

# Event-Flow Graphs for Efficient Path-Sensitive Analyses

Ahmed Tamrawi and Suresh Kothari

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering,  
Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 50011

Email: {atamrawi,kothari}@iastate.edu

**Abstract**—Efficient and accurate path-sensitive analyses pose the challenges of: (a) analyzing an exponentially-increasing number of paths in a control-flow graph (CFG), and (b) checking feasibility of paths in a CFG. We address these challenges by introducing an *equivalence relation* on the CFG paths to partition them into equivalence classes. It is then sufficient to perform analysis on these equivalence classes rather than on the individual paths in a CFG. This technique has two major advantages: (a) although the number of paths in a CFG can be exponentially large, the essential information to be analyzed is captured by a small number of equivalence classes, and (b) checking path feasibility becomes simpler. The key challenge is *how to efficiently compute equivalence classes of paths in a CFG without examining each path in the CFG?* In this paper, we present a *linear-time* algorithm to form equivalence classes without the need for examination of each path in a CFG. The key to this algorithm is construction of an *event-flow graph* (EFG), a compact derivative of the CFG, in which each path represents an equivalence class of paths in the corresponding CFG. EFGs are defined with respect to the set of events that are in turn defined by the analyzed property. The equivalence classes are thus guaranteed to preserve all the event traces in the original CFG. We present an empirical evaluation of the Linux kernel (v3.12). The EFGs in our evaluation are defined with respect to events of the spin safe-synchronization property. Evaluation results show that there are many fewer EFG-based equivalence classes compared to the corresponding number of paths in a CFG. This reduction is close to 99% for CFGs with a large number of paths. Moreover, our controlled experiment results show that EFGs are human comprehensible and compact compared to their corresponding CFGs.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Accurate path-sensitive analyses require that: (a) execution effects along each path in a control-flow graph (CFG) are analyzed in isolation, i.e., without merging effects from different paths, and (b) effects along infeasible paths are excluded. The specific challenges for efficient and accurate path-sensitive analyses are thus: (a) exponential growth of the number of paths with the number of non-nested branch nodes in the CFG [1], [2], and (b) checking path feasibility requires checking satisfiability of branch conditions along the path, a process that also can incur exponential computation [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8].

Intuitively, our novel approach to efficient path-sensitive analysis works by considering equivalence classes of paths as follows: *Two paths are considered equivalent if they have the same event trace.* Each event trace is a sequence of events on a CFG path representing sufficient information for checking whether a given software property holds on that path. Since

all paths in an equivalence class have the same event trace, it is sufficient to check just one path per group/class. In theory, there is an opportunity to circumvent exponential computational growth if the number of equivalence classes remains small even as the number of CFG paths grows exponentially. Although it may seem counterintuitive to just compute the event trace for each class without explicitly examining each CFG path, in this paper, we present an innovative linear-time algorithm that computes all event traces without examining each CFG path, thereby circumventing the exponential computational load.

We define a derivative of CFG, called the *Event-Flow Graph* (EFG), and prove that there is a one-to-one and onto mapping, where each path in the EFG corresponds to a group/class of equivalent paths in the CFG. The EFG retains the events and relevant branch nodes from the CFG, and the EFG is a minimal graph for computing all the event traces, i.e., each path in the EFG produces a unique event trace. We provide a linear-time algorithm to compute the EFG. Another benefit of introducing EFG is that it can minimize computation for checking path feasibility. In our empirical evaluation of the Linux kernel (v3.12) (Section V-C), we found that only the relevant branch nodes for forming equivalence classes were also *sufficient* for checking feasibility.

To assess the benefits of using EFGs in a practical scenario, we conducted an empirical evaluation of the Linux kernel (v3.12). The EFGs are defined with respect to events relevant for verifying the *spin safe-synchronization property* that requires that a lock of a spin object is followed by an unlock of the same object on all feasible execution paths. Our results show that the number of paths and the number of branch nodes are drastically reduced in going from a CFG to its EFG. The results from our controlled experiment show that EFGs are human comprehensible and compact compared to their corresponding CFGs and that is apparent in the reduction of the manual verification time and the effort in checking feasibility. The controlled experiment resulted on reporting a new bug [9] that has been accepted by the Linux community. All the CFGs and their corresponding EFGs from our empirical evaluation are available in [10]. In Section VI, we present an example using the Linux kernel to illustrate the use of EFG in an intra- and inter-procedural path-sensitive analysis.

## II. A MOTIVATING EXAMPLE

Figure 1 shows the CFG of function `hwrng_attr_current_store` from the Linux kernel (v3.12). The nodes  $\top$  and  $\perp$  respectively denote the unique entry

and exit nodes added to the CFG. Also,  $\top$  and  $\perp$  respectively denote the *true* and *false* branches from a branch node. This example concerns event traces that are needed to check the *safe-synchronization property* that requires that a lock of a synchronization object must be followed by an unlock of the same locked object over all feasible CFG paths. The example contains two event nodes highlighted in gray: `mutex_lock_interruptible (&rng_mutex)` ( $e_1$ ) and `mutex_unlock (&rng_mutex)` ( $e_2$ ).




Fig. 1. CFG for Function `hwrng_attr_current_store`

In the CFG, the branch nodes  $c_2, c_3, c_4$ , and  $c_5$  are considered *irrelevant branch nodes*; a branch node is *irrelevant* if all paths branching from it lead to the same *event* or *terminal* node. The branch node  $c_1$  is a *relevant* branch node. For a given path  $P$  in a CFG, the sub-trace of the execution trace of  $P$ , consisting of only the *relevant branch* and *event* nodes, is called the *event trace* of  $P$ . That means, the paths branching from the *false* branch of  $c_1$  have the same *event trace* ( $\top e_1 c_1 e_2 \perp$ ). Paths with identical event traces are considered *equivalent* and grouped into one *equivalence class*. The event trace of the path branching from the *true* branch of  $c_1$  is  $\top e_1 c_1 \perp$ , and it is by itself in another equivalence class.

Each equivalence class is represented by a unique event trace of the paths in that class. Once those equivalence classes

are computed, it is sufficient to analyze *only* the event traces for all equivalence classes to check the *safe-synchronization property*. For example, the CFG in Figure 1 results in two event traces: 1) the trace  $\top e_1 c_1 e_2 \perp$ , and 2) the trace  $\top e_1 c_1 \perp$ . It is then sufficient to analyze only these two traces to cover all the paths in the CFG.

To summarize the important points:

- 1) All CFG paths with the same event trace are grouped into one equivalence class. In this example, all the CFG paths are grouped into two equivalence classes.
- 2) Analyzing event traces is equivalent to analyzing all CFG paths.
- 3) A branch node is *irrelevant* if all the paths branching from it either lead to the same event or terminal node (a broader notion of irrelevant branch nodes is defined later). Four out of five branch nodes are irrelevant in this example.

### III. PATH-SENSITIVE ANALYSIS WITH EVENT TRACES

**Definition 1:** A **Control Flow Graph** (CFG) of a program is defined as  $G = (V, E, \top, \perp)$ , where  $G$  is a directed graph with a set of nodes  $V$  representing the program statements and a set of edges  $E$  representing the control-flow between statements.  $\top$  and  $\perp$  denote the respective unique entry and exit nodes of the graph.

