

Duplicate-sensitivity Guided Transformation Synthesis for DBMS Correctness Bug Detection

Yushan Zhang

Department of Computer Science and Engineering

HKUST

Hong Kong, China

yzhanghw@connect.ust.hk

Rongxin Wu

Department of Cyber Space Security

School of School of Informatics

Xiamen University

Xiamen, China

wurongxin@xmu.edu.cn

Peisen Yao

Department of Computer Science and Engineering

HKUST

Hong Kong, China

pyao@cse.ust.hk

Charles Zhang

Department of Computer Science and Engineering

HKUST

Hong Kong, China

charlesz@cse.ust.hk

Abstract—Database Management System (DBMS) plays a core role in modern software from mobile apps to online banking. It is critical that the DBMS provides correct data to all applications. When the DBMS returns incorrect data, a correctness bug is triggered. Current production-level DBMSs still suffer from insufficient testing due to the limited hand-written test cases. Recently several works proposed to automatically generate many test cases with query transformation, a process of generating an equivalent query pair and testing a DBMS by checking whether the system returns the same result set for both queries. However, all of them still heavily rely on manual work to provide a transformation which largely confines their exploration of the valid input query space.

This paper introduces duplicate-sensitivity guided transformation synthesis which automatically finds new transformations by first synthesizing many candidates then filtering the nonequivalent ones. Our automated synthesis is achieved by mutating a query while keeping its duplicate sensitivity, which is a necessary condition for query equivalence. After candidate synthesis, we keep the mutant query which is equivalent to the given one by using a query equivalent checker. Furthermore, we have implemented our idea in a tool Eqsq and used it to test the production-level DBMSs. In two months, we detected in total 30 newly confirmed and unique bugs in MySQL, TiDB and CynosDB.

Index Terms—DBMS, database system, SQL, testing

I. INTRODUCTION

Database Management Systems (DBMSs) are widely used in modern industries. The users expect the DBMS to retrieve correct data records and report correct analysis results on the giving databases. Unexpectedly, researchers could still find hundreds of queries where the popular and production-level DBMSs return wrong result sets [1], though these systems have been extensively tested during their development [2], [3].

To validate the correctness of different DBMS components (e.g. the optimizer), the developers usually manually write test cases and provide the expected result for a query. However, the quality of test cases is largely limited by developers' testing

skills [4] and the hand-written test cases only cover a very small part of the possible input query space [5], leading to insufficient testing of the DBMS. In what follows, we refer to a test case for the purpose of DBMS correctness testing as a test query and an expected result set.

Recent studies [6]–[10] have proposed several approaches to better explore the query space. They all use automated random query generation to enlarge the explored query space. However, the key challenge is the test oracle problem, i.e., how to find the expected result set of a given query. To address the problem, one category of approaches such as ADUSA [6] and Qex [7] convert the query to Satisfiability Modulo Theory (SMT) constraints and use a constraint solver to deduce the results. However, they cannot work on special data types (e.g. varchar) in the DBMS and big tables because of the performance issue of the solver. Another category of approaches identify a correctness bug by comparing the result set of a pair of equivalent queries. However, existing approaches can only use limited rules/transformations to derive the query pairs. For example, TLP [10] first generates a query Q and then uses a predefined transformation to on Q to obtain a new equivalent query Q' . Next, it checks whether the DBMS generates the same result under the input of Q and Q' . However, since some correctness bugs can only be exposed under a certain query pair and the predefined transformation may fail to generate such query pair, these approaches would lose the chances to detect such bugs. To be more specific, the transformation rule of the existing studies [1], [8], [10] presumes that the generated query pair should explicitly include a “where” predicate (e.g. where a != 0) and the bug was triggered by the inconsistent interpretations of “where” predicates. However, as shown in Figure 1, this bug is exposed by two equivalent queries Q_A (Fig 6b) and Q_B (Fig 6c) in which there are no “where” predicates. Essentially, this bug is caused by an inconsistent representation of the float-point value 0.001. Q_A and Q_B are

expected to return the same value on the given table `t0`, but they have a different value for 0.001 as shown in the result column.

The key point in identifying such a correctness bug in Figure 1 is to compare if a row appears in the result sets of the equivalent query pair. In this example, `mysum1` and `mysum2` do not have a same row, and then this bug is exposed. Inspired by this example, our key idea is to create such a query that a row appears the same number of times in the result sets of both the original and transformed queries. To achieve this goal, it is required to describe the property whether duplicated rows should present in a query’s result set, which we denote as *query duplicate sensitivity*. This property is generally available on all SQL queries, which does not require the query to have a specific component such as the “where” predicate. Although we can create query mutants by preserving this property, it can generate queries which are not equivalent to the given one because it is a necessary condition. To keep the valid query mutants only, we leverage the existing query equivalence checker [11] to do the job.

Following our insight, we designed an automated correctness bug detection tool with duplicate-sensitivity guided query transformations. `Esql` could synthesize many candidate mutant transformations for a query and it uses the query equivalent solver `EQUITAS` [11] to identify the valid mutants. To evaluate the effectiveness of our approach, we have implemented it in a tool called `Esql`. We ran `Esql` on several real-world production-level DBMSs, namely MySQL [12], PingCAP TiDB [13] and Tencent CynosDB [14]. During a two month evaluation, our tool has found 30 confirmed and unique bugs. It detected 14 bugs in MySQL, 13 bugs in TiDB and 3 bugs in Tencent CynosDB. While we evaluated our tool on MySQL-compatible database systems, we believe our approach is also applicable to the other DBMSs.

In summary, we made the following contributions:

- We present a workflow for synthesizing equivalent-preserving query transformations, based on duplicate sensitivity of SQL clauses.
- We implemented our approach in `Esql`, which is a fully automated testing tool for detecting correctness bugs in MySQL-compatible database systems.
- We detected 30 new and unique bugs in the popular production-level DBMSs, as a practical evaluation of `Esql`.

II. ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES

In this section, we use two examples to demonstrate how we obtain more transformations on a given query. Before we look into the examples, we first need to define some jargon to help use explain concepts in the SQL language.

- **SQL Operators.** We consider every SQL clause and function as a SQL operator. In this section, we introduce the `WHERE`, `HAVING` and `DISTINCT` operators.
- **Duplicate Sensitivity.** Every SQL operator must be either duplicate sensitive or duplicate insensitive. `SUM`

is duplicate sensitive and `MAX` is duplicate insensitive. Additionally, `WHERE` and `HAVING` are duplicate sensitive and the `DISTINCT` operator is duplicate insensitive.

