

A mathematical framework for automated bug localization

Tsuyosh Ohta^{*,1}, Tadanori Mizuno^{*}

^{*} Department of Computer Science, Faculty of Information, Shizuoka University, Johoku 3-5-1, Hamamatsu city, 432-8011, Japan

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we propose a mathematical framework for automated bug localization. This framework can be briefly summarized as follows. A program execution can be represented as a rooted acyclic directed graph. We define an execution snapshot by a cut-set on the graph. A program state can be regarded as a conjunction of labels on edges in a cut-set. Then we argue that a debugging task is a pruning process of the execution graph by using cut-sets. A pruning algorithm, i.e., a debugging task, is also presented.

KEYWORDS: algorithmic debugging, execution graph, cut-set

1 Introduction

Algorithmic debugging or automated bug localization techniques have been studied more than two decades. Many individual efforts have been published and implemented, but no comprehensive and standardized frameworks have been proposed so far. In this paper, we propose a mathematical framework for automated bug localization technique.

2 A framework for bug localization

Definition 1 (execution graph) An execution graph $G = \langle v_0, V, E_d \cup E_c \rangle$ is a rooted acyclic directed graph, which represents an instance of an execution of a program. Here, v_0 , V , E_d , and E_c are a root vertex, a set of vertices, a set of data edges, and a set of control edges, respectively.

The root vertex represents a start point of the program. A vertex in V represents some operation during the execution, such as an assignment, unification, sending message, etc. A data edge is labeled by information that is carried along with it. Typically, this edge represents a relation between set/use events on the same variable and is labeled by a (variable name, value) pair. A control edge specifies a relation between a controlling and a controlled vertices. For example, a vertex which represents a predicate in *if* statement controls other vertices that denote statements in *then* and *else* clauses. A mapping function on e to its label is denoted as $label(e)$. A control edge is always labeled as “true.”

According to the programming paradigm, a program dependence graph[FOW87], a proof tree, and another similar graph representation can be employed as a basis of execution graph.

In M. Ronsse, K. De Bosschere (eds), proceedings of the Fifth International Workshop on Automated Debugging (AADE-BUG 2003), September 2003, Ghent. CComputer Research Repository (<http://www.acm.org/corr/>), cs.SE/yymmnnn; whole proceedings: cs.SE/0309027.

¹E-mail: {ohta,mizuno}@cs.inf.shizuoka.ac.jp

Definition 2 (cut-set) In a connected graph G (like an execution graph), a cut-set is a set of edges whose removal from G leaves G disconnected. We denote $C = \langle G, G_1, G_2 \rangle$ if a cut-set C cuts a graph G into two mutually disconnected subgraphs G_1 and G_2 where $C = \{(v_1, v_2) \in E_d \cup E_c \mid v_1 \in G_1, v_2 \in G_2\}$.

Definition 3 (the order of two cut-sets) The order of two cut-sets C_a and C_b is defined as follows.

$$C_a \preceq C_b \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} G_1^a \text{ is a subgraph of } G_1^b \quad \text{and} \quad C_a = C_b \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} G_1^a \text{ is identical to } G_1^b.$$

where $C_a = \langle G, G_1^a, G_2^a \rangle$ and $C_b = \langle G, G_1^b, G_2^b \rangle$. The relation $\preceq$ defines a partial order on cut-sets.

For any given graph, many cut-sets exist. But only a part of them are allowed for debugging purpose because such cut-sets must have two important properties: *reproducibility* and *stoppability* without any influence to a program execution. These properties make problems especially for parallel, concurrent, or distributed programs which may have data races or deadlocks.

Definition 4 (state) For a given cut-set C , we define a state of an execution graph on the C as follows.

$$S_C = \bigwedge_{e \in C} \text{label}(e).$$

Intuitively speaking, any program execution can be represented as a data- and control-flow graph even if the program doesn't written in a procedural language. A *cut-set* is a mathematical view of a snapshot of the execution. The order of cut-sets, therefore, shows which snapshot precedes on the execution. A *state* means a program state to be examined at that snapshot.

Definition 5 (debugging) Debugging is a pruning process of an execution graph. It starts when a programmer becomes aware one of following phenomena.

local data anomaly: For some data edge e , $\text{label}(e)$ doesn't correspond to that of a programmer's intention.

local control anomaly: For some control edge e , a programmer concludes the edge shouldn't exist. In other words, an operation on a terminal vertex of the edge shouldn't have been executed.

global anomaly: For a property A , like an assertion, a state S_C on a cut-set C violates it. This kind of anomaly is well-known as a synchronization error. Deadlock is a typical case.

And the pruning process is as follows.

1. On finding a local anomaly, choose a cut-set C_e which includes the edge identified as the anomaly. Otherwise, set C_e a cut-set that a programmer has found the global anomaly on it.
2. $C_c \leftarrow \{ \text{all out-edges of root vertex} \}$. Here, it is obvious that $C_c \preceq C_e$.

All we have to do is to identify one or more vertices that originate the anomaly. Such vertices surely exist between C_c and C_e . Starting with the original execution graph, the following (a kind of binary search) process successively prunes subgraphs which never contain culprits of the anomaly.

