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Abstract—Finding software vulnerabilities in concurrent programs is a challenging task due to the size of the state-space exploration, as the number of interleavings grows exponentially with the number of program threads and statements. We propose \textit{EBF} (Ensembles of Bounded Model Checking with Fuzzing) – a technique that combines Bounded Model Checking (BMC) and Gray-Box Fuzzing (GBF) to find software vulnerabilities in concurrent programs. Since there are no publicly-available GBF tools for concurrent code, we first propose a novel concurrency-aware gray-box fuzzer that explores different thread schedules by instrumenting the code under test with random delays controlled by the fuzzing engine. Then, we build an ensemble of one BMC and one GBF tool in the following way. On the one hand, when the BMC tool in the ensemble returns a counterexample, we use it as a seed for our GBF tool, thus increasing the likelihood of executing paths guarded by complex mathematical expressions. On the other hand, we aggregate the outcomes of the BMC and GBF tools in the ensemble using a decision matrix, thus improving the accuracy of \textit{EBF}. We evaluate \textit{EBF} against state-of-the-art pure BMC tools and show that it can generate up to 14.9\% more correct verification witnesses than BMC alone. Furthermore, we demonstrate the efficacy of our concurrency-aware \textit{GBF}, by showing that it can find 21.4\% of the vulnerabilities in our evaluation suite, while non-concurrency-aware GBF tools can only find 0.55\%. Finally, thanks to our concurrency-aware GBF tool, \textit{EBF} detects a data race in the open-source \textit{wolfMQtt} library, which demonstrates its effectiveness in finding vulnerabilities in real-world software.

Index Terms—Concurrency-aware Gray-box Fuzzer, Bounded Model Checking, Concurrent Programs, Instrumentation, LLVM pass.

I. INTRODUCTION

Concurrency is becoming prevalent in present-day software systems thanks to the performance benefits provided by multicore hardware\textsuperscript{1}. Examples of such software systems include online banking, auto-pilots, computer games and railway ticket reservation systems\textsuperscript{2}. Ensuring the correctness and safety of such software is crucial since software failures may lead to significant financial losses and affect people’s well-being\textsuperscript{3}. As an example, the OpenSSL library had a Heartbleed\textsuperscript{4} vulnerability that allows a remote attacker to get access to sensitive information.

Despite the significant resources that developers invest into software testing, much of existing software still features security vulnerabilities\textsuperscript{4}. This is because the different possible threads’ interleavings cause the program execution to be non-deterministic, thus making the process of testing and verifying concurrent programs an inherently difficult task\textsuperscript{5}. Furthermore, there exists a wide variety of unwanted concurrent behaviors. On the one hand, the non-determinism of the thread interleavings introduces concurrency bugs such as data races, deadlocks, thread leaks, and resource starvation\textsuperscript{4}, which may cause the program to produce abnormal results or unforeseen hangs. On the other hand, specific program inputs and thread interleavings may lead to memory corruption and security violations (e.g., access out of bounds)\textsuperscript{6}.

Due to this complexity, manual testing of concurrent software is not always adequate, and so automated verification and testing are often employed. In this respect, there is a myriad of different automated techniques such as control engineering\textsuperscript{7}, abstract interpretation\textsuperscript{8} and data-flow analysis\textsuperscript{9} for detecting bugs and vulnerabilities in concurrent programs\textsuperscript{10}, \textsuperscript{11}. Among those, two methods have seen significant development in recent years: bounded model checking (BMC) and fuzzing\textsuperscript{12}.

BMC\textsuperscript{13} searches for violations in bounded executions (up to some given depth $k$) of the given program. If no property violation is detected, then $k$ is increased until a bug is found, the verification problem becomes intractable, or a preset upper bound is reached. Although many industrial-grade bounded model checkers\textsuperscript{14}–\textsuperscript{18} have been successfully used for software verification, BMC has several fundamental drawbacks in general. Namely, BMC often experiences difficulties with achieving high path coverage (especially for multi-threaded programs) and reaching deep statements within the code because of state-space explosion and its dependency on Boolean Satisfiability (SAT)\textsuperscript{19} or Satisfiability Modulo Theories (SMT) solvers\textsuperscript{20}.