#### A. Execution Traces

After labeling each node of the CFG with a unique identifier, we define the *execution trace* of a CFG path as the regular expression of the node labels along that path. Let us illustrate this definition using the CFG first shown in Figure 1 and redrawn in Figure 2(a). The highlighted nodes are the event nodes. Code statements are replaced with nodes labeled  $x_1$  through  $x_{15}$ . Figure 2(b) shows a CFG path; its *execution trace* is:  $\top x_1 x_2 e_1 c_1 x_3 x_4 c_2 c_3 c_4 x_9 c_5 x_{10} x_{11} x_{12} x_{13} e_2 x_{15} \perp$ . Figure 2(c) shows a CFG path with a loop; its *execution trace* is:  $\top x_1 x_2 e_1 c_1 x_3 x_4 (c_2 c_3 x_6)^+ c_2 c_3 c_4 x_7 x_8 e_2 x_{15} \perp$ , where  $(n_i..n_k)^+$  represents the loop between the nodes  $n_i$  to  $n_k$  that is executed one or more times.

#### B. Event Traces

Event traces are defined with respect to  $\mathcal{E}$ ; the set of events of interest associated with the analyzed property. We will use the verification of the *safe-synchronization property* as a running example in illustrating all definitions. The *safe-synchronization property* requires that for every object  $p$ : the locking event  $e_1(p)$  is followed by the unlocking event  $e_2(p)$  on all feasible execution paths. Thus, the set  $\mathcal{E}_p$  of events, for verifying that property for object  $p$ , consists of: the *locking* and *unlocking* events defined on  $p$ , and the *data-flow* events in which the locked object  $p$  is either aliased or escapes to another function as a parameter, a return value, or a global variable. Such data-flow events can be determined using a taint analysis technique [11]. Once the events of interest are determined, one can write a path-sensitive verification algorithm that traverses the CFGs and checks that, for each synchronization object ( $p$ ), a *lock* event  $e_1(p)$  is always succeeded by an *unlock* event  $e_2(p)$  on all execution paths. In case of a *violating path* which has a




Fig. 2. Execution paths in a CFG

lock event not followed by unlock event, path feasibility needs to be conducted.

**Definition 2:** A property  $P$  is a *2-event property* if for every object  $p$ , an event  $e_1(p)$  must be succeeded by another event  $e_2(p)$  on all feasible execution paths.

Note that event-based analyses can be performed to verify properties that can be modeled as 2-event properties like safe-synchronization and memory leak. A number of vulnerabilities listed by the MITRE Corporation [12] can be addressed using event-based analyses.

**Definition 3:** A CFG node is an *event node* if it corresponds to an event of the set of events ( $\mathcal{E}$ ) associated with a given property to be analyzed.

**Definition 4:** Successors of a node  $u$  in a directed graph  $G$ , denoted by  $\text{succ}(u)$ , consist of the set of nodes  $v \neq u$  such that  $\exists$  an edge  $(u, v)$ .

**Definition 5:** Successors of a subgraph  $S$  in a directed graph  $G$ , denoted by  $\text{succ}(S)$ , consist of the set of nodes  $v \notin S$  such that  $v = \text{succ}(u)$  for  $u \in S$ .

**Definition 6:** For a branch node  $c$ , a **branch edge** is an out-coming edge of  $c$ .

**Definition 7:** A branch node  $c$  is an **irrelevant branch node** if the following conditions are satisfied:

- $c$  is a non-event node.

- There exists a subgraph  $S$  containing  $c$  and all branch edges of  $c$ .
- $S$  has no event nodes.
- $S$  has a unique successor, i.e.,  $|\text{succ}(S)| = 1$ .

Figure 3 shows an example of irrelevant branch node  $c$ .




Fig. 3. An example of irrelevant branch node  $c$

**Definition 8:** An *event trace* of a path in CFG is a *sub-expression* of the execution trace consisting only of the *relevant branch nodes*, *event nodes* and the  $\top$  and  $\perp$  nodes.

For example, the event trace for paths  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  depicted in Figure 2(b, c) would be:  $\top e_1 c_1 e_2 \perp$ .

**Definition 9:** The **Event-Flow Graph (EFG)**  $G_{\text{EFG}}$  of a CFG  $G$  with respect to  $\mathcal{E}$  is the node-induced subgraph of  $G$  consisting of the event nodes, the relevant branch nodes, and the entry ( $\top$ ) and exit ( $\perp$ ) nodes.

**Relevancy of Branch Nodes.** The notion of relevancy is defined with respect to equivalence classes of CFG paths. There could be *correlation* between relevant branch nodes and the remaining branch nodes or non-event nodes. In that case, the path feasibility check would need to take into account other nodes correlated to relevant branch nodes. In our empirical evaluation of the Linux kernel (Section V-C), we did not find such correlation. Thus, only the relevant branch nodes for forming equivalence classes were also *sufficient* for checking feasibility.

### C. Equivalence Classes of CFG Paths

In this section, we will show that verifying a property  $P$  on all CFG paths is *equivalent* to verifying  $P$  for all event traces. Initially, let us define an *equivalence relation* on the CFG paths:

**Definition 10:** Given a CFG  $G$  and an event set  $\mathcal{E}$  which is a subset of nodes in  $G$ , we define a relation  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{E}}$  on paths in  $G$  as follows: two CFG paths are **related** iff they have the same event trace.

Note that  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{E}}$  is an equivalence relation because it is *reflexive*, *symmetric*, and *transitive*.

**Theorem 1:** \* Given a CFG  $G$ , a set  $\mathcal{E}$  of events, and the equivalence relation  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{E}}$ , there is a one-to-one and onto mapping between the equivalence classes of  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{E}}$  and the paths of the EFG  $G_{\text{EFG}}$  where each EFG path produces the event trace corresponding to an equivalence class.

\*Theorems' & corollaries' proofs can be found in appendix A.

**Theorem 2:** Given a 2-event property  $P$ , its verification on all CFG paths can be done using the event traces.

**Corollary 1:** Given a 2-event property  $P$ , its verification on all paths of a CFG  $G$  can be done with the corresponding EFG  $G_{\text{EFG}}$ .

The proof directly follows from the above two theorems.

**Remark 1:** Given a CFG and the set  $\mathcal{E}$ , the corresponding EFG is unique. This is because the nodes of EFG are uniquely defined as they are exactly the event nodes and relevant branch nodes. The edges in the EFG are also uniquely defined because they are induced by the edges in the CFG.

#### D. EFGs for Optimal Path-Sensitive Analyses

Given a 2-event property, its path-sensitive analysis can be done using EFGs instead of CFGs as follows:

For every object  $p$ :

- 1) Determine all the events of interest (i.e., the set  $\mathcal{E}_p$ ), including the events  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  defined on  $p$  and the data-flow events for  $p$ .
- 2) If the object  $p$  is passed to other functions either as a parameter or as a return value, then consider all such functions to be *relevant* functions.
- 3) Construct EFGs with respect to  $\mathcal{E}_p$  for *relevant* functions.
- 4) Perform the path-sensitive analysis using the EFGs instead of the CFGs.
- 5) In case of a path that has  $e_1(p)$  not followed by  $e_2(p)$ , path feasibility check is needed. Using EFGs, the path feasibility is conducted by checking the satisfiability of the conditions (relevant branch nodes), where the correlation between conditions can be computed via constant propagation [13] or global value numbering [14] as in [15].