Due to the limited space, we show how our approach works with two common query categories: `SELECT-FROM-WHERE` and `SELECT-FROM-GROUP BY`. Let us start with the first category, and then move to the more complex category with aggregations. Figure 2 shows the categories, the corresponding seed query and the generated query mutant. The gray color highlights where the transformation takes place.

III. CATEGORY 1: SELECT-FROM-WHERE

This category is one of the most frequent queries in the DBMS, which asks the system to filter out data records not satisfying the “where” predicate. These queries will go through complex equivalent transformations during the optimization phase [15], potentially resulting in a nonequivalent final result set due to implementation bugs [16], [17]. However, such bugs are hard to be captured due to the large amount of optimization combinations [16]. Previous work `NoREC` [8] can only detect such bugs because it only manipulates the “where” predicate to create an unoptimized query mutant.

For queries in this category, there are many candidate transformations to apply. In this example, our approach inserts additional operators to the seed query. By adding `DISTINCT` to `SELECT a` in (Figure 2), it generated Q_A . And by adding groups with `GROUP BY`, it gets Q_B . Both inserted operators remove duplicates of an a value and keep only one copy of each different a value. Because adding duplicates for an a value or remove some duplicates will not change the result for `DISTINCT` and `GROUP BY`, they are *duplicate insensitive*. The operators de-duplicate the input tuples and output results with one copy for each row. We denote this operation as δ , following the convention in [18].

IV. CATEGORY 2: SELECT-FROM-GROUP BY

For this category, we consider a query with grouping and an aggregate function. Different from the first category, queries of this category always produce an intermediate result [19], which is a set of distinct groups formed by the `GROUP BY` columns. A `GROUP BY` operator splits the input records into groups based on the given grouping condition. After a grouping, normally an aggregate function is used to compute some results on a group, such as a sum of a numeric column. However, we could not extract the groups explicitly with any SQL operators, which makes it harder to discover such bugs only with the final result set.

Given an input query with `SUM` and `GROUP BY`, we can add a filter clauses either by inserting a `WHERE` operator before the `GROUP BY` or by inserting a `HAVING` after it. `GROUP BY` is also a de-duplicating operator, because given one copy of each a value is sufficient to form the groups in our seed query. When both newly-inserted filter operators `WHERE` and `HAVING` apply to a , they do not modify the intermediate groups. Therefore the query mutant Q_B is still equivalent after the transformation. We denote the filtering operations as σ .

a	b
1	-1
-1	0
0.001	0

(a) Table t_0

```
SELECT SUM(a) AS mysum1
FROM t0;
```

mysum1
0.00099999999999998899

(b) The equivalent query Q_A

```
SELECT SUM(gsum) AS mysum2
FROM (
  SELECT SUM(a) AS gsum
  FROM t0
  GROUP BY a
) AS t;
```

mysum2
0.00100000000000000009

(c) The equivalent query Q_B

Fig. 1: Q_A and Q_B is an equivalent query pair, which is expected to compute the same results. In MySQL they produce different results, which revealed an inconsistent float representation bug.

Category	Seed	Q_A	Q_B
SELECT-FROM-WHERE	SELECT a FROM t WHERE a > 0;	SELECT DISTINCT a FROM t0 WHERE a > 0;	SELECT a FROM t0 WHERE a > 0 GROUP BY a;
SELECT-FROM-WHERE-GROUP BY	SELECT a, SUM(b) FROM t0 GROUP BY a;	SELECT a, SUM(b) FROM t0 WHERE a > 0 GROUP BY a;	SELECT a, SUM(b) FROM t0 GROUP BY a HAVING a > 0;

Fig. 2: Two SQL categories and seed with generated EQP

In this section, we explain the core concepts intuitively with two concrete queries. Next, we formally describe the scope of SQL syntax and the problem background in this paper.

V. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we first define the SQL syntax, followed by a recap of the fundamental relational data model for the Relational Database Management Systems (RDBMSs). We then take special care to describe aggregation operators due to their different semantic. Last we describe the key technical challenge addressed in this work.

A. SQL Syntax and Relational Model

We consider the SQL syntax given in [19] which supports aggregate functions and groupings.

Notations. n is a table name, and T is a set of table names. c is a column name annotated with the name of the containing table, and C is a set of column names. A truth value l is an element of the truth values $L = \{TRUE, FALSE, NULL\}$ in three-valued Logic [20]. V is a set of values which could be assigned to a field. We use the following symbols: 1) T' is a sequence of table names. 2) C' is a sequence of column names. 3) t is a term, where $t \in L \cup V \cup C$.

Figure 3 presents the syntax. A query Q could have a “where” predicate, denoted as p . The predicate can be composed of truth values, an expression of values, and can be recursively constructed with predicates connected by binary and unary operators. A query could also use aggregate functions A in the SELECT part. We also defined *where predicate* and *operator* to ease our references to specific SQL structures.

$Q := \text{SELECT } C' \text{ FROM } T'$ $\mid \text{SELECT } C' \text{ FROM } T \text{ WHERE } p$ $\mid \text{SELECT } A \text{ FROM } T'$ $\mid \text{SELECT } A \text{ FROM } T' \text{ GROUP BY } C$
$p := \text{TRUE} \mid \text{FALSE} \mid \text{NULL}$ $\mid p \text{ op } p$ $\mid \text{op } p$ $\mid v$

Fig. 3: SQL syntax discussed in this paper.

Definition 1 (Where Predicate): Given a query, we refer to the part, between WHERE and the next keyword, as the *where predicate*, or simply as the *predicate* P .

Definition 2 (Operator): An operator operates on inputs with a type of relation or value (single attribute and single tuple relation), and produces a result corresponding to the input type. The operator has two categories: 1) relational operators, which are the operators of a SQL query: SELECT, DISTINCT, WHERE, GROUP BY, UNION, UNION ALL; 2) value operators, which manipulate a value, such as aggregate functions and logic operators.

Relational Model. Modern RDBMSs use SQL, a language manipulating table containing duplicates. This motivated us to adopt the extended relational model in [18], where Dayal proposed the relational model over multiset, allowing duplicated values to present in the database.

Definition 3 (Relation Scheme): A relation scheme S is a set of k -attributes $\{A_1, A_2 \dots A_k\}$. The cardinality of the set is the *arity* of the scheme, denoted as k . Each attribute A_i is associated with its domain: $dom(A)$. A relation scheme could be written as $S(A_1 : dom(A_1), A_2 : dom(A_2) \dots A_k : dom(A_k))$.

Definition 4 (Multiset Relation): A multiset relation R over a relation scheme S is a finite set of pairs $\langle t, i \rangle$, where t is a k -tuple over S and i is the multiplicity of t . When $i = 1$ for every t over S , R is a (set-)relation.

