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Abstract. We present a symbolic-execution-based algorithm that for a given program and a given program location produces a nontrivial necessary condition on input values to drive the program execution to the given location. We also propose an application of necessary conditions in contemporary bug-finding and test-generation tools. Experimental results show that the presented technique can significantly improve performance of the tools.

1 Introduction

Symbolic execution [18, 17] produces, for each path in a program starting in the initial location, a formula called \textit{path condition}, i.e. the necessary and sufficient condition on input data to drive the execution along the path. Symbolic execution serves as a basis in many successful tools for test generation and bug finding, for example Klee [4], Exe [5], Pex [27], Sage [11], or Cute [25]. These tools can relatively quickly find tests that cover a significant part of a given code. However, the ratio of covered code further increases very slowly or not at all. Here we present a method that helps the tools to cover a chosen program location and hence to further improve their performance.

The core of our method and the main contribution of the paper is a symbolic-execution-based algorithm that, for a given program and a given program location, produces a nontrivial necessary condition on input values to drive the program execution to the given location. The basic idea of this algorithm is to replace each program loop by a summary of its effect on both, program variables and path conditions. The algorithm is intuitively explained in Section 2 and precisely described in Section 3.

The algorithm usually produces necessary conditions with quantifiers. In spite of recent advances in SMT solving, current SMT solvers often fail to quickly decide satisfiability of quantified formulae. We employ a specific structure of necessary conditions and introduce a transformation of a quantified necessary condition into a more general but quantifier-free necessary condition. The transformation is presented in Section 4.

Section 5 proposes possible applications of necessary conditions in the test-generation tools. In principle, the application of necessary conditions can speed up recognition of unreachable locations as well as discovery of tests reaching uncovered locations. Experimental results provided in Section 6 shows that the proposed method can seriously improve performance of the tools.
Finally, Section 7 discusses some related work and Section 8 concludes the paper.

2 Outline of the Algorithm

An intuitive explanation of the algorithm is illustrated on the following simple program, where we want to compute a necessary condition to reach the assertion on the last line.

```
k = 0;
for (i = 3; i < n; ++i) {
    if (A[i] == 1)
        ++k;
}
if (k > 12)
    assert(false);
```

The relevant part of the program can be represented as the flowgraph of Figure 1 (left), where the node $h$ corresponds to the target location.

Our algorithm works on flowgraphs. In the following, by complete path we mean a path in the flowgraph leading from the initial to the target location. If a given flowgraph contains only finitely many complete paths $\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_n$, one can compute a necessary (and sufficient) condition very easily: using symbolic execution, we compute a path condition $\varphi_i$ for each complete path $\pi_i$ and we construct the necessary condition as

$$
\hat{\varphi} = \bigvee_{1 \leq i \leq n} \varphi_i.
$$
Unfortunately, the number of complete paths is usually infinite as flowgraphs typically contain cycles. However, the number of acyclic complete paths is always finite. Therefore, we associate to each complete path $\pi$ one acyclic complete path called the backbone of $\pi$. The backbone is defined by the following procedure: If $\pi$ is acyclic, then the backbone is directly $\pi$. Otherwise, we find the leftmost repeating node in $\pi$, remove the part of $\pi$ between the first and the last occurrence of this node (including the last occurrence), and repeat the procedure. In other words, the backbone arises from $\pi$ by removing all cycles. Note that the cycles correspond to iterations of program loops.

The algorithm finds all backbones in a given flowgraph. For each backbone $\rho$, it computes an abstract path condition. This path condition is called abstract as it represents not only the backbone, but all complete paths with backbone $\rho$. More precisely, the abstract path condition is implied by each path condition corresponding to a complete path with backbone $\rho$. The resulting necessary formula is a disjunction of all abstract path conditions.

The crucial step in the computation of abstract path condition for a backbone is to identify all loop entry nodes lying on this backbone and compute summaries of the corresponding loops. We demonstrate the computation of a loop summary on our running example. The flowgraph of Figure 1 (left) has only one backbone $abcgh$. The backbone contains one loop entry node $c$ entering the loop $\{c, d, e, f\}$. The computation of a summary is based on an analysis of paths going around the loop from the entry node back to it. To simplify the analysis, we first extract the loop from the original flowgraph and then we analyse its complete paths. At Figure 1 (middle), there is a flowgraph representing the loop $\{c, d, e, f\}$ of our example. This flowgraph contains two complete paths, namely $\pi_1 = cdefc'$ and $\pi_2 = cdef'$, we need to analyse.

The first part of a loop summary is a description of the overall effect of the loop on variable values, since the first visit of the loop entry node to the last visit of the node. The effect is described by an iterated symbolic state, which is a function that assigns to each program variable its value given by an expression over symbols and path counters. Symbols represent initial values of variables at the first visit of the entry node (for each variable $a$, we denote its symbol by $\bar{a}$). Path counters $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \ldots$ correspond to different backbones of the flowgraph representing the extracted loop. Each path counter represents the number of loop iterations along the corresponding backbone.