\textsuperscript{1}https://heartbleed.com/
Fuzzing \cite{11} is an automated software testing technique that involves the repeated generation of inputs (based on some initial guess – seed value) to a program under test (PUT). The PUT is then executed for each given sequence of input values; its behavior is checked for abnormalities, such as crashes or failures \cite{21}. The main advantages of fuzzing include relative ease of integration with the existing testing frameworks, high scalability, and most importantly, exploring the deep execution paths is not as costly as in BMC. However, fuzzing often suffers from low branch coverage since the input generation is based on random mutations \cite{22}. Typically this occurs when a program features conditional statements with complex conditions (e.g., input validation functions). As a result, providing a good initial seed for the fuzzing process is crucial. Moreover, fuzzing techniques face challenges detecting vulnerabilities in multi-threaded programs \cite{23} since existing fuzzing techniques do not focus on thread interleavings that affect execution states.

Efforts toward developing a combined verification technique harnessing the strengths of both BMC and fuzzing have been made in the past. For example, Ognawala et al. \cite{24} combine symbolic execution and fuzzing and apply it to general-purpose software. Alshmrany et al. \cite{25} use BMC to guide a fuzzer in the analysis of sequential C programs. Chowdhury et al. \cite{26} improve the seeding of gray-box fuzzing by using BMC as a constraints solver to find paths through complex blocks of code. Nevertheless, given the current knowledge in software verification, there are no techniques that combine BMC and fuzzing for verification of concurrent programs, and the question of whether incorporating BMC and fuzzing improves bug finding in concurrent programs remains open.

This paper addresses this fundamental question and makes the following original contributions.

1) We propose a novel open-source state-of-the-art concurrency-aware gray-box fuzzer \cite{27}. Our main technique is instrumenting the PUT with random delays controlled by the fuzzer. In this way, we can discover different thread interleavings and explore deep execution paths. Furthermore, our fuzzer is capable of generating crash reports containing the full program execution path.

2) We introduce EBF – Ensembles of Bounded Model Checking with Fuzzing. This technique combines the strengths of BMC in resolving complex conditional guards with the flexibility of our concurrency-aware gray-box fuzzer. EBF incorporates a result decision matrix for coping with the potentially conflicting verdicts produced by the tools in the ensemble. Furthermore, EBF efficiently distributes the available computational resources between the tools to enhance its bug-finding capabilities.

3) We demonstrate that the combination of BMC and fuzzing improves verification outcomes compared to either technique applied separately. More specifically, EBF improves the bug-finding abilities of all state-of-the-art concurrent BMC tools by up to 14.9%. Similarly, EBF can find 21.4% of the vulnerabilities in our evaluation suite, whereas the state-of-the-art gray-box fuzzer AFL++ can only find 0.55%.

4) We apply EBF to the wolfMQTT open-source library that implements the MQTT messaging protocol, and we discover the presence of a data race bug. We reported the bug to the developers of the wolfMQTT library, who fixed it in June 2021. This demonstrates the real-world capabilities of EBF.

5) We report that the bug-finding capabilities of EBF are stable across a wide range of parameter values. In detail, we run a comparison experiment along three different axes: time allocation between BMC and GBF, maximum delay inserted by GBF and maximum number of threads allowed by GBF. Our results show a large sweet spot of parameter values that allows EBF to find nearly 40-fold more bugs than the worst setting.

This paper is structured as follows: Section II contains the preliminaries on concurrent programs, bounded model checking and fuzzing, and Section III states the main research question of this work. Section IV discusses the main design choices and implementation details of our state-of-the-art fuzzer for concurrent programs. Section V presents EBF, our ensemble verification technique. Section VI presents the experimental results, while Section VII lists the related work, and Section VIII draws the final conclusions.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Concurrency bugs

Concurrent programs feature multiple processes or threads simultaneously operating on shared computing resources \cite{28}. As a result, such programs can feature types of bugs that do not occur in sequential programs. In this work, we consider the three most typical safety vulnerabilities: data races, deadlocks, and thread leaks \cite{29}.

Data race is a condition when the program execution results in an undesired behavior due to a particular sequence and/or timing of the instructions executed by each thread. For instance, when a thread modifies the shared memory without acquiring a lock first, causing memory corruption when another thread tries to update the same memory location (see Figure 1a).