B. Aggregations

We call the classical aggregate function operators: COUNT, SUM, MIN, MAX, AVG and the operator GROUP BY as *aggregations (aggs)*, and we refer to a SQL query with any aggs as an *agg query*. Similarly, the SQL query without aggs is called the *non-agg query*. We consider agg operators to be different because their results can contain tuples that are not part of the input relation.

Group By. Hella etc. [21] pointed out this operator produces an intermediate result, which is a set of grouped tuples. As as long as we use the current SQL syntax, we cannot extract this intermediate result explicitly with a query.

Aggregate Function. These functions always run on a group, which can be a result of a GROUP BY. They always produce an one-attribute one-tuple relation as the result for each and every group.

C. Problem Statement

At high level, our approach tests a DBMS as follows. Given a seed query Q , we first generate many query mutants by performing different transformations on Q . We then run the pair formed by Q with one of the mutant on the tested DBMS. If the DBMS does not produce same result set for them, then a correctness bug is detected.

To transform a SQL query, we can walk over the production rules of the SQL’s context-free grammar, as in conventional grammar-based testing. However, randomly applying the production rules is inefficient in generating both syntactically and semantically valid queries [22], and it can produce many nonequivalent query pairs. Thus, in this work, the key technical challenge we address is as follows:

Given a query Q_A , automatically find transformations to generate candidate mutants Q_B etc., such that Q_A, Q_B are equivalent.

The cornerstone of our solution is to use the property of *duplicate sensitivity* to guide the generation of candidate query mutants. In the following section, we present the theoretical foundation and the technical detail of our approach.

VI. APPROACH

We start this section with a formal definition for duplicate sensitivity, and then prove the preservation of duplicate sensitivity as a necessary condition for query equivalence. Next, we present how to use duplicate sensitivity to guide the creation of equivalent transformations. At last we give the overall algorithm for testing the DBMS.

A. Duplicate Sensitivity for Query Equivalence

Duplicate Sensitivity. We start by recapping the property of duplicate sensitivity for a single SQL operator such as SUM and MAX. We then extend the notion of duplicate sensitivity to a whole SQL query.

Definition 5 (Duplicate Sensitive Operators): An operator is duplicate sensitive, if multiplicity of input changes the result, vice versa.

$$\begin{aligned} \pi : \tau &\rightarrow \tau && \text{(SELECT)} \\ \sigma : \tau &\rightarrow \tau && \text{(WHERE, HAVING)} \\ \gamma : \tau &\rightarrow \tau_v && \text{(Aggregate Function)} \\ \delta : \tau_b &\rightarrow \tau_s && \text{(DISTINCT, GROUP BY)} \end{aligned}$$

Fig. 4: Describing SQL clause input and output. τ_b is a multiset type, τ_s is a set type, τ_v is a value type and τ is generic it could be either of the three. A set type is duplicate insensitive, a multiset type is duplicate sensitive and a value type’s sensitivity depends on the function.

Example 1: For relational operators, we know that SELECT, WHERE and UNION ALL are duplicate sensitive and DISTINCT, GROUP BY and UNION are duplicate insensitive. For value operators we know that MIN, MAX are insensitive, and SUM, COUNT, AVG are duplicate sensitive.

We have also observed that all operators take a relation as input (Definition 2), which is then processed by the next operator. From this point of view, a SQL query is a series of operators, which can be either duplicate sensitive or insensitive. Thus, we generalize the notion of duplicate sensitivity to a SQL query, defined as below.

Definition 6 (Query Duplicate Sensitivity): The duplicate sensitivity of a SQL query is the *ordered composition* of the duplicate sensitivity of its operators.

Let g and h be two SQL operators, and $g \cdot h$ be their composition. We can obtain the duplicate sensitivity of $g \cdot h$ (denoted as “ $DS(g \cdot h)$ ”) as the following:

$$DS(g \cdot h) = \begin{cases} \text{sensitive, } g : \text{sensitive} \wedge h : \text{sensitive} \\ \text{insensitive, } \text{others} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Given any SQL query, we can compute the duplicate sensitivity of it using the above rules.

Example 2: Suppose we have a query SELECT a FROM t0 WHERE a > 1 GROUP BY a, we know the sensitivity for each operator in this query: SELECT is sensitive, WHERE is sensitive and GROUP BY is insensitive. Formally, each operator is a transformation function which is given in Figure 4. The ordered composition of these operators is applying these functions in order. One possible composition of the query is $\pi \cdot \delta \cdot \sigma$, and the ordered composition of its operators’ sensitivity can be derived by following Equation 1, which is insensitive.

Necessary Condition for Query Equivalence. We now prove that two equivalent queries must have the same duplicate sensitivity by constructing a contrapositive proof using query equivalence.

Lemma 1 (Query Equivalence): Given two queries Q_1 and Q_2 . They are equivalent, denoted as $Q_1 \equiv Q_2$ if and only if the following holds:

$$\forall D, R_1(D) \subseteq R_2(D) \wedge R_2(D) \subseteq R_1(D).$$

$R_1(D)$ is the result set of Q_1 on relation D and $R_2(D)$ is the result set of Q_2 on relation D , respectively.

$$\begin{array}{l}
Q_A: \text{ SELECT DISTINCT } a \\
\text{ FROM } t0 \\
\text{ WHERE } a > 0; \\
\end{array}
\quad (\pi_a \cdot \delta) \cdot \sigma_{a>0}$$

$$\begin{array}{l}
Q_B: \text{ SELECT } a \\
\text{ FROM } t0 \\
\text{ WHERE } a > 0 \\
\text{ GROUP BY } a; \\
\end{array}
\quad \pi_a \cdot (\delta \cdot \sigma_{a>0})$$

Fig. 5: Two operator series of different order have the same execution result. Execution of the relational algebra expressions starts from right to left.

TABLE I: Remapping from relational algebra to SQL.

Operator	SQL Keywords
σ	HAVING, WHERE
δ	DISTINCT, GROUP BY

Theorem 1: Given two queries Q_1 and Q_2 , if $Q_1 \equiv Q_2$, then $DS(Q_1) \equiv DS(Q_2)$. Where $DS(Q_1)$ and $DS(Q_2)$ denote *duplicate-sensitivity* of Q_1 and Q_2 , respectively.