In our example, we assign path counters $\kappa_1, \kappa_2$ to backbones $\pi_1, \pi_2$ respectively. The overall effect of the loop with respect to the entry node $c$ can be described by the iterated symbolic state $\theta^\kappa$ with only two interesting values (as the other variables are not changed in the loop):

$$\theta^\kappa(i) = \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + i \quad \quad \theta^\kappa(k) = \kappa_1 + k$$

In other words, by $\kappa_1$ iterations of $\pi_1$ and $\kappa_2$ iterations of $\pi_2$ executed in an arbitrary order, the values of $i$ and $k$ are increased by $\kappa_1 + \kappa_2$ and $\kappa_1$, respectively.

The second part of a loop summary is a looping condition $\phi^\kappa$. Given path counters $\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_n$ corresponding to acyclic paths $\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_n$ around the loop,
the formula $\varphi^E$ describes a necessary condition to perform $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \kappa_i$ iterations of the loop such that, for each $i$, exactly $\kappa_i$ iterations use path $\pi_i$. In other words, $\varphi^E$ has to be implied by each path condition $\varphi$ corresponding to such $\sum_i \kappa_i$ iterations of the loop. Note that, for each test on a path $\pi_i$, we know that this test appears exactly $\kappa_i$-times in $\varphi$. Of course, all the variables in this test can be evaluated to different symbolic expressions each time. We construct the looping condition $\varphi^E$ as $\psi_1 \land \ldots \land \psi_n$. Each subformula $\psi_i$ says that, for each of the $\kappa_i$ iterations along the path $\pi_i$, all tests on the path must be satisfied for some possible values of variables, i.e. for some values given by the iterated symbolic state and some admissible values of path counters.

In the example, the looping condition $\varphi^E$ for the loop $\{c, d, e, f\}$ with the entry node $c$ has the form $\psi_1 \land \psi_2$. We focus on the construction of $\psi_1$, which corresponds to path $\pi_1$ containing two tests: $i < n$ and $A[i] == 1$. The iterated symbolic state says that values of $i$, $n$, and $A[i]$ in $(\tau_1 + 1)$-st iteration of $\pi_1$ and after $\tau_2$ iterations of $\pi_2$ are $\tau_1 + \tau_2 + \frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, and $A(\tau_1 + \tau_2 + \frac{1}{2})$ respectively. To complete this iteration of $\pi_1$, the conditions $\tau_1 + \tau_2 + \frac{1}{2} < n$ and $A(\tau_1 + \tau_2 + \frac{1}{2})$ have to be satisfied. In general, if we want to make $\kappa_1$ iterations of $\pi_1$ and $\kappa_2$ iterations of $\pi_2$, the formula $\psi_1$ says that for each $\tau_1$ satisfying $0 \leq \tau_1 < \kappa_1$ and $\tau_2$ satisfying $0 \leq \tau_2 < \kappa_2$ such that $\tau_1 + \tau_2 + \frac{1}{2} < n$ and $A(\tau_1 + \tau_2 + \frac{1}{2}) = 1$. The complete looping condition for our example is as follows:

$$\begin{align*}
\varphi^E & \equiv \psi_1 \land \psi_2 \\
\psi_1 & \equiv \forall \tau_1 \left(0 \leq \tau_1 < \kappa_1 \rightarrow \exists \tau_2 \left(0 \leq \tau_2 \leq \kappa_2 \land \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \frac{1}{2} < n \land A(\tau_1 + \tau_2 + \frac{1}{2}) = 1\right)\right) \\
\psi_2 & \equiv \forall \tau_2 \left(0 \leq \tau_2 < \kappa_2 \rightarrow \exists \tau_1 \left(0 \leq \tau_1 \leq \kappa_1 \land \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \frac{1}{2} < n \land A(\tau_1 + \tau_2 + \frac{1}{2}) \neq 1\right)\right)
\end{align*}$$

Finally, we assign loop summaries to the corresponding loop entry nodes on a backbone and we apply (a slight modification of) symbolic execution to get an abstract path condition for the backbone.