EFGs can be used to perform inter-procedural path-sensitive analysis. In Section VI, we illustrate a case study on inter-procedural verification using EFGs. To conclude, EFG is the minimal graph that produces all event traces for an accurate and efficient path sensitive analysis given a 2-event property  $P$  and its associated set of events  $\mathcal{E}$ . For the EFG to be useful in practice, the next section presents an efficient algorithm to construct the EFG from a given CFG.

### IV. COMPUTING EVENT TRACES OF A CFG

In this section, we first present an algorithm to compact a given CFG into a  $T$ -irreducible graph. This compaction algorithm will be used later in computing the EFG. Then, we present an algorithm that *efficiently* computes the equivalences classes of CFG paths in linear-time based on Tarjan's algorithm to compute strongly-connected components of a directed graph [16].

#### A. Algorithm I: $T$ -irreducible Graph

**Definition 11:** A **Colored Directed Graph** (CDG) is defined as  $G = (V, E, C, \top, \perp)$ , where  $(V, E)$  is a finite directed graph with a set of nodes  $V$  and a set of edges  $E$ .  $\top$  and  $\perp$  respectively represent the unique entry and exit nodes of the graph.  $C \subseteq V$  is the set of colored nodes.

For the purpose of this algorithm, a CFG is modeled as a CDG by treating the event nodes as colored nodes.

#### $T_1$ : Elimination of Non-branching and Non-colored Nodes

Let  $G = (V, E, C, \top, \perp)$  be a CDG and  $n$  be a *non-colored* node ( $n \notin C$ ) with a single successor  $m$ . The  $T_1$  transformation is the consumption of node  $n$  by  $m$ . Induced edges are introduced so that the predecessors of node  $n$  become predecessors of node  $m$ . (Figure 4(a))

The  $T_1$  transformation eliminates every node from CFG that is neither a branch node nor an event node. These nodes are removed because they are irrelevant to the analysis because they are **not** included in the resultant event traces.

#### $T_2$ : Elimination of Self-Loop Edges

Let  $G = (V, E, C, \top, \perp)$  be a CDG and let  $n$  be a *non-colored* node ( $n \notin C$ ) that has a self-loop edge  $(n, n)$ . The  $T_2$  transformation removes that edge. (Figure 4(b))

The intuition behind  $T_2$  transformation is: in a loop block that contains no event nodes, execution of the loop is immaterial. Therefore,  $T_2$  removes the self-loop edges.

#### $T_3$ : Elimination of Irrelevant Branch Nodes

Let  $G = (V, E, C, \top, \perp)$  be a CDG and let  $n$  be a *non-colored* node ( $n \notin C$ ) that has two or more edges, all pointing to the same successor  $m$  of  $n$ . Then the  $T_3$  transformation is the consumption of node  $n$  by  $m$  and the predecessors of node  $n$  become predecessors of node  $m$ . (Figure 4(c))

The intuition behind the  $T_3$  transformation is as follows: Imagine the case where a branch node  $n$  has only non-colored nodes on its branches, and all those branches ultimately merge at node  $m$ . If the non-colored nodes on those branches are eliminated by the  $T_1$  transformation, all branches will point to node  $m$ . At this point, the branching at  $n$  is *irrelevant* so the branch node  $n$  can be eliminated.




Fig. 4. Algorithm I transformations: (a) $T_1$ , (b) $T_2$ , (c) $T_3$

**Definition 12:** Let  $T = \{T_1, T_2, T_3\}$  be the set of basic transformations described above. A CDG  $G$  is  $T$ -irreducible if it cannot be further reduced by applying transformations in  $T$ .

Algorithm I uses the transformations  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$ , and  $T_3$  to construct a  $T$ -irreducible graph as follows:

- Start with a CFG  $G_{\text{CFG}} = (V_{G_{\text{CFG}}}, E_{G_{\text{CFG}}}, \top, \perp)$  and transform it into a CDG  $G_{\text{CDG}} = (V_{G_{\text{CFG}}}, E_{G_{\text{CFG}}}, C, \top, \perp)$ . The set  $C$  of colored nodes is the set of event nodes defined by the set  $\mathcal{E}$  associated with the analyzed property. i.e., CFG is modeled as a CDG by treating the event nodes as colored nodes.



- Transform  $G_{CDG}$  into a  $T$ -irreducible graph by applying the transformations in  $T$ .

### B. Algorithm II: Transform CFG to EFG

We will present a *linear-time* algorithm that produces the minimal number of equivalence classes by transforming a CFG  $G$  into  $G_{EFG}$ , the corresponding *event-flow graph* (EFG). Intuitively, one might think that the problem of computing all event traces would require individual examination of each path in a CFG, but Algorithm II shows this not to be true. As observed in our empirical evaluation of the Linux kernel, while the number of CFG paths may grow exponentially, the number of event traces does not. In such scenarios, Algorithm II is very efficient because it requires a computational load proportional to the number of event traces rather than to the number of CFG paths.

We claim that the graph produced by Algorithm II is indeed the *event-flow graph* (EFG) that we have defined earlier and shown to be the minimal graph that produces all the event traces needed for an accurate and efficient path-sensitive analysis. First, we will present CFG to EFG transformation algorithm and later provide a proof that the produced graph is actually the EFG. We will use the following additional definition to further describe Algorithm II.

**Definition 13:**  $G_{CG}$  is the *condensation graph* of a directed graph  $G$  if each *strongly-connected component* (SCC) of  $G$  contracts to a single node in  $G_{CG}$  and the edges of  $G_{CG}$  are induced by edges in  $G$ . Thus,  $G_{CG}$  is a directed acyclic graph (DAG).

Given a CFG  $G_{CFG}$  and the set  $\mathcal{E}$  of events as computed in step (1) in Section III-D. Now, let us fully describe algorithm II that transforms the CFG  $G_{CFG}$  to its EFG  $G_{EFG}$ :

- (1) **T-Irreducible Graph Construction:** Start with a CFG  $G_{CFG}$  and transform it into a  $T$ -irreducible graph  $G_{T-irr}$  by applying Algorithm I.
- (2) **Non-Colored Condensation Graph Construction:** Compute the subgraph  $G_I$  of  $G_{T-irr}$  induced by its non-colored nodes. Then, construct the non-colored condensation graph  $G_{NCCG}$  of  $G_I$ .
- (3) **Colored Condensation Graph:** Construct a new CDG  $G_{CCG}$  by adding the colored nodes in  $G_{T-irr}$  to  $G_{NCCG}$ . If an edge exists between an SCC and a colored node  $n$  in  $G_{T-irr}$  then introduce an edge in  $G_{CCG}$  between the contracted node for that SCC and the colored node  $n$ .
- (4) **Condensed EFG Construction:** Transform  $G_{CCG}$  into a  $T$ -irreducible graph  $G_{cEFG}$  by applying Algorithm I.
- (5) **EFG Construction:** Transform  $G_{cEFG}$  into  $G_{EFG}$  by expanding each *remaining* contracted SCC in  $G_{cEFG}$  back to the original SCC as in  $G_{T-irr}$ .