Proof 1: We construct a contrapositive proof for this theorem. The theorem when formally written is: $Q_1 \equiv Q_2 \rightarrow DS(Q_1) \equiv DS(Q_2)$, which is logically equivalent to $DS(Q_1) \not\equiv DS(Q_2) \rightarrow Q_1 \not\equiv Q_2$ (contrapositive form). Given two queries Q_1 and Q_2 , w.l.o.g., we can assume $R(Q_1)$ is a multiset (duplicate sensitive) and $R(Q_2)$ is a set (duplicate insensitive). We consider a tuple t with multiplicity i in D , which is contained in both $R(Q_1)$ and $R(Q_2)$:

Case 1: $i = 1$. $R(Q_1) \subseteq R(Q_2) \wedge R(Q_2) \subseteq R(Q_1)$ on t .

Case 2: $i \geq 2$. Because $R(Q_1)$ is a multiset and $R(Q_2)$ is a set, then $R(Q_1) \not\subseteq R(Q_2) \wedge R(Q_2) \subseteq R(Q_1)$. This is because when a tuple appears in the result set, all of its duplicates must also appear.

Combining both cases, we get $R(Q_1) \not\subseteq R(Q_2) \wedge R(Q_2) \subseteq R(Q_1)$, together with the contrapositive form of Lemma 1, we have $Q_1 \not\equiv Q_2$. This completes the proof. \square

We have proved that duplicate sensitivity is a necessary condition for query equivalence, then we can follow this theorem to guide our transformations to preserve the sensitivity for the query mutant. Next, we illustrate how the transformation is done on a concrete query.

B. Sensitivity-guided Transformation Synthesis

The goal of our approach is to find more transformations on a query, which guarantees the equivalence between the given query and the mutant. The key insight is to first generate many candidate mutants with Theorem 1. To achieve it, we first convert a query to an intermediate form, then apply transformations and last convert it back to a SQL query. To ease our discussion, we use relational algebra symbols to represent the operators. Conventionally, we have the following relational algebra: π for projection, σ for selection, γ for aggregate and δ for distinct. Next, we use an example to illustrate our approach.

1) *A taste:* Let us consider Category 1 in Figure 2 again, viewing the query as a series of operators. We could obtain an execution order of each query as in Figure 5. Q_A performs selection (σ), de-duplicating (δ) and at last projection (π). Among those operations, only the second one changes multiplicity of every tuple, while the first one keeps or removes all duplicates and the third one has no impact on the duplicates. However, the problem is how we can preserve the duplicate sensitivity while transforming Q_A to Q_B . We achieve this by considering the context of an operator, which means if it is compatible with both the input and output types of the previous and the next operator.

2) *In action:* We have three steps to transform a query and to generate a duplicate-sensitivity preserving mutant. In the first step, we represent Q_A in a relational algebra expression as $\pi \cdot \delta \cdot \sigma$ (SELECT-DISTINCT-WHERE). In the second step, we apply transformations on the expression. We have many choices for the transformation, e.g. replace an operator, change the order of the operators. However, to preserve duplicate sensitivity of the query, we need to choose the transformation carefully. For instance, if we change an operator from sensitive to insensitive, it may also alter the sensitivity of the query (Equation 1). We should always stick to the goal that we should not alter a query's sensitivity during our transformations.

Considering the existing transformation rules [23], we apply associativity to the expression and obtain two new expressions: $\pi \cdot (\delta \cdot \sigma)$ or $(\pi \cdot \delta) \cdot \sigma$, which both are still duplicate sensitive. On the SQL level we can interpret those expressions differently (Table I. For the first expression, we take out the projection and we obtain SELECT-(DISTINCT-WHERE) (pull out projection). For the second expression, we take out the selection and we obtain (SELECT-DISTINCT)-WHERE (pull out selection). We can also apply commutativity rules to the expression, then we obtain $\pi \cdot (\sigma \cdot \delta)$ which we interpret as SELECT-(WHERE-DISTINCT) on the SQL level. In the last step, we remap the interpretation to concrete SQL queries. For instance, the expression SELECT-(WHERE-DISTINCT) is remapped to SELECT a FROM t0 WHERE a>0 GROUP BY a. We could use GROUP BY instead of DISTINCT operator because both operator are compatible to the context following our new definition.

To wrap up, our query transformation approach has three steps as the following:

- 1) Convert a SQL query Q to a relational algebra expression E ;
- 2) Apply transformation rules such as associativity and commutativity to E and obtain an duplicate-sensitivity preserving expression E' . The existing rules used for query optimization [23] are also applicable.
- 3) Remap E' back to a SQL query by considering duplicate sensitivity of the SQL operators.

C. Detecting Bugs with Eqsq

We now could use the duplicate-sensitivity guided transformation to create tests. Following our approach, we designed a




Fig. 6: Workflow of guided transformation synthesis

tool called Eqsq. We describe its architecture for bug finding and the query transformation algorithm in this section. We give more implementation details in Section VII.

System Overview. Figure 6 shows the architecture of Eqsq. It takes a bunch of seed queries and processes them one by one. The Mutator takes a seed query and generates an mutated query pair. The pair is sent to an equivalence checker where it is discarded if they are nonequivalent. The equivalent query pairs are executed by a database server and the results are collected. The result checker reports a bug if it finds a difference in the pair’s result set.

Algorithm 1: Eqsq’s main logic

Input: A set of randomly given seed queries
Output: A bug report or nothing

```

1 Procedure test_db(Seeds)
2   foreach  $Q \in Seeds$  do
3      $Q_e \leftarrow \text{transform\_query}(Q)$  ;
4      $checkRes \leftarrow \text{equal\_checker.check}(Q, Q_e)$  ;
5     if  $checkRes$  is False then
6       continue ;
7      $R \leftarrow \text{db.execute}(Q)$  ;
8      $R_e \leftarrow \text{db.execute}(Q_e)$  ;
9     if  $R$  is not equal to  $R_e$  then
10      report a bug ;

```

Algorithms. Algorithm 1 presents the high-level process of detecting correctness bugs with our approach. It first takes a set of seed queries *Seeds* and a DMBS under test as input, where the execution result of a single query is previously unknown during our testing. At the start of Eqsq’s main bug checking logic, we suppose that a bunch of seed queries are given as input. It iteratively takes a seed query (line 2), and transforms it to get a query mutant (Algorithm 2). Next, it sends the query and the mutant to the query checker where the nonequivalent query pairs are discarded (line 4-line 6). Then it runs the equivalent query pairs in the tested DBMS and save the results respectively (line 7- line 8). At last, it checks if both queries have the same execution results (line 9), if not then it reports a correctness bug (line 10).