In our running example, the symbolic execution of the backbone $abegh$ proceeds as follows. The first two edges of the backbone are executed in the standard way. We get a symbolic state $\theta_1$ with only two interesting values (the other variables are not changed)

$$\theta_1(i) = 3 \quad \theta_1(k) = 0$$

and a path condition $\gamma_1 \equiv true$. As we are now in the loop entry node $c$, we have to process the loop summary $(\theta^E, \varphi^E)$. The composition of $\theta_1$ and $\varphi^E$ results in a symbolic state $\theta_2$ representing variable values after the loop:

$$\theta_2(i) = \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 3 \quad \theta_2(k) = \kappa_1$$

We also extend the path condition $\gamma_1$ with the looping condition $\varphi^E$, where the symbols $i, k$ are replaced by $\theta_1(i), \theta_1(k)$ respectively. Hence, we get path condition $\gamma_2 \equiv \varphi^E[i/3, k/0]$. At the end, we process the last two edges of the
The edges do not change variable values, but they extend the path condition \( \gamma_2 \) with tests \( i \geq n \) and \( k > 12 \) evaluated in abstract state \( \theta_2 \). Hence, we get path condition

\[
\gamma_3 \equiv \varphi_{i/3, k/0} \land \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 3 \geq n \land \kappa_1 > 12.
\]

To obtain the resulting abstract path condition for the backbone, we existentially quantify all path counters in the formula \( \gamma_3 \) and we state that values of the path counters have to be non-negative. Hence, the abstract path condition for the backbone of our example is

\[
\varphi \equiv \exists \kappa_1, \kappa_2 \left( \kappa_1, \kappa_2 \geq 0 \land \varphi_{i/3, k/0} \land \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 3 \geq n \land \kappa_1 > 12 \right).
\]

The necessary condition \( \hat{\varphi} \) is then a disjunction of all abstract path conditions for backbones. As there is only one backbone \( abegh \) in our running example, we directly get \( \hat{\varphi} = \varphi \).

To sum up, our technique produces a necessary formula \( \hat{\varphi} \) that has to be satisfied by all inputs driving the execution to the target location. In general, the formula is not a sufficient condition on inputs to reach the target node for two reasons.

- It is not always possible to express the overall effect of a loop on a variable in the presented way. In such a case, the variable is assigned the special value \( \dagger \) with the meaning “unknown”. If we symbolically execute a test containing a variable with the value \( \dagger \), we do not add this test to our path condition.
- The looping condition is constructed as a necessary but not a sufficient condition. More precisely, it checks whether tests in each iteration are satisfied for the iterated symbolic state with some admissible values of path counters, but the consistency of these admissible values over all iterations is not checked.

3 Precise Description of the Algorithm

For simplicity and due to space limitations, we restrict our attention to programs manipulating only integer variables and read-only multidimensional integer arrays, and with no function calls. The advanced version of the algorithm, which is presented in [26], works with programs that can modify arrays. Moreover, the algorithm can be extended to handle variables of other types, function calls, etc.

3.1 Preliminaries

A flowgraph is a tuple \( P = (V, E, l_s, l_t, \iota) \), where \( (V, E) \) is a finite oriented graph, \( l_s, l_t \in V \) are different start and target nodes respectively, and \( \iota : E \to I \) is a function assigning to each edge \( e \) an instruction \( \iota(e) \). A node is branching if its out-degree is 2. All other nodes have out-degree at most 1. We use two kinds of instruction: an assignment instruction \( a := \tau \) for some scalar variable \( a \) and
some expression \( e \), and an assumption \( \text{assume}(\gamma) \) for some quantifier-free formula \( \gamma \) over program variables. Out-edges of any branching node are labeled with assumptions \( \text{assume}(\gamma) \) and \( \text{assume}(\neg \gamma) \) for some \( \gamma \). We often omit the keyword \( \text{assume} \) in our examples. We assume that instructions only operate on scalar variables \( a, b, \ldots \) of type \( \text{Int} \) and multi-dimensional array variables \( A, B, \ldots \) of type \( \text{Int}^k \rightarrow \text{Int} \). Note that often we identify programs with the corresponding flowgraphs.

A path in a flowgraph is a finite sequence \( \pi = v_1 v_2 \cdots v_k \) of nodes such that \( k \geq 0 \) and \( (v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E \) for all \( 1 \leq i < k \). Paths are always denoted by Greek letters. The terms complete path and its backbone have been already defined in the previous section.

Now we formalize definitions of loops and loop entry nodes on a backbone. Let \( \pi \) be a backbone with a prefix \( \alpha v \). There is a loop \( C \) with an entry node \( v \) along \( \pi \) if there exists a path \( v \beta v \) such that no node of \( \beta \) appears in \( \alpha \). The loop \( C \) is then the smallest set containing all nodes of all paths \( v \beta v \) satisfying that no node of \( \beta \) appears in \( \alpha \). For example, the flowgraph of Figure 1 (right) contains two backbones: \( \pi_1 = bdl \) and \( \pi_2 = abdl \). While \( \pi_1 \) contains only one loop \( \{a, b, c, d\} \) with entry node \( b \), \( \pi_2 \) contains loop \( \{a, b, c\} \) with entry node \( a \) and loop \( \{b, c\} \) with entry node \( b \).

