



# ***Simplifying Failure-Inducing Input***

*Ralf Hildebrandt and Andreas Zeller*

*ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis (ISSTA)  
Portland, Oregon, August 23, 2000*



## **The Mozilla BugAthon**

*Mozilla*—Netscape’s open source web browser project

Maintained by dozens of Netscape engineers and 100s of volunteers


In February 2000: ~5,500 open bugs in the Bugzilla database

*Mozilla BugAthon*—call for volunteers who would *simplify test cases*:

Pledge Level	Reward
5 bugs	invitation to the Gecko launch party
10 bugs	the invitation, plus an attractive Gecko stuffed animal
12 bugs	same, but animal autographed by the Father of Gecko
15 bugs	the invitation, plus a Gecko T-shirt
17 bugs	same, but T-shirt signed by the grateful engineer
20 bugs	same, but T-shirt signed by the whole raptor team



## Failure-Inducing Circumstances



Which of the circumstances  $c_i$  are the causes for  $y$ ?



## ***Differing Circumstances***

Assumption—two program runs under differing circumstances:

- one passes the test (✓)—e.g. on some trivial or empty input
- the other one fails (✗)—the one we're interested in

Assumption: a gradual *transition* between these two runs.

We denote the *differences* between these program runs by a *set of changes*  $C = \{\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_n\}$ —i.e. changes applied to the circumstances.

A  $\Delta_i$  can stand for:

- the insertion of a single character
- the deletion of a line
- the insertion of a substructure...



## Tests

A *test case* is a subset of changes  $c \subseteq C$ .

Let  $test : 2^C \rightarrow \{\checkmark, \times, ?\}$  be a function which checks a test case.

Three possible outcomes:

- The test passes (**✓**)
- The test fails (**✗**)
- The test outcome is unresolved (**?**)

Axioms:

$test(\emptyset) = \checkmark$  (“cause absent, effect absent”)

$test(C) = \times$  (“cause present, effect present”)



## ***Minimal Test Cases***

Our goal: a *minimal test case*  $c \subseteq C$

If  $c$  is *minimal*, the failure does not occur in any subset:

$$\forall c' \subset c \text{ (} test(c') \neq \mathbf{x} \text{)}$$

Problem: One must test all  $2^{|c|} - 1$  subsets of  $c$ .

Pragmatic approach: a *1-minimal* test case

No single  $\Delta_i$  can be omitted without causing the failure to disappear:

$$\forall c' \subset c \text{ (} |c| - |c'| \leq 1 \Rightarrow \text{(} test(c') \neq \mathbf{x} \text{))}$$

“If you remove any more characters from the file of the simplified test case, you no longer see the bug.” (Mozilla BugAThon)



## A Minimizing Algorithm

Basic pattern: Start by removing large chunks, try smaller ones later...



... until the automated test fails—and then repeat with smaller subset.

- Guarantees 1-minimality (every subset will eventually be tested)
- Best efficiency for small failure-inducing input



## A Minimizing Algorithm (2)

The *minimizing delta debugging algorithm*  $ddmin(c)$  is

$ddmin(c) = ddmin_2(c, 2)$  where

$$ddmin_2(c, n) = \begin{cases} ddmin_2(c_i, 2) & \text{if } \exists i \cdot test(c_i) = \mathbf{x} \\ ddmin_2(c - c_i, \max(n - 1, 2)) & \text{if } \exists i \cdot test(c - c_i) = \mathbf{x} \\ ddmin_2(c, \min(|c|, 2n)) & \text{if } n < |c| \\ c & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where  $c = \bigcup c_i$  with  $c_i$  pairwise disjoint and  $\forall c_i \cdot (|c_i| \approx |c|/n)$ .

Number of tests:  $|c|^2 + 3|c|$  in worst case,  $\log_2 |c|$  in best case.



## Example: GCC Dumps Core

```
#define SIZE 20

double mult(double z[], int n)
{
    int i, j;

    i = 0;
    for (j = 0; j < n; j++) {
        i = i + j + 1;
        z[i] = z[i] * (z[0] + 1.0);
    }
    return z[n];
}

void copy(double to[],
           double from[], int count)
{
    int n = (count + 7) / 8;
    switch (count % 8) do {
        case 0: *to++ = *from++;
        case 7: *to++ = *from++;
        case 6: *to++ = *from++;
        case 5: *to++ = *from++;
        case 4: *to++ = *from++;
        case 3: *to++ = *from++;
        case 2: *to++ = *from++;
        case 1: *to++ = *from++;
    } while (--n > 0);
    return mult(to, 2);
}

int main(int argc, char *argv[])
{
    double x[SIZE], y[SIZE];
    double *px = x;

    while (px < x + SIZE)
        *px++ = (px - x) * (SIZE + 1.0);

    return copy(y, x, SIZE);
}
```

```
linux$ (ulimit -H -s 256; gcc -O bug.c)
```

```
gcc: Internal compiler error: program cc1 got fatal signal 11
```