Algorithm 2: Transformation synthesis

Input: A random seed query Q
Output: An EQP (Q, Q_e)

```

1 Function transform_query( $Q$ )
2    $t \leftarrow \text{parse}(Q)$  ;
3   foreach  $r \in rules$  do
4     if  $r$  is applicable on  $t$  then
5        $t_e \leftarrow r(t)$  ;
6       generate  $Q_e$  from  $t_e$  ;
7       break ;
8   return  $(Q, Q_e)$  ;

```

In Algorithm 1 we omit that how the seed query is transformed for simplicity, now we present the procedure `transformQuery` in Algorithm 2. The procedure first parses a given query and obtains the corresponding tree representing the algebra operators (line 2). Then the tree goes through mutants (Table II) to search for an applicable transformation (line 3-line 6). At last the procedure returns the new EQP (line 8).

VII. IMPLEMENTATION

We implemented the main logic of Eqsq including transformations of the input seed query and result equivalence checks with Go [24]. We dispatched the candidate equivalence checks to a formal query equivalence checker EQUITAS [11]. We present the important implementation details in this section.

Seed Generation. We leverage the existing tool `go-randgen` [25] to randomly generate databases and queries as the input. `go-randgen` is a general testing tool following the MySQL SQL dialects. We manually specify the grammar by providing a Bison YY file [26]. To use Eqsq to test other DMBSa, only minimum effort is required to set up the input generator (e.g. using PostgreSQL PHP Generator [27]).

Query Filtering. Though we try to precisely specify the correct SQL grammar for testing, it is still not easy to get all queries executable because SQL is a Context-Free Language [28]. With the grammar file, only the syntax is valid, but the semantics is determined at the runtime. To run the queries, Eqsq firstly loads all the queries and then attempts to execute every and each of them one by one. To filter the invalid queries, we created a list of errors to be ignored. When an error from the list is returned by the tested DBMS, Eqsq discards the query immediately. For other queries which may throw an unseen error, it is possible that a bug is associated with the query. In this case, we keep the query and need manual effort to verify it is a real bug. Due to the given grammar’s complexity, we have an average of 10% of valid queries observed.

Selected Oracles. Because of the extensibility of our approach to generating query candidates, we cannot exhaustively implement all the possible transformations on the seed query. We selected two transformations for our implementation, while

TABLE II: Example relational algebra transformation rules. One row in the table describes a rule. The second column is the relational algebra expression E for a seed query, the third column is a duplicate-sensitivity preserving expression E_e to the second column, the fourth column is a candidate mapping from E_e to a SQL query, and the last column is the name of this rule.

No.	Expression E	Preserving E_e	SQL pattern	Name
1	$\pi \cdot \sigma$	$\pi \cdot (\sigma)$	SELECT-(WHERE)	projection pull up
2	$\sigma_2 \cdot \sigma_1$	$\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2$	WHERE-(WHERE)	commutative selections
3	$\pi_1 \cdot \pi_2 \cdots \pi_n$	π_1	SELECT	cascade of projection
4	$E_1 \cup E_2$	$E_2 \cup E_1$	SELECT-UNION-SELECT	commutative set union

the others would be easily added. We chose to implement for WHERE to be consistent with most of the existing works and implement for GROUP BY and aggregate functions, which are the magic touch of our approach. To obtain the query candidate, a query is first parsed by sqlparser [29] to an Abstract Syntax Tree (AST) which then goes through transformations. The implementation could be extended to concatenate different transformations, while our implementation transforms each query only once.

Testing Iteration. Each iteration of Eqsq’s execution starts by generating the databases and 2000 queries by default. It first cleans the given database and creates a new one, and then it invokes the main logic to run and verify each of the queries. It saves the query when a bug is discovered. From our experience, such an iteration takes around 10s to finish when testing against MySQL 8.0.21.

VIII. EVALUATION

We guide our quantitative evaluation by the following three research questions:

- **RQ1:** Can Eqsq detect correctness bugs in production level databases?
- **RQ2:** What are the impacts of the detected bugs?
- **RQ3:** Can Eqsq improve the code coverage of the input seed queries?

Results Summary. We conducted a *two-month* real-world evaluation of Eqsq’s bug finding capability on four MySQL compatible DBMSs: MySQL 5.7, MySQL 8.0, TiDB and CynosDB. The results are highlighted as below:

- Eqsq has detected 30 new bugs in the tested DBMSs. They are all unique and are confirmed by the developers. This emphasizes the effectiveness and practicability of Eqsq.
- Most of the detected bugs have been confirmed in several versions of the same DBMS, and some of them could be reproduced cross different DBMSs.
- Almost all the bugs reported in TiDB (12 out of 13) have been fixed. All the bugs in CynosDB have been planned to be fixed, and several of detect bugs in MySQL are already patched.

A. Evaluation Setup

Environment. We performed all experiments on a server with 80 core Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2698 v4 @ 2.20GHz

TABLE III: The tested DBMSs are highly ranked on the DB-Engine and have received thousands of stars on GitHub.

Name	Rank	Stars	Size (LOC) ¹
MySQL 5.7	2	5.4K	2,965,321
MySQL 8.0	2	6.4K	3,610,003
TiDB	60	27.5K	701,491
CynosDB	N/A	-	3,700,000 ²

and 256GB physical memory running Ubuntu-18.04. We ran Eqsq in a single thread process on the server.

Tested Database Systems. Although our approach requires minimum efforts to be plugged into the existing generators, we still need knowledge to understand different DBMSs and the corresponding SQL dialects. We chose MySQL compatible databases as our tested systems, because MySQL is the top open-source RDBMSs in the DB-Engine Ranking [30]. We show information about the tested systems in Table III.

MySQL. MySQL 5.7 and MySQL 8.0 are considered as different systems in our evaluation due to that they have distinct differences [31]. We will also see that a bug in MySQL 5.7 may not be triggered in MySQL 8.0 and vice versa. This also gives us the reason to consider them separately. If there are new releases coming, we shifted to the new release for testing.

TiDB. TiDB [13] is a relatively new DBMS developed by PingCAP. It is a distributed system supporting Hybrid Transactional and Analytical Processing (HTAP) workloads, and it is compatible with the MySQL protocol. Since there is a long time duration between its official releases, we continue to test the master branch of the source repository. We cloned the source code from the official repository and built the system locally.

Tencent CynosDB (CDB). CDB [14] is a Tencent Cloud product, which is a MySQL 100%-compatible enterprise-level database. It is highly available and distributed, and it supports more than a million queries per second. Because CDB is not open-source and it is a cloud product, we set up the test environment with a Tencent VPS and one CDB instance compatible with MySQL 5.7 and tested the database server on the VPS.

¹Lines of code.

²Provided by the developer.

TABLE IV: Confirmed bugs in the tested DBMSs.