For a loop \( C \) with an entry node \( v \), a flowgraph induced by the loop, denoted as \( P(C, v) \), is the subgraph of the original flowgraph induced by \( C \) where \( v \) is marked as the start node, a fresh node \( v' \) is added and marked as the target node, and every edge \( (u, v) \in E \) leading to \( v \) is replaced by an edge \( (u, v') \). An example of an induced flowgraph is provided in Figure 1 (middle).

By symbolic expressions we mean all expressions build with integers, standard integer operations and functions, and

- a (constant) symbol \( a \) for each scalar variable \( a \),
- a function symbol \( A \) for each array variable \( A \), where arity of \( A \) corresponds to the dimension of array \( A \),
- a countable set \( \{\kappa_1, \tau_1, \kappa_2, \tau_2, \ldots\} \) of variables called path counters, and
- a special constant symbol \( \star \) called unknown.

Let \( f, e_1, \ldots, e_n \) be symbolic expressions and \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \) be path counters or constant symbols corresponding to scalar variables. Then \( f[x_1/e_1, \ldots, x_n/e_n] \) is a symbolic expression \( f \) where all occurrences of \( x_i \) are replaced by \( e_i \), simultaneously for all \( i \). To shorten the notation, we write \( f[\vec{x}/\vec{e}] \) when the meaning is clearly given by a context. We also use the notation \( \varphi[\vec{x}/\vec{e}] \) with the analogous meaning.

A symbolic state is a function \( \theta \) assigning to each scalar variable \( a \) a symbolic expression and to each array variable \( A \) the function symbol \( A \) (recall that our programs do not change values of arrays). Let \( a \) be a scalar variable and \( e \) be a symbolic expression. Then \( \theta[a \rightarrow e] \) is a symbolic state equal to \( \theta \) except for variable \( a \), where \( \theta[a \rightarrow e](a) = e \). The notation \( \theta(\cdot) \) is used in a more general way. It always denotes the operation of replacing each (scalar or array) variable \( a \) by \( \theta(a) \). Similarly, \( \theta(\cdot) \) denotes the operation on symbolic expressions
or formulae, where each symbol \( g \) is replaced by \( \theta(a) \). Additionally, \( \theta_1(\theta_2) \) denotes composition of two symbolic states \( \theta_1 \) and \( \theta_2 \) satisfying \( \theta_1(\theta_2)(a) = \theta_1(\theta_2(a)) \) for each variable \( a \). Intuitively, the symbolic state \( \theta_1(\theta_2) \) represents an overall effect of symbolic execution of a code with effect \( \theta_1 \) followed by a code with effect \( \theta_2 \).

Finally, for vectors \( \vec{u} = (u_1, \ldots, u_n) \) and \( \vec{v} = (v_1, \ldots, v_n) \) we use \( \vec{u} \leq \vec{v} \) as an abbreviation for \( u_1 \leq v_1 \land \ldots \land u_n \leq v_n \).

### 3.2 The Algorithm

Now we precisely formulate our algorithm computing a necessary condition \( \hat{\phi} \) for reaching a target node of a given flowgraph. In contrast to the intuitive description given in Section 2, we describe more details including computation of loop summaries and dealing with nested loops.

To compute the necessary condition, we call Algorithm 1 on the set of all backbones \( \{\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k\} \) of the given program. The algorithm performs a modified symbolic execution of these backbones described later. We extract path conditions \( \varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_k \) from the algorithm output and we compute the necessary condition as

\[
\hat{\phi} \equiv \bigvee_{1 \leq i \leq k} \exists \vec{\kappa}_i \left( \vec{\kappa}_i \geq 0 \land \varphi_i \right),
\]

where \( \vec{\kappa}_i \) is a vector of all path counters having a free occurrence in \( \varphi_i \).

The Algorithm 1 symbolically executes backbones. For each backbone \( \pi_i \), we first analyse all loops along it (see \textbf{foreach} loop at lines 3-9). Since we convert loops into induced flowgraphs, we can analyse loops (and their nested loops) in the same way as we analyse the original program (see line 7). The main part of the loop analysis is the computation of loop summaries (see line 8) performed by Algorithm 2 and discussed later. After analysis of loops along \( \pi_i \), the backbone is symbolically executed (see \textbf{foreach} loop at lines 13-21). The symbolic execution differs from the original one only at loop entry locations, where we process the computed loop summaries. For each backbone \( \pi_i \), the algorithm computes a symbolic state \( \theta_i \) and a path condition \( \varphi_i \).

It remains to discuss the computation of loop summaries. The procedure is depicted in Algorithm 2. The algorithm introduces new path counters \( \vec{\kappa} \) for all backbones within the loop. Note that the algorithm knows the effect of each backbone within the loop as it gets the corresponding symbolic states and path conditions as input. The only task is to combine these symbolic states into an iterated symbolic state \( \theta^\vec{\kappa} \) and to assemble a looping condition \( \varphi^\vec{\kappa} \).