**Remark 2:** The resultant graph  $G_{cEFG}$  after step (4) is the *condensed EFG*. In addition, we claim that the resultant graph  $G_{EFG}$  after step (5) is the EFG.

Figures 5(a-f) illustrate the successive graphs constructed by Algorithm II, starting with the CFG (graph a) and ending with the EFG (graph f).




Fig. 5. A transformation from CFG to EFG

### C. Algorithm II Complexity

The algorithmic complexity of constructing the  $T$ -irreducible graph (Steps 1 and 4) is  $O(|V| + |E|)$  where  $|V|$  and  $|E|$  are the respective numbers of nodes and edges in the CFG. For detecting the SCCs in step (2), we use an algorithm by Tarjan [16] to compute strongly-connected components of a directed graph. The run-time of this algorithm is also  $O(|V| + |E|)$ , yielding a linear run-time complexity of  $O(|V| + |E|)$  for Algorithm II.

### D. Algorithm I versus Algorithm II

The EFG constructed by Algorithm II achieves an important compaction of the CFG that is not possible in Algorithm I. Recall that the graph  $G_{T-irr}$  produced by Algorithm I may contain irrelevant branch nodes. For example, consider two branch nodes  $A$  and  $B$  with  $suc(A) = \{B, E\}$  and  $suc(B) = \{A, E\}$ , where  $E$  is an event node. The branch nodes  $A$  and  $B$  are irrelevant and should be eliminated. The subgraph consisting of the two branch nodes  $A$  and  $B$  has a unique successor  $E$  and thus, they will be eliminated in the condensed EFG  $G_{cEFG}$ . Note that in the above scenario even though there can be more than two branch nodes that are successors of each other, as long as they have the same event node as the successor, all such branch nodes are irrelevant and will be eliminated by Algorithm II. Thus, by including steps (2-5), Algorithm II can achieve compaction beyond that of Algorithm I.

Note that there can be a strongly-connected component (SCC) of branch nodes with two or more successors and, if so, those branch nodes must be retained. An example of such a scenario is shown in Figure 6 depicting the EFG of function `cancel_bulk_urbs` from the Linux kernel (v3.12). In the EFG,

the SCC consisting of the branch nodes  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  is retained as it has two successors: the terminal node  $\perp$  and the event node  $e_1$ .




Fig. 6. EFG for function `cancel_bulk_urbs`

### E. EFG: Correctness Proof

In Algorithm II, it is not enough to claim that the resultant graph  $G_{\text{EFG}}$  after step (5) is the EFG. We will now prove that Algorithm II produces the EFG correctly. This amounts to proving that Algorithm II removes *all* irrelevant branch nodes.

**Theorem 3:** Let  $G$  be a colored  $T$ -irreducible and acyclic graph. Then for any subgraph  $S$  containing non-colored nodes of  $G$ :  $|suc(S)| \geq 2$ .

**Corollary 2:** Let  $G$  be a CFG and  $G_{\text{CEFG}}$  be the condensed EFG. Then, for any subgraph  $S$  containing non-colored nodes of  $G_{\text{CEFG}}$ ,  $|suc(S)| \geq 2$ .

**Corollary 3:** The graph produced by Algorithm II does not contain any irrelevant branch nodes.

## V. AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION

We present an empirical evaluation to show the applicability and advantages of using event-flow graphs (EFG) rather than control-flow graphs (CFG) to perform path-sensitive analyses. Specifically, we evaluate the following:

- The reduction in nodes and edges in going from CFGs to EFGs.
- The reduction in branch nodes, since only the *relevant* branch nodes are retained in the EFGs.
- The reduction in the effort to check feasibility of paths.

### A. Experimental Setup

We use the Linux kernel (v3.12) for our empirical evaluation. We consider the *spin safe-synchronization property* for defining the events of interest ( $\mathcal{E}$ ) for our analysis. We have used EnSoft's C-Atlas [17] platform to compute  $\mathcal{E}$ , the CFGs, and EFGs. The C-Atlas first compiles the Linux kernel (v3.12) and pre-computes a *database* of relationships (i.e., call, control-flow, data-flow, etc.) between various program artifacts. This process took 34 minutes. Then, we query the C-Atlas database to find all the *spin synchronization* objects  $\mathcal{P}$ . This query identifies all the variables passed as parameters to the *spin locking* (`spin_lock`, `spin_trylock`) and *unlocking* (`spin_unlock`) functions.

We followed the steps (1-3) in Section III-D and wrote a Java program -based on a taint analysis technique [11]- using the C-Atlas APIs to determine the set  $\mathcal{E}_p$  for every object  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ , by identifying the events  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  that are defined on  $p$  in addition to the relevant data-flow events for  $p$ , including those in which  $p$  are passed as parameters or return values to other functions. Based on these events, we determine all the Linux kernel functions, referred to as *relevant functions*, needing to be analyzed for every object  $p$ . Afterward, we wrote a Java program using the C-Atlas APIs to construct the EFG for each relevant function from its corresponding CFG based on the set  $\mathcal{E}_p$ .

In the Linux kernel (v3.12), there are 531 spin objects and in total 3,894 *relevant* functions for the analysis of all objects. The conversion from CFGs to EFGs using Algorithm II took 9 seconds for all relevant functions. All experiments were carried out on a Windows 8, Intel Core i7 2.40Ghz, 8GB RAM laptop computer.

Table I summarizes for the Linux kernel (v3.12) the number of artifacts: *LOC* - lines of code, *Src Files* - source files, *Functions* - functions, *Rlvnt. Func.* - *relevant* functions, *Spin Objs.* - spin lock objects, and *Events* - events of interest to the *spin safe-synchronization* property.

TABLE I. PROGRAM ARTIFACTS OF THE LINUX KERNEL (v3.12)

LOC	Src Files	Functions	Rlvnt. Func.	Spin Objs.	Events
11,479,683	36,613	63,190	3,894	531	8,086

### B. Experiment I: Reductions from CFG to EFG

We present the reduction in nodes and edges in going from CFGs to EFGs. Recall that the EFG consists of the event and relevant branch nodes and that the reduction is due to the removal of non-event nodes and irrelevant branch nodes.

Table II shows the distribution of nodes, edges, and branch nodes for both the CFGs and EFGs for all the *relevant* functions ( $F_{\text{Relevant}}$ ). In assessing graphs with a large number of nodes, we find only 15 EFGs compared to 1,058 CFGs that have ( $> 30$ ) nodes, i.e., a reduction of  $\sim 99\%$ . In assessing graphs with a large number of edges, we find only 76 EFGs compared to 1,309 CFGs that have ( $> 30$ ) edges, i.e., a reduction of  $\sim 94\%$ . In assessing graphs with a large number of branch nodes, we find only 107 EFGs compared to 597 CFGs that have ( $> 10$ ) branch nodes, i.e., a reduction of  $\sim 90\%$ . In assessing straightforward cases for checking feasibility of paths, we find 559 CFGs compared to 1,458 EFGs with no branch nodes, i.e., a 161% increase.