3. Choose an appropriate C_t such that $C_c \prec C_t \preceq C_e$. If a such cut-set doesn't exist (typically, only zero or one vertex exist between C_c and C_t), go to step 5.
4. Examine a state S_{C_t} on C_t . If the state contains one or more anomalies, $C_e \leftarrow C_t$. Otherwise, $C_c \leftarrow C_t$. Then go to step 3.
5. If $C_c = C_e$ (no vertices exist between two cut-sets), it means that some indispensable operations are missed at that execution point. Otherwise (it means exactly one vertex remains between two cut-sets), there are two types of culprits on $e \in C_e - C_c$.




Figure 1: Interpretation of Shapiro's method.




Figure 2: Interpretation of Shimomura's method.

- (a) If e has a local anomaly, an initial vertex of e is the culprit. Maybe an operation at the vertex is in the wrong.
- (b) Otherwise, C_e must have a global anomaly. We can find all culprits as:

- i. $M \leftarrow \phi$
- ii. for each $a \in S_{C_e}$ do
 - $M \leftarrow M \cup \{a\}$ if $S_{C_e - \{a\}}$ doesn't have the global anomaly.

All initial vertices of edges in M are culprits. That is to say, such vertices indicate missing *critical sections* starting at that execution points.

3 Related Works

Shapiro's algorithmic debugging was invented for prolog programs[Sha82]. Fig. 1 shows our interpretation of his work. From our viewpoint, it uses a proof tree as an execution graph. (Attention: This interpretation differs from a normal proof tree. Our interpretation is based on a line graph² of a normal proof tree.) He used only one edge as a cut-set since removal of any edge divides a tree into two disconnected subtrees. A state is also simple because only one label, i.e., one unified clause, is enough. In this work, step 3 of the pruning process is fully automated and a programmer carries out step 4 by answering "yes" or "no" to tell a system the correctness of the label on the edge. GADT[FGKS91] and Lichtenstein's system[LS89] can be interpreted as the same manner because they are straightforward extensions of Shapiro's work.

FIND has developed for sequential procedural languages[SOCO95]. Our interpretation of this work is shown in Fig. 2. It uses an execution graph that represents a *critical slice*, which is an extension of dynamic slice[KL88]. A vertex represents a statement execution and an edge represents some relation between two vertices such as set/use relation of a value of some variable or control relation of a conditional statement and another statement. FIND uses a traditional breakpoint as a cut-set. A state was represented as data- and control-flows across the cut-set, which has ordinary meaning of the word *state* we use for procedural programs. This system carries out step 3 automatically and step 4 manually. A programmer examines both data- and control-edges whether they are correct or not on a cut-set (breakpoint).

²A line graph can be get by interchanging vertices and edges of an original graph.

FORMAN [Aug98] also uses a directed graph representing event trace. It uses two types of edges (relations) between events: precedence and inclusion. Compared with our approach, FORMAN has an advantage of modeling power of hierarchical objects, such as procedure call, with inclusion edges. But it is too simple for an interactive debugging tool because precedence edges only models a normal control flow³. On the other hand, FORMAN lets an event have attributes to represent current program status and other things. So, to represent a program state, FORMAN uses attributes on vertices while we use a graph structure (a set of labels on edges), i.e., a cut-set, due to improving interactive debugging performance.

Other Approaches: From our point of view, constraint or assertion based approaches direct to automation on step 4. That is to say, their purpose is to check a state without human effort but using predefined predicates, from which might get a specification of a program, hopefully. Knowledge based approach aims at finding better C_t to prune an execution tree as large as possible at one time. Slicing is a technique to construct an effective execution tree to find faults. Here, a word “effective” means that edges of the tree lead programmers to faults as fast as possible without making a detour.

4 Conclusions

In this paper, we proposed a mathematical framework for automated bug localization. Based on this framework, we are now implementing an assertion-based automated bug localization system for distributed programs. It'll be published near future.

References

- [Aug98] M. Auguston. Building program behavior models. In *European conference on artificial intelligence ECAI-98, workshop on spacial and temporal reasoning*, pages 19–26, Brighton, England, August 23–28 1998.
- [FGKS91] P. Fritzson, T. Gyimothy, M. Kamkar, and N. Shahmehri. Generalized algorithmic debugging and testing. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, 26(6):317–326, 1991.
- [FOW87] J. Ferrante, K. J. Ottenstein, and J. D. Warren. The program dependence graph and its use in optimization. *ACM Transactions on Programming Language and Systems*, 9(3):319–349, 1987.
- [KL88] B. Korel and J. Laski. Dynamic program slicing. *Information Processing Letters*, 29(3):155–163, 1988.
- [LS89] Y. Lichtenstein and E. Shapiro. Concurrent algorithmic debugging. *ACM SIGPLAN Notice*, 24(1):248–260, 1989.
- [Sha82] E. Y. Shapiro. *Algorithmic Program Debugging*. MIT Press, 1982.
- [SOCO95] T. Shimomura, Y. Oki, T. Chikaraishi, and T. Ohta. An algorithmic fault-locating method for procedural languages and its implementation FIND. In *2nd international workshop on automated and algorithmic debugging*, Saint-Malo, France, May 22–24 1995.

³For fairness to FORMAN, it is enough for an off-line event grammar checker.