The first half of the algorithm (see lines 2-10) computes the iterated state \( \theta^\vec{\kappa} \). To be on the safe side, we start with \( \theta^\vec{\kappa} = * \) to all scalar variables. Then we gradually improve the precision of \( \theta^\vec{\kappa} \). The crucial step is the computation of an improved value \( e \) for a scalar variable \( a \) (see line 6). Then value \( e \) is defined as \( * \) except for the following cases:

1. For each backbone \( \pi'_i \), we have \( \theta'_i(a) = a \). In other words, the value of \( a \) is not changed in any iteration of the loop. This case is trivial. We set \( e = a \).
**Algorithm 1: executeBackbones(\{π_1, ..., π_k\})**

**Input:**
\{π_1, ..., π_k\} // backbone paths to be executed

**Output:**
\{(π_1, θ_1, ϕ_1), ..., (π_k, θ_k, ϕ_k)\} // result of symbolic execution of backbones

\[\text{result} \leftarrow \emptyset\]

\[\text{foreach } i = 1, ..., k \text{ do}\]

\[\text{foreach loop entry } v \text{ along } π_i \text{ do}\]

\[\text{Let } C \text{ be the loop at } v\]

\[\text{Compute induced flowgraph } P(C, v) \text{ for the loop } C \text{ at } v\]

\[\{(π'_1, θ'_1, ϕ'_1), ..., (π'_l, θ'_l, ϕ'_l)\} \leftarrow \text{executeBackbones}(\{π'_1, ..., π'_l\})\]

\[(θ^κ, ϕ^κ) \leftarrow \text{computeSummary}(\{(π'_1, θ'_1, ϕ'_1), ..., (π'_l, θ'_l, ϕ'_l)\})\]

\[\text{Attach the summary } (θ^κ, ϕ^κ) \text{ to the loop entry } v\]

\[\text{Initialize } θ_i \text{ to return } a \text{ for each variable } a\]

\[ϕ_i \leftarrow \text{true}\]

\[π_i = v_1 \ldots v_n\]

\[\text{foreach } j = 1, ..., n - 1 \text{ do}\]

\[\text{if } v_j \text{ is a loop entry then}\]

\[\varphi_i \leftarrow \varphi_i \land θ_i(ϕ^κ)\]

\[θ_i \leftarrow θ_i(θ^κ)\]

\[\text{if } ι((v_j, v_{j+1})) \text{ has the form } \text{assume}(γ) \text{ and } θ_i(γ) \text{ contains no } * \text{ then}\]

\[ϕ_i \leftarrow ϕ_i \land θ_i(γ)\]

\[\text{if } ι((v_j, v_{j+1})) \text{ has the form } a \leftarrow e \text{ then}\]

\[θ_i \leftarrow θ_i[a \rightarrow θ_i(e)]\]

\[\text{Insert triple } (π_i, θ_i, ϕ_i) \text{ into } \text{result}\]

\[\text{return } \text{result}\]

2. For each backbone π'_i, either θ'_i(a) = a or θ'_i(a) = a + d_i for some symbolic expression d_i such that θ^κ(d_i) contains neither * nor any path counters. Let us assume that the latter possibility holds for backbones π'_1, ..., π'_m. The condition on θ^κ(d_i) guarantees that the value of d_i is constant during all iterations over the loop. In this case, we set e = a + \sum_{1≤i≤m} d_i · κ_i.

Note that one can easily add another cases covering other situations where the value of a can be expressed precisely, e.g. the case capturing geometric progression. Description of all the cases we have implemented is rather technical and has no impact to understanding of the algorithm. Some other cases can be found in [26].

The second half of the algorithm (see lines 11-17) builds looping condition ϕ^κ. The pseudo-code follows the description given in Section 2. The only extension is handling of path counters κ'_i related to inner loops along a backbone π'_i. Since an inner loop can be iterated a different number of times in each iteration of π'_i,
Algorithm 2: computeSummary({(π′_1,θ′_1,ϕ′_1),..., (π′_l,θ′_l,ϕ′_l)})

Input: 
{(π′_1,θ′_1,ϕ′_1),..., (π′_l,θ′_l,ϕ′_l)} // results from single execution of backbones