Name	Value ³	Error ⁴	Total	Fixed
MySQL	12	2	14	0
TiDB	6	7	13	12
CynosDB	2	1	3	0
TOTAL	20	10	30	12

Baselines. We have to admit that a nuts-and-bolts comparison among the related tools is hard to achieve. For the early studies [6], [7], [32], the tools are not available. More recent tool MutaSQL [9] is not open source. Thus, the only available tool is SQLancer [1], [8], [10]. We omitted comparison with SQLancer for three reasons. Firstly, both tools support SQL grammar in a different way which makes it hard to compare fairly. More importantly, it doesn’t take seed input and ends in log explosion when executing queries. Additionally, we designed our evaluation to run on new versions of the tested database systems, which is manual-extensive and objective to run both tools and compare the bugs. Although we did not design a separate experiment, we did evaluate both tools on coverage. Our experiment result showed that both tools achieved almost the same coverage when running for 12 hours by controlling the available parameters. Generally speaking, our approach is orthogonal to the existing works. Therefore, we will mainly discuss the newly detected bugs and report coverage improvement of our tool.

B. RQ1: Efficacy in Detection of Correctness Bugs

All the confirmed bugs found by our tool is shown in Table IV with more details on the number of detected bugs and the bug types. All of bugs included in the table have been uniquely verified for each database. In total, we discovered 30 new and unique bugs, among which 20 are value-based bugs and 10 are error-based. “Value-based bugs” are the ones that the query is executable but returns wrong result sets. “Error-based bugs” occur when the query is executed and it throws an error instead of a result set. The DBMSs under tests have a thorough bug fixing process and it takes weeks to months to see a bug patched and fixed in the following releases. For instance, 12/13 bugs of TiDB have been fixed up to the time we completed writing this paper. For CynosDB, we contacted the developer and were notified that these bugs will be fixed soon.

In the following part, we enumerate the bug information for each of the tested DBMSs.

MySQL. We submitted bugs via the MySQL bug tacker [33]. Most of our new bug report were usually confirmed within 3 days. Our submitted bugs are all assigned as *severity S3 (Non-critical)*, which is just less severe than S2 (Serious) and S1 (Critical). Because we expected to find correctness bugs, it is very reasonable they are assigned as S3. We totally submitted 14 reports for bugs detected by our tool,

³Executable query produces incorrect value.

⁴Executable query throws error.

TABLE V: The detected bugs in MySQL are listed here. The column “Bug ID” is the corresponding number for the bug in the MySQL Bug Tracker.

No.	Bug ID	Type	Status	Affected Versions
1	100209	Value	Verified	5.7
2	100270	Value	Verified	5.6.48, 5.7.31
3	100301	Value	Verified	5.6.48, 5.7.31
4	100375	Error	Verified	5.6.48, 5.7.31
5	100443	Value	Verified	5.7, 8.0
6	100453	Value	Verified	5.7.31
7	100489	Value	Verified	5.6.48, 5.7.31, 8.0.21
8	100670	Value	Verified	5.6.48, 5.7.31, 8.0.21
9	100750	Error	Verified	5.7.31, 8.0.21
10	100777	Value	Verified	5.7.31, 8.0.21
11	100806	Value	Verified	5.7.31, 8.0.21
12	100807	Value	Verified	5.7.31, 8.0.21
13	100837	Value	Verified	5.6, 5.7, 8.0
14	100985	Value	Verified	5.6.48, 5.7.31, 8.0.21

TABLE VI: The detected bugs in TiDB are listed here. The column “Bug ID” is the corresponding issue number of the bug in TiDB’s repository on GitHub.

No.	Bug ID	Type	Status
1	18314	Error	Fixed
2	18493	Error	Verified
3	18525	Value	Fixed
4	18652	Error	Fixed
5	18653	Error	Fixed
6	18674	Value	Fixed
7	18700	Value	Fixed
8	19986	Value	Fixed
9	19992	Value	Fixed
10	19999	Value	Fixed
11	20001	Value	Fixed
12	20003	Value	Fixed
13	20295	Error	Fixed

and all of them got confirmed by the developers. This means our approach achieves 100% true-positive on testing MySQL. We list all detected bugs in MySQL in Table V.

TiDB. Because it is easy for TiDB to have the same bug as MySQL due to its high-compatibility with MySQL, which makes it more difficult to filter the duplicated bugs. Though, we have removed duplicates from the final result as much as possible. For the counted bugs, most of them are tagged as *Major* or *Moderate* while a few are as *Critical*. 12 of the 13 confirmed bugs have been fixed while one is verified. We list all detected and valid bugs in TiDB in Table VI.

CynosDB. CDB does not have a publicly accessible bug tracker, we contacted the developer and reported the bugs directly to them. For our bug report, 3 unique bugs are confirmed while the remaining are bugs caused by the underlying MySQL source code on which the tested version of CDB is implemented. Because CDB is a commercial product, we can only access and test the version that are available on the product website, so we stopped testing this DBMS after we found the reported bugs.

C. RQ2: Significance of the Bugs

We studied the impact of the correctness bugs found in different releases of MySQL. We did not perform this experiment on CDB since only a fixed version of it is accessible in the cloud. Table V also shows the number of reproducible bugs on each major release. We use the milestone releases 5.6, 5.7 and 8.0 to represent all the later releases, and we consider each milestone as an individual version. The affected versions are verified by the developer(s) who is assigned to process the bug report.

Affected Versions. Our tool detected 14 bugs in total in MySQL. Among these bugs, 4 of them could be reproduced on all 3 versions, 7 of them on 2 versions and 3 of them on 1 version. We evaluated our tool by testing 5.7.31 and 8.0.21 versions separately. The results show the detected bugs by our tool have unexpected high impacts on in-production MySQL servers. Those long-latent bugs have been missed by the regularly executed MySQL Test Framework [3]. It highlights the significance of our bug finding results.

Feedback From the Developer. The developers of the tested DBMSs appreciated our bug finding efforts and were amazed by the results. Some of them were even curious and requested to use our tool with comments like “how did you find the bugs?” and “what method do you use” because of Eqsq’s good efficacy in bug detection. After we submitted many bug reports to TiDB and shared our experience in DBMS testing, they expressed their appreciation for our testing efforts to make TiDB better: “*It is very significant that your work has helped us find many bugs in TiDB, while most of the bugs are related to correctness. Since correctness is the most important thing in the DBMS, it helped us a lot to make TiDB stable and resilient.*”

D. RQ3: Coverage Improvement

In this section, we show the effectiveness of our approach in improving source code coverage. We designed our experiment to examine the overall coverage improvement of Eqsq during a 12-hour testing. This shows how our tool works in practice with randomly generated test cases. Among the selected DBMSs, we exclude CDB since its source code is not available and it is accessible as a cloud service. For TiDB we have encountered an issue with the storage which crashes the database server constantly before we finish our experiment, so we also excluded it from this experiment.