The reductions from CFGs to EFGs are particularly important for complex CFGs, and especially for CFGs with a large number of branch nodes. Table III lists the reductions for the ten functions in  $F_{\text{Relevant}}$  with the largest number branch nodes<sup>†</sup>. The  $P(\%)$  columns denote the reduction percentages for nodes, edges, and branch nodes. For example, for function `xs_udp_data_ready` the reductions from CFG to EFG are: from 1,101 to 8 nodes, from 1,513 to 11 edges, and from 317 to 4 branch nodes.

<sup>†</sup>A complete comparison of all relevant functions for the spin safe-synchronization property in the Linux kernel (v3.12) is available at [10]

TABLE II. CFG AND EFG STATISTICS FOR THE 3,894 RELEVANT FUNCTIONS ( $F_{\text{RELEVANT}}$ ) IN LINUX KERNEL (v3.12)

Graph	Artifact	Distribution				
CFG	Nodes	$\leq 5$	$6 \rightarrow 10$	$11 \rightarrow 30$	$31 \rightarrow 50$	$> 50$
		185	759	1,892	614	444
	Edges	$\leq 5$	$6 \rightarrow 10$	$11 \rightarrow 30$	$31 \rightarrow 50$	$> 50$
		266	661	1,658	691	618
EFG	Nodes	$\leq 5$	$6 \rightarrow 10$	$11 \rightarrow 30$	$31 \rightarrow 50$	$> 50$
		2,185	1,246	448	14	1
	Edges	$\leq 5$	$6 \rightarrow 10$	$11 \rightarrow 30$	$31 \rightarrow 50$	$> 50$
		2,159	910	749	63	13
	Branch Nodes	$\leq 0$	$1 \rightarrow 5$	$6 \rightarrow 10$	$11 \rightarrow 30$	$> 30$
		559	1,996	742	493	104
		$\leq 5$	$6 \rightarrow 10$	$11 \rightarrow 30$	$31 \rightarrow 50$	$> 50$
		2,185	1,246	448	14	1

TABLE III. A COMPARISON OF CFG VS. EFG

Function Name	Nodes			Edges			Branch Nodes		
	CFG	EFG	P(%)	CFG	EFG	P(%)	CFG	EFG	P(%)
xs_udp_data_ready <sup>1</sup>	1,101	8	99.3	1,513	11	99.3	317	4	98.7
tcp_v4_err <sup>2</sup>	1,024	7	99.3	1,400	9	99.4	287	3	99.0
udp_v6_queue_rcv_skb <sup>2</sup>	838	17	98.0	1,153	28	97.6	244	12	95.1
udp_queue_rcv_skb <sup>2</sup>	838	16	98.1	1,152	26	97.7	243	11	95.5
tcp_v6_rcv <sup>2</sup>	732	24	96.7	999	41	95.9	205	18	91.2
tcp_v4_rcv <sup>2</sup>	731	24	96.7	998	41	95.9	205	18	91.2
tcp_v6_err <sup>2</sup>	720	6	99.2	984	7	99.3	203	2	99.0
tcp_recvmmsg <sup>2</sup>	583	41	93.0	790	75	90.5	173	35	79.8
tcp_v4_conn_request <sup>2</sup>	605	18	97.0	822	32	96.1	170	16	90.6
tcp_close <sup>2</sup>	601	9	98.5	815	10	98.8	167	2	98.8

Spin objects: 1: rpe\_xprt.transport\_lock, 2: sock.sk\_lock.slock

### C. Experiment II: Manual Verification

For this experiment, we randomly selected 400 locking events from the Linux kernel (v3.12) and asked two analysts<sup>‡</sup> to manually verify the spin safe-synchronization property for those events. The analysts were asked to report: 1) the analysis time for each event, 2) the conditions (branch nodes) that were used to decide on a path feasibility in case of a path that has a locking event  $e_1(p)$  is not followed by an unlocking event  $e_2(p)$  (i.e., violating path), and 3) “buggy” or “safe” verdict for each locking event where buggy means that the violating path is feasible.

We conducted the experiment in two rounds, where in each round we asked the analysts to verify 200 events. In the first round  $R1$ : the first analyst  $A1$  to use only CFGs where the other analyst  $A2$  to use EFGs. In the second round  $R2$ :  $A1$  to use EFGs and  $A2$  to use CFGs. The analysts were given the following information:

- The function  $f_i$  and the line number for the locking event  $e_j(p)$  that needs to be verified.
- The set of all relevant functions for the analysis of the locking event  $e_j(p)$ .
- The nodes that correspond to the events in  $\mathcal{E}_p$  are highlighted in the corresponding CFGs and EFGs. All the branch nodes are diamond-shaped.

In case of a path feasibility check, the analyst calculates the Boolean combination, i.e., AND( $\wedge$ ), OR( $\vee$ ), NOT( $\neg$ ), of conditions which must be true for the path to be executed.

<sup>‡</sup>Two PhD students with  $\sim 9$  years of experience in programming.

Then, he checks the satisfiability of that combination. For the sake of simplicity, the analyst can infer the correlation between conditions *only* from the information within the graphs assigned to him.

Table IV shows the analysis times for each analyst in each round along with the number of safe and buggy events. Also, it shows the number of times path feasibility ( $F_{\text{Feas.}}$ ) is conducted. Both analysts came up with identical verdicts for safe and buggy and reported exactly the same set of conditions/branch nodes used for checking feasibility.  $A1$  in  $R2$  and  $A2$  in  $R1$  reported that EFGs were enough to perform the verification and the relevant branch nodes were *sufficient* for checking feasibility. The number of feasibility checks varies when using CFGs and EFGs. This occurs if multiple paths in the CFG, that are checked for feasibility, happen to be equivalent, hence they are represented by one path (event trace) in the corresponding EFG.

Moreover, both analysts reported a new bug [9] that has been accepted by the Linux community and it turned out to be spanning multiple kernel versions.

TABLE IV. CONTROLLED EXPERIMENT RESULTS

Analyst	Round 1 ( $R1$ )				Round 2 ( $R2$ )			
	Safe	Buggy	Feas.	Time	Safe	Buggy	Feas.	Time
$A1$	200	0	49	10hr 44min	199	1	21	2hr 49min
$A2$	200	0	18	3hr 16min	199	1	58	11hr 22min

### VI. AN EFG APPLICATION STUDY

This study presents a real-world example from the Linux kernel (v3.12) to illustrate the applicability and advantages of using EFGs in an inter-procedural path-sensitive verification. It illustrates the verification of the safe-synchronization property for the *read-semaphore* synchronization object (cpufreq\_rwlock), by verifying that every *locking* event (down\_read, down\_read\_trylock) is always succeeded by an *unlocking* event (up\_read) on every feasible execution path. The study involves three functions: cpufreq\_bp\_resume ( $f_1$ ), cpufreq\_cpu\_get ( $f_2$ ), and cpufreq\_cpu\_put ( $f_3$ ). Figure 7 captures the relevant functions for the analysis, and it shows that  $f_1$  first calls  $f_2$  and then calls  $f_3$ . The first advantage of using EFGs to perform the analysis is that EFGs are *simpler* and more *compact* than their CFG counterparts. The CFG statistics are given in Table V and the EFGs are shown in Figure 7.