## Example: GCC Dumps Core (2)

Step	Test case	test
1	#define SIZE 20\n double <b>mult</b> (double z[],int n) { ... } □	<b>x</b>
2	#define SIZE 20\n □	✓
3	□ double <b>mult</b> (double z[],int n) { ... }	<b>x</b>
4	double <b>mult</b> (double z[],int n) { int i, j; i = 0; □ }	✓
5	double <b>mult</b> (double z[],int n) { □ for(j = 0; j < n; j++) { ... } ... }	?
⋮	⋮	⋮
839	t(double z[],int n){int i,j;for(;;){i = i + j + 1;z[i] = z[i] * (z[□] + 0);}return z[n];}	?
840	t(double z[],int n){int i,j;for(;;){i = i + j + 1;z[i] = z[i] * (z[0□ + 0);}return z[n];}	?
841	t(double z[],int n){int i,j;for(;;){i = i + j + 1;z[i] = z[i] * (z[0] □ 0);}return z[n];}	?
842	t(double z[],int n){int i,j;for(;;){i = i + j + 1;z[i] = z[i] * (z[0] + □);}return z[n];}	?
843	t(double z[],int n){int i,j;for(;;){i = i + j + 1;z[i] = z[i] * (z[0] + 0□);}return z[n];}	?
844	t(double z[],int n){int i,j;for(;;){i = i + j + 1;z[i] = z[i] * (z[0] + 0)□}return z[n];}	?
⋮	⋮	⋮

Minimal input found after 857 tests:

```
t(double z[],int n){int i,j;for(;;){i = i+j+1;z[i] = z[i]*(z[0]+0);}return z[n];}
```



## **Example: Minimizing Fuzz**

Classical experiment: UNIX tools fed with *fuzz* input (10,000 random characters). Most crash.

Minimizing input reveals causes:

Program	Minimized Input	<i>test</i> runs
flex - lexical analyzer	<2121 characters>	11589
u1 - do underlining	<516 characters>	3055
nroff - format documents	"\302\n"	60
plot - graphics filter	"f"	17

(Tests carried out on a Sun Solaris 2.6 machine)



## **Example: Mozilla Cannot Print**

Mozilla bug #24735, reported by *anantk@yahoo.com*:

Ok the following operations cause mozilla to crash consistently on my machine

- > Start mozilla
- > Go to [bugzilla.mozilla.org](http://bugzilla.mozilla.org)
- > Select search for bug
- > Print to file setting the bottom and right margins to .50 (I use the file `/var/tmp/netscape.ps`)
- > Once it's done printing do the exact same thing again on the same file (`/var/tmp/netscape.ps`)
- > This causes the browser to crash with a segfault



## ***Mozilla Cannot Print—Minimizing User Actions***

X11 Capture/Replay tool recorded 95 user actions (mouse motions, key presses, etc.)

Delta Debugging simplified these user actions to 3 relevant ones (82 test runs / 21 minutes):

1. Press the *P* key while the *Alt* key is held. (Invoke the *Print* dialog.)
2. Press *mouse button 1* on the *Print* button (Arm the *Print* button.)
3. Release *mouse button 1*. (Start printing.)

Everything else is irrelevant—including releasing the *P* key.



## ***Mozilla Cannot Print—Minimizing HTML***

The original *Search for bug* page has a length of 896 lines.

Delta Debugging simplified this page to a single line (57 test runs):

```
<SELECT NAME="priority" MULTIPLE SIZE=7>
```

Minimization by characters minimized the line even further.

New, simplified bug report:

- > Create a HTML page containing ‘<SELECT>’
- > Load the page and print it using *Alt+P* and *Print*.
- > The browser crashes with a segmentation fault.



## ***Future Work: Integrating Analysis***

Basic idea: reduce large number of tests by additional knowledge

**Structure knowledge** can be a big help in decomposing input:

- Decompose GCC input according to C syntax
- Decompose TROFF input by lines
- Decompose HTML input according to HTML syntax...

**Relating the input to the output** (by means of program analysis)  
helps in finding good candidates for causality.



## ***Future Work: Alternate Circumstances***

Besides program input, one may consider alternate circumstances that affect program execution:

- Changes to the program code (Zeller 1999)
- Executed functions
- Performed schedules
- Taken branches...

Delta debugging can separate all these into relevant and irrelevant circumstances—hopefully with the help of program analysis.



## ***Future Work: Open Issues***

When is a run considered a failure?

- Too few details  $\Rightarrow$  more false positives
- Too many details  $\Rightarrow$  larger number of circumstances



## ***Future Work: Open Issues (2)***

Delta debugging minimizes problems of the kind

$$\Delta_1 \wedge \Delta_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta_n \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{Y}$$

But problems may also look like

$$\Delta_i \vee \Delta_j \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{Y} \quad \text{or} \quad \neg \Delta_i \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{Y} \quad \text{or} \dots$$

The “simplest” causality is in fact the shortest algorithm  $f$  that computes  $\mathcal{Y} = f(\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_n)$



## ***Causes and Events***

The *cause* of any event is a preceding event without which the event in question would not have occurred.

How to demonstrate causality? John Stuart Mill (1806–1873):

- **Method of agreement**—Effect present when cause present
- **Method of difference**—Effect absent when cause absent
- **Method of concomitant variation**—Both agreement and difference (stronger)

Causality cannot be demonstrated without experimentation!



## ***Causality is the Key***

Example program:

```
a = b;  
printf("a = %d\n", a);
```

Output:

```
a = 0
```

What does this say about b?



```
float a;
```



## ***Conclusion***

Delta debugging. . .

- automatically simplifies failure-inducing circumstances
- proves causality by experimentation
- requires large number of tests (but analysis can help!)

*<http://www.fmi.uni-passau.de/st/dd/>*