning and fully implementation

we are trying to use fuzzer to help improve our previous unit tests. The fuzzer I chose is Radamsa. It is an open-source input generator that mutates given input by applying pre-defined mutation rules and patterns.

With those randomly generated inputs, we can modify previous unit test cases and replace the normal inputs with those generated corner inputs. An example is shown below.

[illegible]

There are both advantages and disadvantages of using fuzzing or Radamsa. It can Easily generate inputs with the given format and able to generate special inputs (corner cases). However, by using fuzzing, we still need to manually write assertions. And sometimes generate out-of-bound inputs. For example, there is some weird character in the IP address Example shown in the previous figure.

These two approaches improve our test robustness in different aspects, but we didn't use all the magic of them. In the

future, we may explore more functions of SPF and try different fuzzers.