TABLE V. CFG STATISTICS FOR THE APPLICATION STUDY

Function Name	Nodes	Edges	Branch Nodes
cpufreq_bp_resume	16	6	2
cpufreq_cpu_get	17	31	11
cpufreq_cpu_put	6	6	1

In  $f_2$ , there exist four paths corresponding to the four equivalence classes (i.e., unique event traces) of paths in the CFG. Three of those equivalence classes contain  $e_1$  that needs to be verified. In the Linux kernel, function (down\_read\_trylock) returns 1 if the lock occurs, otherwise 0. In this example the  $e_1$  event evaluates to *true* if the lock does not occur; otherwise, it evaluates to *false*. That means that, of the three equivalence classes containing  $e_1$ , the equivalence class that contains the *true* branch is *infeasible* when the lock occurs. Hence, the paths that contain this branch do **not** require




Fig. 7. An inter-procedural verification for the locking event in function `cpufreq_cpu_get`

verification. Now, for the other two equivalence classes that contain the *false* branch of  $e_1$ , those paths must have an unlocking event (`up_read`). In  $f_2$ , the paths that contain the *true* branch of the branch node  $c_3$  contains unlocking event  $e_2$ . That means that event  $e_1$  is verified on those paths. However, on the path that contains the *false* branch of  $c_3$  (path *A*), there is no unlocking event. Looking at the EFG of  $f_2$  alone, one can conclude that this path *A* contributes to a violation with respect to the tested property. However, the path *A* locking event  $e_1$  is verified with unlocking event  $e_3$  in function  $f_3$  via function  $f_1$ . Here is how this is accomplished:

In  $f_1$ , the path that corresponds to the *false* branch of  $c_3$  (path *A*) is inflated into two paths: path *B* that goes via the *true* branch of  $c_1$ , and path *C* that goes via the *false* branch of  $c_1$ . One can conclude that path *B* contributes to a bug since no unlocking event occurs and the function returns. However, path *B* turns out to be infeasible if path *A* in  $f_2$  is taken. This is true because: (1) path *A* is the path taken via the *false* branch of  $c_3$ ; that means  $c_3$  evaluates to *false*, (2)  $c_1 = c_3$  and the variable `policy` is returned from  $f_2$  to  $f_1$ . Hence,  $c_1$  must evaluate to *false* if path *A* is taken. This means that path *B* is infeasible when path *A* is taken. In other words, path *B* has no verification need. That leaves path *C* that is feasible and should have an unlocking event.

In  $f_1$ , path *C* calls  $f_3$ . In  $f_3$ , path *C* is inflated into paths *D* and *E* that traverses the *true* and *false* branches of  $c_4$ , respectively. Using reasoning like that for path *B*, one can conclude that path *D* contributes to a bug. However, path *D* is infeasible when path *A* is taken. This is true because path *A* is the path taken via the *false* branch of  $c_3$ ; that means that it also goes via the *false* branch of  $c_2$ . Hence,  $c_2$  evaluates to *false* in other words, (`cpufreq_disabled()`) must return *false*, so  $c_4$  evaluates to *false* if path *A* is taken. This means that path *D* is infeasible when path *A* is taken. In other words, path *D* needs no verification. That leaves us with one path, *E*, that is feasible and has an unlocking event. We can finally conclude that there is no violation for the safe-synchronization property and that  $e_1$  in function  $f_2$  is verified by  $e_2$  in  $f_2$  (intra-procedural) and by  $e_3$  in  $f_3$  via  $f_1$  (inter-procedural).

This case study shows that: 1) EFGs can be used to perform both intra- and inter-procedural path-sensitive analyses efficiently and accurately. Also, 2) the branch nodes contained

in the EFG are the relevant branch nodes for the events and, in determining the feasibility of paths. In this case study, the number of branch nodes are reduced to 5 compared to 14 branch nodes in the corresponding CFGs.

## VII. RELATED WORK

Event-flow graphs are inspired by the work done by Neginhal *et al.* [18]. They developed the C-Vision tool that introduced the notion of *event view*. C-Vision reductions are based on user-input to determine irrelevant nodes/edges to be removed. There is no algorithmic notion to compute the compact CFG. However, this paper provides a linear-time algorithm to compute the event-flow graph with regard to the given events of interest to the property being analyzed. EFGs enable efficient path-sensitive analyses, and can complement existing analysis techniques that have been researched for path-sensitive analyses.

Many model-checking techniques [19] were developed to verify whether a program's model meets a given property specified in temporal logic. These techniques emphasize precision and accuracy while sacrificing scalability. Many of these techniques explore all paths and result in state space explosion problem [20], [21], [22], [8], [23].

Our approach deals with the problematic exponential number of paths by forming equivalence classes of CFG paths, and analyzing one path from each equivalence class. Our empirical evaluation on the Linux kernel shows that EFGs achieve significant reductions in terms of nodes, edges, and branch nodes, especially for complex CFGs with large numbers of paths and branch nodes. Thus, performing efficient model-checking analyses using EFGs instead of CFGs can be quite beneficial.

Another line of research focuses on identifying and eliminating infeasible paths before analysis is performed. [24] claimed that 9-40% of the paths in many programs can be statically identified as infeasible paths. Goldberg *et al.* [25] have applied theorem-proving and Ngo and Tan [3] have proposed a heuristic approach to identify infeasible paths. Vojdani *et al.* [4] applies the concept of global invariants to deal with the exponentially-large number of paths eliminating infeasible paths. Holley and Rosen [26] have introduced qualified data-flow analysis to distinguish infeasible paths from the remaining paths. Other researchers have used symbolic evaluation to detect infeasible paths [5], [6], [7], [8].

Detecting infeasible paths is expensive as it relies on checking the satisfiability of conditions along a path. EFGs can minimize computation for checking path feasibility. As shown in our empirical evaluation of the Linux kernel (Section V-C), the relevant branch nodes for forming equivalence classes were also *sufficient* for checking feasibility.

Another challenge posed by precise path-sensitive analysis is the separation of execution effects/impact along different paths. Many heuristics schemes are aimed at achieving partial path-sensitive solutions that selectively join or separate the effects of using different paths using logical disjunctions [1], [27], [28], [29], [30], [21], [8]. Other approaches [4], [31], [23], [32], [1], [33] determine the relevancy of a branch node through analyzing each individual execution path branching



from a branch node. This process requires computation proportional to the number of execution paths.