We standardized our experiment with a Dockerfile to automatically set up all necessary servers and tools. To collect coverage of a running MySQL server, we compiled and installed MySQL 8.0.21 from source code. The binary is compiled with Gcov [34] support to save runtime and accumulative coverage statistics. We cleaned all coverage files generated during the installation and the preprocess phases before we started to run our tool.

We let Eqsq run for 12 hours, then collected the final coverage (Final). Next, we restarted the server to collect the dry coverage (Dry) with the saved seed queries. We collected

TABLE VII: Coverage by the seed queries and the queries after transformations.

Name	Type	Line	Branch	Function
MySQL	Dry	20.8%	11.1%	21.8%
	Final	23.4%	12.8%	24.8%
	Δ ⁵	+2.6%	+1.7%	+3.0%
	$ \Delta $ ⁶	+13,848	+10,075	+1,437

the coverage of criteria line, branch and function. We report both the coverage by percentage and the absolute increment amount.

Table VII shows the coverage data for MySQL. We can see that after our transformation, the coverage has increased for each of the criteria respectively. On MySQL, our tool achieved a 2.6% coverage improvement for executed lines, 1.7% for branches and 3.0% for functions. Though the increased coverage counted in percentage is relatively small, our testing has covered more than ten thousands of new lines and new branches in the source code and also executed more than one thousand new functions.

IX. THREATS TO VALIDITY

Construct validity is concerned with the issue of whether random testing is enough to demonstrate bug detection capability of our tool. We use a random database and query generator to test the DBMS, depending on the generator the database and query may not represent the overall distribution, they should be generated to maximize features of the DBMS.

The threats to internal validity lie in the online query equivalent checker. Because we need to filter the invalid candidates during runtime, it depends on the checker to provide the result. Our query generation speed is largely limited by the capability and overhead of the checker. To reduce the threats, we implemented fixed transformations inside our tool.

External validity deals with issues that limit the ability to generalize our results. In our experiment, we have used MySQL-compatible DBMS for evaluating the effectiveness of our approach. However, because our approach does not rely on specific features of the tested DBMS and it is not designed for a specific DBMS, our approach should still work on other DBMSs.

X. DISCUSSIONS

Findings. Except for what we discussed in Section VIII, we also have interesting findings. Firstly, we found one of the detected bug [35] in MySQL can be reproduced in MariaDB and TiDB. It is reasonable that such a bug exists in MariaDB [36], which is a fork of MySQL. However, it is unexpected that the bug exists in TiDB which is an independently-developed DBMS. We had a brief discussion with a TiDB developer on this bug. He mentioned that the bug may be introduced when implementing the MySQL protocol with referencing to the

⁵Increased coverage computed by $Final - Dry$.

⁶Absolute increased amount.

original source code. This implies that more such bugs can probably exist in TiDB’s underlying source code and in other DBMSs which reference MySQL source code in a similar way. Secondly, our tool detected a parsing bug [37] in MySQL, which was firstly confirmed by the MySQL verification team but was classified as not a bug after a few hours. The reason for this update was because the team has found the bug is claimed as a documented defect, though the test case has no violation with the SQL standard. This is an example of how a DBMS’s implementation can deviate from the standard.

Extensions. Currently, we only implemented two fixed transformations for MySQL-compatible systems. To run our tool for other DBMSs, two main components are required, i.e., a connector of the specific server and a SQL grammar file. A Golang native connector is easier to use with our tool but many new systems do not provide such support. In this case, our tool can be used as a seed generator and the output queries could be exported to fit into the testing process. The grammar file is customizable on any level to the user’s need, however manual efforts are required to understand and write the file.

XI. RELATED WORK

In this section, we discuss the approach for testing DBMS with an emphasis on correctness bugs. Particularly, we show how the related works solve the problem of deciding the expected result set of a query.

Constraint Solving. A previous common solution to generate the expected result of a given query is to use constraint solving. ADUSA [6], [38] generates test oracle by translating a SQL query to an Alloy [39] specification, which describes the constraints in a query. By solving the constraints with an SMT solver, it knows which concrete values can satisfy the constraint and should be returned by the original query. It then inserts the value to the DBMS as data and checks if executing the query will return the same value. However, due to the incomplete model, ADUSA can only convert query with limited data types to Alloy specification. For example, it cannot convert a DBMS varchar field into the Alloy language. Qex [7], [40] is another symbolic query explorer which models more SQL features, but its practical adoption is hindered by high overhead in symbolically processing big tables and complex joins.

More recently, PQS [1] synthesizes queries instead of solving constraints. It implements an expression generator, which takes a table row from the database and generates an expression that is evaluated to true on the row. Then it runs the query in the DBMS and checks if the row is contained in a query using the generated expression as the “where” condition. Though PQS can generate the test oracle more practically than the previous work, it can only reveal bugs with a symptom of missing the picked row. Compared to all the previous works, our idea is more generally applicable to the DBMS, and it can detect bugs having different symptoms (e.g., “order by” has wrong ordering).

Differential Testing. Differential testing is a common approach to decide which result set is incorrect. RAGS [32] and SparkFuzz [41] are in this category. They compare the result sets of one query from several chosen DBMSs, which are expected to return the same result set. The SQL Server team proposed a self-differential approach [16] for their query optimization rules, which compares results of the same query with turning on and off the optimization. However, differential testing cannot be used to test unique extensions such as PostgreSQL’s data type `path` to save a geometric path on a plane [42].

Metamorphic Testing. The key idea of metamorphic testing is to detect output violations of a bunch of related test cases [43]. In the context of our problem, it means to derive from the existing queries to obtain query mutants that have known result sets. Similarly, NoREC [8] constructs a non-optimizing version of a query and compares the result. However, they are only limited to testing the optimization, while our approach generally tests the DBMS. MutaSQL [9] takes a given equivalent transformation and construct a pair of equivalent queries and reports a bug when they return different result sets. In comparison, our approach use guided synthesis to discover new equivalent transformations, not relying on developer knowledge to provide them.

XII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we presented a fully automated approach to generate equivalent query pairs, namely Essql, which can detect correctness bugs in the DBMS. Essql’s main contribution is a necessary condition for query equivalence, which is leveraged to generate many candidate query mutant. To evaluate the efficacy of Essql, we have used it to test several production-level DBMSs including MySQL, TiDB and CynosDB. Our evaluation results show that Essql can detect in total 30 bugs which are all uniquely confirmed .

