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Broader Context: Work on JPF at UIUC

• Two lines of work
  – Extend functionality
  – Improve performance

• Summary
  – Several contributions to JPF codebase: overflow checking, untracked fields, bug fixes
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Java PathFinder

• Java PathFinder (JPF) is an explicit-state model checker for Java programs
  – Used to find bugs in programs or verify properties

• Takes as input a Java program and explores all executions that the program can have

• JPF generates as output:
  – Executions that violate given properties
  – Test inputs for the given program
  – Statistics about state-space exploration
Example: Red-black tree

Simplified class TreeMap:

```java
class TreeMap {
    int size; Entry root;
    static class Entry {
        int key, value; boolean color;
        Entry left, right, parent; ...
    }
    void put(int key, int value) { ... }
    void remove(int key) { ... }
}
```

A driver for exploration of tree states:

```java
// input bounds sequence length
// and range of input keys
static void main(int N) {
    // an empty tree, the root object for exploration
    TreeMap t = new TreeMap();
    for (int i = 0; i < N; i++) {
        int methodNum = Verify.getInt(0, 1);
        switch (methodNum) {
            case 0: t.put(Verify.getInt(1, N), 0); break;
            case 1: t.remove(Verify.getInt(1, N)); break;
        }
        Verify.ignoreIfPreviouslySeen(t);
    }
}
```

Generates method sequences, not directly object graphs (which Korat does)
Explicit-state model checking

- Store state
- Take next value
- Execute operation
- Prune path (if state was seen)
- Restore state (backtrack)
Java PathFinder – state representation

- JPF is a backtrackable Java Virtual Machine (JVM)
  - Runs on the top of the host JVM
- Uses special representation for state of model checked program

![Java program (classfiles)](image)

![JPF](image)

![JVM](image)

```
97: [2, 98, 99]
98: [1, -1, -1]
99: [3, -1, -1]
```
Java PathFinder – operations

• Operations on special state representation:
  – Bytecode execution: manipulates state to execute program bytecodes
  – State backtracking: stores/restores state to backtrack execution for state-space exploration
  – State comparison: detects cycles in the state space
Java PathFinder – MJI

• Model Java Interface (MJI)
  – Allows host JVM code to manipulate JPF state
  – Provides a mechanism for executing parts of application code on the host JVM
  – Similar to JNI for Java/JVM

• Quote from JPF documentation: “For components that are not property-relevant, it makes sense to delegate the execution from the state-tracked JPF into the non-state tracked host VM.”
// input bounds sequence length
// and range of input keys
static void main(int N) {
    // an empty tree, the root object for exploration
    TreeMap t = new TreeMap();
    for (int i = 0; i < N; i++) {
        int methodNum = Verify.getInt(0, 1);
        switch (methodNum) {
            case 0: t.put(Verify.getInt(1, N), 0); break;
            case 1: t.remove(Verify.getInt(1, N)); break;
        }
        Verify.ignoreIfPreviouslySeen(t);
        incrementCounters(methodNum == 1);
    }
}
static int totalCounter = 0, lastRemoveCounter = 0;
static void incrementCounters(boolean isLastRemove) {
    totalCounter++;
    if (isLastRemove) lastRemoveCounter++;
}
Some of our state extensions

// input bounds sequence length
// and range of input keys
static void main(int N) {
    // an empty tree, the root object for exploration
    TreeMap t = new TreeMap();
    for (int i = 0; i < N; i++) {
        int methodNum = Verify.getInt(0, 1);
        switch (methodNum) {
            case 0: t.put(Verify.getInt(1, N), 0); break;
            case 1: t.remove(Verify.getInt(1, N)); break;
        }
        Verify.ignoreIfPreviouslySeen(t);
        incrementCounters(methodNum == 1);
    }
}

static int totalCounter = 0, lastRemoveCounter = 0;
static void incrementCounters(boolean isLastRemove) {
    totalCounter++;
    if (isLastRemove) lastRemoveCounter++;
}
### Extensions target JPF operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bytecode execution</th>
<th>State backtracking</th>
<th>State comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Untracked State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delta Execution</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Execution</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incremental Checking</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Untracked state [Gvero et al. 2008]