The Binary Decision Diagram (BDD) [34] has been used in different contexts of program analysis as a way to reduce the explosion of state space [6], [35], [36]. The Binary Decision Tree (BDT) to BDD reduction has been also used for path-sensitive analysis [37], [38]. EFGs can be used in place of BDT to BDD reduction. While EFGs constitute a general technique for simplifying boolean formulas, EFGs have some advantages over BDDs for path-sensitive analysis. The BDT to BDD transformation is similar to those presented in the discussion of Algorithm I (Section IV-A). Unlike BDT to BDD reduction, the EFG transformation achieves further reduction and does not require the input CFG to be acyclic. The EFG transformation deals with cyclic graphs by incorporating a *linear-time* algorithm by Tarjan [16] to compute strongly-connected components of a directed graph.

CFG pruning techniques have been proposed in [39], [15] to overcome the computational complexity of exploring all paths. EFGs can complement their techniques as the EFG transformation achieves further reduction in the graph size. Other pruning techniques have been introduced by Choi *et al.* [40] and Ramalingam [41] to optimize data-flow graphs. While there is some commonality, those techniques are not well-suited for path-sensitive analyses; the equivalence relation -defined by [40], [41]- is defined with regard to data-flow analysis problems. This equivalence relation is different from the one defined by EFG. Path-sensitive analysis requires preserving the unique event traces and that will not be achieved by the cited techniques.

## VIII. CONCLUSION

Efficient and accurate path-sensitive analyses pose challenges of: (a) analyzing the exponentially-increasing number of paths in a CFG, and (b) checking feasibility of paths in a CFG. This paper presents a technique that uses *equivalence classes* of CFG paths to address these challenges. We introduce the notion of *event-flow graph* (EFG) and present a *linear-time* algorithm to compute equivalence classes by compacting a CFG into an EFG. Each path in the EFG represents an equivalence class of paths in the CFG. We show that it is enough to perform path-sensitive analyses only on the equivalence classes produced by an EFG rather than on all the individual paths in the CFG.

Our empirical evaluation on the Linux kernel (v3.12) shows that using EFGs can significantly improve efficiency of path-sensitive analyses. Moreover, our controlled experiment results show that EFGs are human comprehensible and compact compared to their corresponding CFGs as they impose fewer paths to verify and fewer branch nodes for feasibility checking. We illustrated an application of EFGs to perform intra- and inter-procedural path-sensitive analyses.

For future work, we are currently developing a verification framework for verifying the safe-synchronization property and analyzing memory leaks in the Linux kernel. The framework leverages the EFG-based path-sensitive analyses to enable developing a sound verification framework that can scale well to large systems such as the Linux kernel.

## APPENDIX THEOREMS' AND COROLLARIES' PROOFS

**Theorem 1 Proof.** The equivalence relation  $\mathcal{R}_E$  partitions the CFG paths into equivalence classes such that all paths in an equivalence class have the same event trace, and the CFG paths that are in different equivalence classes have different event traces.

Since  $G_{EFG}$  is the node-induced subgraph of the given CFG  $G$  consisting of the event and the relevant branch nodes, it follows that given an EFG path  $S$ , it will produce an unique event trace  $T$  and conversely given an event trace  $T$  there will be a unique EFG path  $S$  for which the event trace is  $T$ . Thus, there is a one-to-one and onto mapping between the equivalence classes of  $\mathcal{R}_E$  and the paths of the EFG  $G_{EFG}$ .

**Theorem 2 Proof.** If property  $P$  holds for an object  $p$  on all CFG paths then it clearly holds for all corresponding event traces. Therefore, the case we must argue is the one in which property  $P$  is violated for object  $p$  on a CFG path  $S$ . Let  $T$  be the event trace for path  $S$ . Path  $S$  may pass through many branch nodes. We will argue that only the relevant branch nodes on that path are important in determining the existence of a feasible path with trace  $T$ . We will argue that there exists a feasible CFG path with trace  $T$  if and only if there exists a path  $S'$  with trace  $T$  that is feasible with respect to the relevant branch nodes on  $S$ .

If every path with trace  $T$  is infeasible with respect to the relevant branch nodes, then all paths equivalent to  $S$  are also infeasible, because the addition of irrelevant branch nodes cannot turn an infeasible path into a feasible one. On the other hand, suppose there exists a path  $S'$  with trace  $T$  that is feasible with respect to the relevant branch nodes. By the definition of irrelevant branch nodes, an equivalence class has paths going through all possible branches at an irrelevant branch node, so if the path  $S'$  is not feasible due to having some irrelevant branch nodes we can choose feasible branches at those nodes to construct a new CFG path that is feasible and equivalent to  $S'$ . Thus, if there exists a path  $S'$  with trace  $T$  that is feasible with respect to the relevant branch nodes on  $S$ , then there always exists a feasible CFG path with trace  $T$ .

Thus, if property  $P$  is violated on path  $S$ , then we have the following: (a) if  $S$  is feasible with respect to the relevant branch nodes on  $S$ , then there is a feasible path in the equivalence class of  $S$ , and the violation of  $P$  is a true positive; (b) if  $S$  is not feasible with respect to the relevant branch nodes on  $S$ , then all paths equivalent to  $S$  are also not feasible.

*Definition 14:* The boundary of a subgraph  $S$  in a directed graph  $G$ , denoted by  $boundary(S)$ , is the set of nodes  $u \in S$  such that  $suc(u) \in suc(S)$ .

**Theorem 3 Proof.** If a non-colored node  $u \in G$  has only one successor then it is eliminated by transformation  $T_1$ . Thus, since  $G$  is *T-irreducible*,  $|suc(u)| \geq 2$  for all non-colored nodes  $u \in G$ . Also, by assumption,  $G$  is an acyclic graph. Using these two facts, we will show that every subgraph  $S$  has a node with at least two successors outside  $S$  and thus  $|suc(S)| \geq 2$ .

Let  $P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_n} : (v_0, v_1), (v_1, v_2), \dots, (v_{n-1}, v_n)$  be a maximal path in subgraph  $S$ . Since  $v_n$  is the terminal node of this

maximal path  $P$ , its successor cannot be another node in  $S$  not on the path  $P$ . Also, the successor of  $v_n$  cannot be another node on the path  $P$  because  $G_c$  is an acyclic graph, so  $v_n$  must be a boundary node and all its successors must be outside the subgraph  $S$ . Since  $v_n$  is a non-colored node,  $|suc(v_n)| \geq 2$ . Since  $v_n$ , a node in  $S$ , has at least two successors outside of  $S$ , we have  $|suc(S)| \geq 2$ . This completes the proof.

**Corollary 2 Proof.** Note that the condensed EFG  $G_{\text{cEFG}}$  is the graph resulting from step (4) of the EFG construction algorithm. By construction, the condensed graph  $G_{\text{cEFG}}$  is a colored  $T$ -irreducible graph. Also, by construction  $G_{\text{cEFG}}$  is an acyclic graph. By applying the above theorem to  $G_{\text{cEFG}}$  we get the proof of the corollary.