Output: 
(θ^κ, ϕ^κ) // the computed summary

1. Introduce fresh path counters \( \vec{κ} = (κ_1, ..., κ_l) \) for \( π'_1, ..., π'_l \) respectively
2. Initialize \( θ^κ \) to return \( * \) for each scalar variable
3. repeat
   4. \( \text{change} \leftarrow false \)
   5. foreach scalar variable \( a \) do
      6. Compute an improved value \( e \) for the variable \( a \) from \( θ'_1, ..., θ'_l \) and \( θ^κ \)
      7. if \( e \not= * \land θ^κ(a) = * \) then
         8. \( θ^κ \leftarrow θ^κ[a \rightarrow e] \)
         9. \( \text{change} \leftarrow true \)
   10. until \( \text{change} = false \)
11. foreach \( i = 1, ..., l \) do
   12. Let \( \vec{κ}'_i \) be a vector of all path counters having a free occurrence in \( ϕ'_i \)
   13. \( γ'_i \leftarrow (θ^κ(ϕ'_i))[\vec{κ}/\vec{τ}] \), where \( \vec{τ} = (τ_1, ..., τ_l) \)
   14. Remove all predicates of \( γ'_i \) containing \( * \)
   15. Let \( \vec{κ}_i = (κ_{i-1}, ..., κ_i) \) and \( \vec{τ}_i = (τ_{i-1}, ..., τ_i) \) and \( \vec{κ}'_i = (κ_{i-1}, ..., κ_{i+1}) \)
   16. \( ψ'_i \leftarrow ∀τ_i (0 \leq τ_i < κ_i \rightarrow ∃τ'_i (0 \leq τ'_i \leq κ'_i \land ∃κ''_i (κ''_i \geq 0 \land γ'_i))) \)
   17. \( ϕ^κ \leftarrow ψ'_1 \land ... \land ψ'_l \)
18. return \( (θ^κ, ϕ^κ) \)

we have to existentially quantify the corresponding path counters in the looping condition \( ϕ^κ \).

In a real code, the number of iteration of an inner loop is often the same in each iteration of the outer loop. Or there may be some simple relation between the number of iterations of an inner loop and the current value of the path counter related to the outer loop. Capturing this relation can greatly improve the precision of a loop summary. Therefore, we have developed an ‘heavyweight’ version of Algorithm 2, where we try to find a linear relations between inner and outer path counters using an SMT solver. For details see [26].

3.3 Soundness and Incompleteness

We finish this section by formulating soundness and incompleteness theorems for our algorithm.

Theorem 1 (Soundness) Let \( \hat{ϕ} \) be the necessary condition computed by our algorithm for a given program and a given target location. If \( \hat{ϕ} \) is not satisfiable, then the target location is not reachable in that program.

An intuitive proof can be found in [26].
Theorem 2 (Incompleteness) There is a program and an unreachable target location in it for which the formula $\hat{\varphi}$ computed by our algorithm is satisfiable.

Proof. Let us consider the following C code:

```c
int i = 1; while (i < 3) { if (i == 2) i = 1; else i = 2; }
```

The loop never terminates. Therefore, a program location below it is not reachable. But $\hat{\varphi}$ computed for that location is equal to true, since variable $i$ does not follow a monotone progression. □

4 Dealing with Quantifiers

We can ask an SMT solver whether a computed necessary condition $\hat{\varphi}$ is satisfiable or not. If it is, we may further ask for a model. As we will see in Section 5, such queries to a solver should be fast. Unfortunately, our experience with solvers shows that presence of quantifiers in $\hat{\varphi}$ usually causes performance issues. To overcome this issue, we introduce a transformation of $\hat{\varphi}$ into a quantifier-free formula $\hat{\varphi}^K$ that is implied by $\hat{\varphi}$ and thus remains necessary. The transformation is parametrized by $K \geq 0$.

One can immediately see that all universal quantifiers in $\hat{\varphi}$ come from formulae $\psi'_i$ of line 16 of Algorithm 2. Each formula $\psi'_i$ has the form

$$\psi'_i \equiv \forall \tau_i (0 \leq \tau_i < \kappa_i \rightarrow \rho(\tau_i)).$$

Clearly, the formula is equivalent to $\bigwedge_{0 \leq \tau_i < \kappa_i} \rho(\tau_i)$. We do not know the value of $\kappa_i$, but we can weaken the formula to check only the first $K$ instances of $\rho(\tau_i)$. In other words, we replace each $\psi'_i$ in $\hat{\varphi}$ by a weaker formula

$$\psi^K_i \equiv \bigwedge_{0 \leq \tau_i \leq K} (\tau_i < \kappa_i \rightarrow \rho(\tau_i)).$$

Having eliminated all universal quantifiers, we can also eliminate existential quantification of all $\kappa_i$ and all $\tau_i$ by redefining them as uninterpreted integer constants. The resulting formula is denoted as $\hat{\varphi}^K$.

Let us note that the choice of $K$ affects the length and precision of $\hat{\varphi}^K$: the higher value of $K$ we choose, the stronger and longer formula $\hat{\varphi}^K$ we get.

In some cases, an SMT solver decides satisfiability of $\hat{\varphi}$ very quickly: even in a shorter time than needed for transformation of $\hat{\varphi}$ into $\hat{\varphi}^K$. In practice, we ask the solver for satisfiability of $\hat{\varphi}$ and, in parallel, we transform $\hat{\varphi}$ into $\hat{\varphi}^K$ and then ask the solver for satisfiability of $\hat{\varphi}^K$. We take the faster answer.