• Provides a new functionality in JPF
  – By default, JPF stores and restores the entire JVM state during backtracking
  – Untracked State allows the user to mark that certain parts of the state JPF should not restore during backtracking

• Useful for collecting some information about all execution paths, e.g., counting some events or measuring coverage
Changes

• Added Java annotation: `@UntrackedField`
• Used to mark some fields as untracked, i.e., not to be restored during backtracking

```java
@UntrackedField
static int totalCounter = 0;
@UntrackedField
static int lastRemoveCounter = 0;
static void incrementCounters(boolean isLastRemove) {
    totalCounter++;
    if (isLastRemove) lastRemoveCounter++;
}
```
Untracked state - definition

• Our implementation allows both static and non-static fields, as well as primitive and reference fields, to be marked as untracked.

• An object is untracked if all its fields are untracked.

• If an untracked reference points to an object, that object and all objects reachable from it are untracked.
  – Gets tricky with aliasing (some tracked, some untracked references), details in paper & code doc.
Our implementation

- New package gov.nasa.jpf.jvm.untracked
- Several changes to existing classes, aiming to minimally affect existing JPF code
  - Did not change the way that JPF stores the state: JPF still stores all fields of all objects, even if some are untracked
  - Only changed the way that JPF restores the state to avoid restoring untracked fields and objects
- Our code is integrated in JPF’s repository
  - Thanks to Peter for feedback
Previous solution

• Before we added \texttt{@UntrackedField} to JPF, one had to maintain state not backtracked by JPF using MJIs or listeners.

• MJIs require much more coding, for counters:
  – Mark the incrementCounters method as native
  – Provide a separate class that implements this method, keeping state on host JVM.

• Listeners
  – Can intercept certain events
  – Manipulating JPF state still requires MJIs.
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Delta execution [d’Amorim et al. 2007]

- Goal is to speed up state-space exploration
- Exploits the fact that many execution paths overlap during exploration
- Key idea: share overlapping parts of multiple executions and separately execute only those parts that differ
Our approach

• Manipulate several states at once
  – A novel representation for a set of concrete states (called Delta State)
  – Efficient operations for that representation

• Targets all three major JPF state operations
  – Bytecode execution operates on Delta State
  – State backtracking restores Delta State
  – State comparison handles many states at once
Brief illustration

- Executes a method/value combination at once against multiple TreeMap states, combined into a single Delta State
- It **splits** and **merges** Delta State

Executions of put(2) on a set of states

Was seen
Some experimental results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject-Bound</th>
<th>Exploration Time (sec)</th>
<th># States</th>
<th># Executions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Δ Exec</td>
<td>Std / Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binheap-8</td>
<td>458.81</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>38.50x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bst-10</td>
<td>214.06</td>
<td>30.13</td>
<td>7.11x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deque-9</td>
<td>552.11</td>
<td>28.84</td>
<td>19.14x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fibheap-8</td>
<td>400.84</td>
<td>21.59</td>
<td>18.57x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filesystem-4</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>5.59x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heaparray-9</td>
<td>2724.63</td>
<td>21.49</td>
<td>126.80x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>queue-7</td>
<td>84.42</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>16.63x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stack-7</td>
<td>59.70</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>14.43x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treemap-11</td>
<td>90.80</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>9.63x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ubstack-9</td>
<td>1502.24</td>
<td>32.54</td>
<td>46.17x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GMEAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.79x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mixed execution [d’Amorim et al. 2006]

• Goal is to speed up execution/exploration
• Key idea: execute some parts of the program being checked not on JPF but directly on the host JVM
• Executes on the host JVM deterministic blocks that have no:
  – thread interleavings
  – non-deterministic choices
• This extension targets only bytecode execution
Mixed execution – translation

• Translates the state between JPF and JVM:
  – From JPF to JVM at the beginning of a block
  – From JVM to JPF at the end of a block