**Corollary 3 Proof.** By construction, the graph  $G_{\text{T-irr}}$  resulting after step (1) of Algorithm II, consists of only event nodes, relevant branch nodes, and the irrelevant branch nodes retained by Algorithm I. We will now argue that all the irrelevant branch nodes will be eliminated when  $G_{\text{cEFG}}$  is constructed in step (4) of Algorithm II. According to the definition of irrelevant branch nodes (Definition 7), a node  $c$  is irrelevant if there is a subgraph  $S$  that contains  $c$ , all its branch edges,  $S$  has no event nodes, and  $|suc(S)| = 1$ . It follows from this definition and from the corollary 2 that  $G_{\text{cEFG}}$  does not contain any irrelevant branch nodes. Thus, the final graph produced by Algorithm II also does not contain any irrelevant branch nodes, because it consists of the nodes in  $G_{\text{cEFG}}$  and all the event nodes.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research was supported by DARPA under agreement number FA8750-12-2-0126.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] M. Das, S. Lerner, and M. Seigle, "ESP: Path-sensitive program verification in polynomial time," *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, 2002.
- [2] L. Carter, J. Ferrante, and C. Thomborson, "Folklore confirmed: reducible flow graphs are exponentially larger," in *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT*, 2003.
- [3] M. Ngo and K. Tan, "Detecting large number of infeasible paths through recognizing their patterns," *ACM*, 2007.
- [4] V. Vojdani and V. Vene, "Goblint: Path-sensitive data race analysis," in *Annales Univ. Sci. Budapest., Sect. Comp*, 2009.
- [5] A. Navabi, N. Kidd, and S. Jagannathan, "Path-sensitive analysis using edge strings," 2010.
- [6] T. Ball and S. K. Rajamani, "Bebop: A path-sensitive interprocedural dataflow engine," *ACM*, 2001, pp. 97–103.
- [7] Z. Xu and J. Zhang, "Path and context sensitive inter-procedural memory leak detection," in *The Eighth International Conference on Quality Software*, 2008s.
- [8] I. Dillig, T. Dillig, and A. Aiken, "Sound, complete and scalable path-sensitive analysis," in *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, vol. 43, no. 6. *ACM*, 2008, pp. 270–280.
- [9] "Reported bug," [https://bugzilla.kernel.org/show\\_bug.cgi?id=68011](https://bugzilla.kernel.org/show_bug.cgi?id=68011).
- [10] <https://sites.google.com/site/efgwebsite/>.
- [11] M. Potet, L. Mounier, and N. Tapus, "Detecting software vulnerabilities static taint analysis," 2009.
- [12] "Common weakness enumeration," <http://cwe.mitre.org>.
- [13] M. N. Wegman and F. K. Zadeck, "Constant propagation with conditional branches," *TOPLAS*, 1991.
- [14] C. Click, "Global code motion/global value numbering," in *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*. *ACM*, 1995.
- [15] H. K. Cho, T. Kelly, Y. Wang, S. Lafortune, H. Liao, and S. Mahlke, "Practical lock/unlock pairing for concurrent programs," in *Code Generation and Optimization (CGO)*, 2013.
- [16] R. Tarjan, "Depth-first search and linear graph algorithms," *SIAM journal on computing*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 146–160, 1972.
- [17] "Ensoft corp." <http://www.ensoftcorp.com>.
- [18] S. Neginhal and S. Kothari, "Event views and graph reductions for understanding system level c code," in *ICSM*, 2006.
- [19] R. Jhala and R. Majumdar, "Software model checking," *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 41, no. 4, p. 21, 2009.
- [20] E. Clarke, D. Kroening, and F. Lerda, "A tool for checking ANSI-C programs," in *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*. Springer, 2004, pp. 168–176.
- [21] G. Balakrishnan, S. Sankaranarayanan, F. Ivančić, O. Wei, and A. Gupta, "SLR: Path-sensitive analysis through infeasible-path detection and syntactic language refinement," *Static Analysis*, 2008.
- [22] W. R. Harris, S. Sankaranarayanan, F. Ivančić, and A. Gupta, "Program analysis via satisfiability modulo path programs," in *ACM Sigplan Notices*, vol. 45, no. 1. *ACM*, 2010, pp. 71–82.
- [23] N. Dor, S. Adams, M. Das, and Z. Yang, "Software validation via scalable path-sensitive value flow analysis," in *ACM SIGSOFT Software Engineering Notes*, vol. 29, no. 4, 2004.
- [24] R. Bodik, R. Gupta, and M. L. Soffa, "Refining data flow information using infeasible paths," in *Software Engineering/ESEC/FSE'97*. Springer, 1997, pp. 361–377.
- [25] A. Goldberg, T. C. Wang, and D. Zimmerman, "Applications of feasible path analysis to program testing," in *Proceedings of the 1994 ACM SIGSOFT international symposium on Software testing and analysis*.
- [26] L. H. Holley and B. K. Rosen, "Qualified data flow problems," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, no. 1, 1981.
- [27] D. Dhurjati, M. Das, and Y. Yang, "Path-sensitive dataflow analysis with iterative refinement," in *Static Analysis*. Springer, 2006, pp. 425–442.
- [28] J. Fischer, R. Jhala, and R. Majumdar, "Joining dataflow with predicates," in *ACM Software Engineering Notes*, 2005.
- [29] L. Mauborgne and X. Rival, "Trace partitioning in abstract interpretation based static analyzers," in *Programming Languages and Systems*. Springer, 2005, pp. 5–20.
- [30] S. Sankaranarayanan, F. Ivančić, I. Shlyakhter, and A. Gupta, "Static analysis in disjunctive numerical domains," in *Static Analysis*. Springer, 2006, pp. 3–17.
- [31] Y. Wang, Y. Gong, Q. Xiao, and Z. Yang, "An improved global analysis for program bug checking," in *International Conference on Test and Measurement*, 2009.
- [32] J. Jaffar and V. Murali, "A path-sensitively sliced control flow graph,"
- [33] H. Cui, G. Hu, J. Wu, and J. Yang, "Verifying systems rules using rule-directed symbolic execution," in *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, 2013.
- [34] S. B. Akers, "Binary decision diagrams," *IEEE Trans. Computers*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 509–516, 1978.
- [35] R. Manevich, G. Ramalingam, J. Field, D. Goyal, and M. Sagiv, "Compactly representing first-order structures for static analysis," in *Static Analysis*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2002.
- [36] J. Whaley and M. S. Lam, "Cloning-based context-sensitive pointer alias analysis using binary decision diagrams," in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 2004 Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. *ACM*.
- [37] Y. Xie and A. Aiken, "Saturn: A scalable framework for error detection using boolean satisfiability," *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, vol. 29, no. 3, May 2007.
- [38] X. Zhang, R. Gupta, and Y. Zhang, "Efficient forward computation of dynamic slices using reduced ordered binary decision diagrams," in *ICSE*, 2004.
- [39] M. Ramanathan, A. Grama, and S. Jagannathan, "Path-sensitive inference of function precedence protocols," in *ICSE*, 2007.
- [40] J.-D. Choi, R. Cytron, and J. Ferrante, "Automatic construction of sparse data flow evaluation graphs," in *Proceedings of the 18th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT symposium on Principles of programming languages*. *ACM*, 1991, pp. 55–66.
- [41] G. Ramalingam, *On sparse evaluation representations*. Springer, 1997.