5 Integration into Tools

Tools typically explore program paths iteratively. At each iteration there is a set of program locations $\{v_1, \ldots, v_k\}$, from which the symbolic execution may
continue further. At the beginning, the set contains only program entry location. In each iteration of the symbolic execution the set is updated such that actions of program edges going out from some locations \( v_i \) are symbolically executed. Different tools use different systematic and heuristic strategies for selecting locations \( v_i \) to be processed in the current iteration. It is also important to note that for each \( v_i \) there is available an actual path condition \( \varphi_i \) capturing already taken symbolic execution from the entry location up to \( v_i \).

When a tool detects difficulties to cover a particular program location, then using \( \hat{\varphi} \) it can restrict selection from the whole set \( \{v_1, \ldots, v_k\} \) to only those locations \( v_i \), for which a formula \( \varphi_i \land \hat{\varphi} \) is satisfiable. In other words, if for some \( v_i \) the formula \( \varphi_i \land \hat{\varphi} \) is not satisfiable, then we are guaranteed there is no real path from \( v_i \) to the target location. And therefore, \( v_i \) can safely be removed from the consideration.

Tools like SAGE, PEX or CUTE combine symbolic execution with concrete one. Let us assume that a location \( v_i \), for which the formula \( \varphi_i \land \hat{\varphi} \) is satisfiable, was selected in a current iteration. These tools require a concrete input to the program to proceed further from \( v_i \). Such an input can directly be extracted from any model of the formula \( \varphi_i \land \hat{\varphi} \).

### 6 Experimental Results

We have implemented the algorithm (employing the mentioned heavyweight version of Algorithm 2, extended to handle modifiable arrays, and slightly optimized) in an experimental tool called APC. We also prepared a small set of benchmark programs mostly taken from other papers. In each benchmark we marked a selected location as the target one. All the benchmarks have a huge number of paths, so it is difficult to reach the target. We run PEX and APC on the benchmarks and we measured times till the target locations were reached. This measurement is obviously unfair from PEX perspective, since its task is to cover an analysed benchmark by tests and not to reach a single particular location in it. Therefore, we clarify the right meaning of the measurement now.

Our only goal here is to show that PEX could benefit from our algorithm. Typical scenario when running PEX on a benchmark is that all the code except the target location is covered in few seconds (typically up to three). Then PEX keeps searching space of program paths for a longer time without covering the target location. In contrast, APC only builds a necessary condition \( \hat{\varphi} \) and asks SMT solver for its satisfiability. If we want to show that PEX could benefit from the algorithm, then APC must be significantly faster then PEX in more benchmarks.

Before we present the results, we discuss the benchmarks. Benchmark HWM taken from [1] checks whether an input string contains four substrings: Hello, world, at and Microsoft! It does not matter at which position and in which order the words occur in the string. The target location can be reached only when all the words are presented in the string. The benchmark consists of four loops in a sequence, where each loop searches for one of the four subwords. Each
loop traverses the input string from the beginning and at each position it runs a nested loop checking whether the subword starts at this position. Benchmark HWM is the most complicated one from our set of benchmarks. We also took its two lightened versions presented in [20]: Benchmark HW searching the input string only for subwords Hello and world while benchmark Hello searches only for the first one.

Benchmark MatrIR scans upper triangle of an input matrix. The target location is reached if the matrix is bigger than 20 \times 20 and it contains a line with more than 15 scanned elements between 10 and 100.

Benchmarks OneLoop and TwoLoops originate from [20]. They are designed such that their target locations are not reachable. Both benchmarks contain a loop iterated \( n \)-times. In each iteration, the variable \( i \) (initially set to 0) is increased by 4. The target location is then guarded by an assertion \( i == 15 \) in OneLoop and by a loop \( \text{while } (i != j + 7) \ j += 2 \) in TwoLoops (\( j \) is initialized to 0 before the loop).

The last benchmark WinDriver comes from a practice and we took it from [12]. It is a part of a Windows driver processing a stream of network packets. It reads an input stream and decomposes it into a two dimensional array of packets. A position in the array where the data from the stream are copied into are encoded in the input stream itself. We marked the target location as a failure branch of a consistency check of the filled in array. It was discussed in the paper [12] that the consistency check can be broken. For complete benchmark listings see [26].

The experimental results are depicted in Table 1. They show running times in seconds of PEX and APC on the benchmarks. We did all the measurements on a single common desktop computer\(^1\). The mark T/O in PEX column indicates that it failed to reach the target location within an hour. For APC we provide the total running times and also time profiles of different paths of the computation. In sub-column 'Bld \( \hat{\psi} \)' there are times required to build the necessary condition \( \hat{\psi} \).