• Lazy translation
  – Optimization that speeds up Mixed Execution
  – Translates only the parts of the state that an execution accesses (not entire reachable states)
Mixed execution – example

- In the TreeMap driver, executions of the put and remove methods manipulate the tree.
- Mixed Execution executes these methods on the host JVM in three steps.
1. translates the objects from the JPF representation into the host JVM representation

2. invokes the method on the translated state

3. translates the state back
Some experimental results

• Evaluated Mixed Execution and lazy translation on six subject programs that use JPF to generate tests for data structures
  – Mixed Execution can improve the overall time for state exploration up to 1.73x
  – Improves the time for execution of deterministic blocks up to 3.05x

• Also evaluated Mixed Execution on a fairly complex routing protocol, AODV, and the results show a speedup of up to 1.41x

• Lazy translation can improve the eager Mixed Execution up to 1.35x
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Incremental checking [Lauterburg+ ’08]

• Considers evolving code, basic scenario:
  – Explore state space for one version of code
  – Code changes (bug fix, optimization…)
  – How to explore new version faster?

• Previous work on incremental model checking focuses on control-intensive properties
  – Dynamically allocated data not handled well

• Our goal: speed up JPF for evolving code with dynamically allocated data
Key idea

- Reuse state space graphs from previous exploration to speed up next exploration
- In addition to performing exploration and producing usual output (tests, violations…), produce a state-space graph
  - Nodes in graphs are hashes of states (requires no data layout changes between versions)
  - Edges are transitions (method/value pairs)
- While exploring current version, check if results are known from previous version
Potential savings

• Bytecode execution
  – No need to execute an unchanged transition on a state found in previous exploration (except to build new states for exploration)

• State comparison costs
  – No need to compute hash code of a state if it is found in previous exploration
  – No need to verify correctness property of a state if it is found in previous exploration
### Some experimental results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject &amp; Bound</th>
<th>Ver.</th>
<th>Time (sec)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Inc</td>
<td>ISSE</td>
<td>Savings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aodv 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>302.24</td>
<td>302.46</td>
<td>- 0.07%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>302.85</td>
<td>113.68</td>
<td>62.46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>302.54</td>
<td>113.64</td>
<td>62.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binheap 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>416.90</td>
<td>428.02</td>
<td>- 2.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>404.78</td>
<td>249.13</td>
<td>38.45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bst 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1782.46</td>
<td>2238.98</td>
<td>- 25.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1140.94</td>
<td>807.23</td>
<td>29.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filesystem 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1083.80</td>
<td>1085.16</td>
<td>- 0.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1064.53</td>
<td>419.03</td>
<td>60.64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1040.02</td>
<td>409.41</td>
<td>60.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filesystem 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1053.24</td>
<td>1064.40</td>
<td>- 1.06%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1045.59</td>
<td>446.91</td>
<td>57.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heaparray 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67.36</td>
<td>70.69</td>
<td>- 4.94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>131.73</td>
<td>137.93</td>
<td>- 4.71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time savings for non-initial explorations: -4.71% to 62.46% (median **56.99%**).
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Conclusions

• Developed several state extensions for JPF
  – Extending functionality
    • Untracked state for (no) backtracking
    • Overflow checking for arithmetic (not in this talk)
  – Improving performance
    • Delta execution: speedup 0.88x-126.80x
    • Mixed execution: speedup up to 1.73x
    • Incremental checking: speedup 0.96x-2.66x

• Contributed some code to the JPF codebase
  – State extensions + bug fixes
Ongoing and future work

• Ongoing work: optimized generation of object graphs (Sarfraz's talk)
  – Several optimizations to get over 10x speedup
  – Undo Backtracking contributed to JPF

• Future work
  – Contribute more code to JPF (this summer: two GSoC mentees and two undergrad visitors)
  – Integrate various extensions (synergistic speedup)
  – Speedup: Replace JPF interpreter with compiler??

http://mir.cs.uiuc.edu/jpf