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Rigger and Z. Su, “Testing database engines via pivoted query synthesis,” in *14th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation*. USENIX Association, Nov. 2020.
- [2] How sqlite is tested. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sqlite.org/testing.html>
- [3] The mysql test framework. [Online]. Available: https://dev.mysql.com/doc/dev/mysql-server/8.0.21/PAGE_MYSQL_TEST_RUN.html
- [4] A. Causevic, D. Sundmark, and S. Punnekkat, “Factors limiting industrial adoption of test driven development: A systematic review,” in *2011 Fourth IEEE International Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 337–346.
- [5] L. Giakoumakis and C. A. Galindo-Legaria, “Testing sql server’s query optimizer: Challenges, techniques and experiences.” *IEEE Computer Society Technical Committee on Data Engineerin*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 36–43, 2008.
- [6] S. A. Khalek, B. Elkarablieh, Y. O. Laleye, and S. Khurshid, “Query-aware test generation using a relational constraint solver,” in *23rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 238–247.
- [7] M. Veanes, N. Tillmann, and J. De Halleux, “Qex: Symbolic sql query explorer,” in *International Conference on Logic for Programming Artificial Intelligence and Reasoning*. Springer, 2010, pp. 425–446.

- [8] M. Rigger and Z. Su, "Detecting optimization bugs in database engines via non-optimizing reference engine construction," in *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2020, pp. 1140–1152.
- [9] X. Chen, C. Wang, and A. Cheung, "Testing query execution engines with mutations," in *Proceedings of the Workshop on Testing Database Systems*. ACM, jun 2020, pp. 1–5.
- [10] M. Rigger and Z. Su, "Finding bugs in database systems via query partitioning," *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, vol. 4, no. OOPSLA, pp. 1–30, 2020.
- [11] Q. Zhou, J. Arulraj, S. Navathe, W. Harris, and D. Xu, "Automated verification of query equivalence using satisfiability modulo theories," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 12, no. 11, pp. 1276–1288, 2019.
- [12] Mysql. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mysql.com/>
- [13] Pingcap: Tidb, sql at scale. [Online]. Available: <https://pingcap.com/>
- [14] Cloud database cynosdb (chinese). [Online]. Available: <https://cloud.tencent.com/product/cynosdb>
- [15] S. Chaudhuri, "An overview of query optimization in relational systems," in *Proceedings of the seventeenth ACM SIGACT-SIGMOD-SIGART symposium on Principles of database systems*, 1998, pp. 34–43.
- [16] H. G. Elmongui, V. Narasayya, and R. Ramamurthy, "A framework for testing query transformation rules," in *Proceedings of the 2009 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of data*, 2009, pp. 257–268.
- [17] M. Elhemi and L. Giakoumakis, "Unit-testing query transformation rules," in *Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop on Testing Database Systems*, ser. DBTest '08. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2008. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1385269.1385273>
- [18] U. Dayal, N. Goodman, and R. H. Katz, "An extended relational algebra with control over duplicate elimination," in *Proceedings of the 1st ACM SIGACT-SIGMOD symposium on Principles of database systems*. ACM, 1982, pp. 117–123.
- [19] *A formal semantics of SQL queries, its validation, and applications*, vol. 11, no. 1. VLDB Endowment, sep 2017.
- [20] L. Libkin, "Sql's three-valued logic and certain answers," *ACM Trans. Database Syst.*, vol. 41, no. 1, Mar. 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2877206>
- [21] L. Hella, L. Libkin, J. Nurmonen, and L. Wong, "Logics with aggregate operators," in *Proceedings of the 14th Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*. IEEE, 1999, pp. 35–44.
- [22] R. Zhong, Y. Chen, H. Hu, H. Zhang, W. Lee, and D. Wu, "Squirrel: Testing database management systems with language validity and coverage feedback," in *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2020, pp. 955–970.
- [23] A. Silberschatz, H. F. Korth, and S. Sudarshan, "Databasesystem concepts, seventh edition," 2019.
- [24] Golang. [Online]. Available: <https://golang.org/>
- [25] Pingcap. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/pingcap/go-randgen>
- [26] Grammar file (bison 3.7.1). [Online]. Available: https://www.gnu.org/software/bison/manual/html_node/Grammar-File.html
- [27] PostgreSQL php generator - free postgres php generator by sql maestro group. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sqlmaestro.com/products/postgresql/phpgenerator/>
- [28] N. Hollingum, "On the practice and application of context-free language reachability," 2017.
- [29] xwb1989/sqlparser: Sql parser implemented in go. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/xwb1989/sqlparser>
- [30] Db-engines ranking - popularity ranking of relational dbms. [Online]. Available: <https://db-engines.com/en/ranking/relational-dbms>
- [31] Mysql :: Mysql 8.0 reference manual :: 1.3 what is new in mysql 8.0. [Online]. Available: <https://dev.mysql.com/doc/refman/8.0/en/mysql-nutshell.html>
- [32] D. R. Slutz, "Massive stochastic testing of sql," in *VLDB*, vol. 98. Citeseer, 1998, pp. 618–622.
- [33] Mysql bugs. [Online]. Available: <https://bugs.mysql.com/>
- [34] Gcov (using the gnu compiler collection (gcc)). [Online]. Available: <https://gcc.gnu.org/onlinedocs/gcc/Gcov.html>
- [35] Use mod result (float number) in having/where is not considered as true. [Online]. Available: <https://bugs.mysql.com/bug.php?id=100270>
- [36] Mariadb foundation - mariadb.org. [Online]. Available: <https://mariadb.org/>
- [37] Mysql bugs: #99971: colmn name from outer query cannot be resolved in the subquery. [Online]. Available: <https://bugs.mysql.com/bug.php?id=99971>
- [38] S. Abdul Khalek and S. Khurshid, "Automated sql query generation for systematic testing of database engines," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM international conference on Automated software engineering*, 2010, pp. 329–332.
- [39] Alloy. [Online]. Available: <https://alloytools.org/>
- [40] M. Veanes, P. Grigorenko, P. De Halleux, and N. Tillmann, "Symbolic query exploration," in *International Conference on Formal Engineering Methods*. Springer, 2009, pp. 49–68.
- [41] B. Ghit, N. Poggi, J. Rosen, R. Xin, and P. Boncz, "Sparkfuzz: searching correctness regressions in modern query engines," in *Proceedings of the workshop on Testing Database Systems*. ACM, jun 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [42] PostgreSQL: Documentation: 13: Chapter 8. data types. [Online]. Available: <https://www.postgresql.org/docs/current/datatype.html>
- [43] T. Y. Chen, S. C. Cheung, and S. M. Yiu, "Metamorphic testing: A new approach for generating next test cases," 2020.