\(^1\) Intel\textsuperscript{\textregistered} Core\textsuperscript{\texttrademark} i7 CPU 920 @ 2x2.67GHz, 6GB RAM, Windows 7 Professional 64-bit, MS PEX 0.92.50603.1, MS Moles 1.0.0.0, MS Visual Studio 2008, MS .NET Framework v3.5 SP1, MS Z3 SMT solver v3.2, and boost v1.42.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>PEX</th>
<th>APC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hello</td>
<td>5.257</td>
<td>0.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW</td>
<td>25.05</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWM</td>
<td>T/O</td>
<td>4.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MatrIR</td>
<td>95.00</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WinDriver</td>
<td>28.39</td>
<td>0.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OneLoop</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TwoLoops</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Running times of PEX and APC on benchmarks.
In sub-column 'Trans + SMT $\hat{\phi}^{25}$' there are two times for each benchmark. The first number identifies a time spent by transformation of $\hat{\phi}$ into $\hat{\phi}^{25}$. The second number represents a time spent by Z3 SMT solver [29] to decide satisfiability of the formula $\hat{\phi}^{25}$. Characters behind these times identify results of the queries: S for satisfiable, U for unsatisfiable and X for unknown. The last sub-column 'SMT $\hat{\phi}$' contains running times of Z3 SMT solver directly on formulae $\hat{\phi}$. The mark M/O means that Z3 went out of memory. As we explained in Section 4 the construction and satisfiability checking of $\hat{\phi}^K$ runs in parallel with satisfiability checking of $\hat{\phi}$. Therefore, we take the minimum of the times to compute the total running time of Apc. The faster variant is written in boldface.

For all benchmarks, the computed necessary conditions $\hat{\phi}$ are also sufficient. Thus, models of formulae $\hat{\phi}$ produced by Z3 SMT solver directly describe tests covering the target locations.

7 Related Work

Early work on symbolic execution [18, 17] showed its effectiveness in test generation. King [18] further showed that symbolic execution can bring more automation into Floyd’s inductive proving method [6]. Nevertheless, loops as the source of the path explosion problem were not in the center of interest.

More recent approaches dealt mostly with limitations of SMT solvers and the environment problem by combining the symbolic execution with the concrete one [9, 1, 25, 10, 7, 11, 8, 27, 11, 21]. Although practical usability of the symbolic execution improved, these approaches still suffer from the path explosion problem. An interesting idea is to combine the symbolic execution with a complementary technique [14, 16, 2, 19, 15]. Complementary techniques typically perform differently on different parts of the analysed program. Therefore, an information exchange between the techniques leads to a mutual improvement of their performance. There are also techniques based on saving of already observed program behaviour and early terminating those executions, whose further progress will not explore a new one [3, 5, 4]. Compositional approaches are typically based on computation of function summaries [7, 1]. A function summary often consists of pre and post condition. Preconditions identify paths through the function and postconditions capture effects of the function along those paths. Reusing these summaries at call sites typically leads to an interesting performance improvement. Moreover, the summaries may insert additional symbolic values into the path condition which causes another improvement. And there are also techniques partitioning program paths into separate classes according to similarities in program states [22, 23]. Values of output variables of a program or function are typically considered as a partitioning criteria. A search strategy Fitnex [28] implemented in PEx [27] guides a path exploration to a particular target location using a fitness function. The function measures how close an already discovered feasible path is to the target.

Although the techniques above showed performance improvements when dealing with the path explosion problem, they do not focus directly on loops. The
LESE [24] approach introduces symbolic variables for the number of times each loop was executed. These variables are related to our path counters, but the path counters provide finer information as they are associated to iterations via individual paths through a loop. LESE links the symbolic variables with features of a known grammar generating inputs. Using these links, the grammar can control the numbers of loop iterations performed on a generated input. A technique presented in [13] analyses loops on-the-fly, i.e. during simultaneous concrete and symbolic execution of a program for a concrete input. The loop analysis infers inductive variables, i.e. variables that are modified by a constant value in each loop iteration. These variables are used to build loop summaries expressed in a form of pre a post conditions. The summaries are derived from the partial loop invariants synthesized dynamically using pattern matching rules on the loop guards and induction variables. The algorithm presented in [20] shares exactly the same goal as this paper: to reach a given target location. For each pair of acyclic paths around a loop, the technique introduces artificial counter keeping information about the number of iterations around one path since the last iteration around the other path. Values of program variables are expressed using these counters. Predicates on paths to the target are used to build constraint systems on the counters. Solutions of the systems guide symbolic execution to the target.

8 Conclusion

We presented an algorithm computing a necessary condition $\hat{\varphi}$ that represents an over-approximated set containing all real program paths leading to a given target program location. We proposed the use of $\hat{\varphi}$ in test-generation tools based on symbolic execution. Such a tool can cover the target location faster by using $\hat{\varphi}$ to explore only program paths in the over-approximated set. We also showed that $\hat{\varphi}$ can be used in the tools very easily and naturally. Finally, our experimental results indicate that Pex could benefit from our algorithm.
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