Deadlock occurs when the program is not in the terminal state and it cannot progress to any other state. For instance, when a thread does not release a lock after accessing the shared memory, therefore, denying memory access for any other thread (see Figure 1b).

Thread leak is a vulnerability specific to multi-threaded programs that happens when a terminated thread never joins the calling thread, thus never releasing the occupied resources (see Figure 1c).

B. Bounded Model Checking

Bounded model checking (BMC) is a verification technique that has been successfully applied to software and hardware verification over the past decades \cite{13}. BMC works with the underlying program’s mathematical model (represented as a finite state transition system). It explores the model’s
BMC tool.

Thus, existing BMC tools like ESBMC [31], CBMC [32] and Cseq [33] differ mainly in their choices of program encoding and symbolic abstractions. We provide more details on their strategies to deal with concurrent programs in Section VII.

C. Gray-Box Fuzzing

Fuzzing is an automated testing technique that discovers vulnerabilities by repeatedly executing a program with randomly-generated inputs [34]. Since most inputs generated this way are invalid, state-of-the-art fuzzers let users specify a small set of valid program inputs (the seeds) and employ a mutation-based strategy to generate new ones. Gray-box fuzzing improves on this idea by guiding the mutation process with program-specific metrics. To do so, the program under test must be instrumented with some additional code that tracks the required metric (e.g., code coverage) during execution.

Algorithm 1 Gray-box Fuzzing

**Input:** PUT – program under test, M – corpus of initial seeds.

**Output:** $Q_S$ – seed queue, $S_I$ – crash inputs found

1: $P_f ← instrument(PUT)$ \{instrument the PUT\}
2: $Q_S ← M$ \{initialise the seed queue\}
3: $S_I = \emptyset$
4: while not timeout do
5: \hspace{1em} $t ← select\_next\_seed(Q_S)$ \{pick seed from queue\}
6: \hspace{1em} $N ← get\_mutation\_chance(P_f, t)$
7: \hspace{1em} for all $i ∈ 1 \ldots N$ do
8: \hspace{2em} $t' ← mutate\_input(t)$ \{mutate the seed\}
9: \hspace{2em} $rep ← run(P_f, t', M_e)$ \{execute the PUT\}
10: \hspace{2em} if is\_crash(rep) then
11: \hspace{3em} $S_I ← S_I ∪ t'$ \{new vulnerable input found!\}
12: \hspace{2em} else if covers\_new\_trace(t', rep) then
13: \hspace{3em} $Q_S ← Q_S ⊕ t'$ \{add promising seeds to queue\}
14: \hspace{2em} end if
15: \hspace{1em} end for
16: end while

Algorithm 1 [23, 35] shows the standard workflow of a gray-box fuzzer (GBF). GBF takes a target PUT and initial seeds $M$ as inputs. Then, it instruments the PUT (line 1) by inserting some additional code that allows the fuzzer to collect code coverage statistics in the PUT. At every iteration of the main fuzzing loop (line 4), it selects a seed $t$ (line 5) and chooses a random number $N$ of mutations (line 6). Then, the fuzzer repeatedly executes the instrumented program $P_f$ (line 9) with different mutated seed $t'$ (line 8) as input and obtains the execution statistics. If $t'$ triggers a crash in the instrumented program $P_f$ (line 10), it is added to the set of vulnerable inputs (line 11). Otherwise, if $t'$ does not cause a crash but covers a new branch in the PUT (line 12), it is added to the seed queue $Q_S$ (line 13). This may help the fuzzer discover more vulnerabilities in the subsequent
iterations. Finally, the execution of the main fuzzing loop continues until the predefined timeout is reached.

Multiple attempts have been made to detect security vulnerabilities in concurrent programs with fuzzing. MUZZ [23] is a gray-box fuzzing tool that detects bugs in multi-threaded programs using thread-aware instrumentation. Unfortunately, it is not publicly available yet. ConAFL [36] is another thread-aware GBF that focuses on user-space multi-threaded programs. It uses heavy thread-aware static and dynamic analysis, resulting in scalability issues. Namely, ConAFL employs static analysis to locate sensitive concurrent operations to determine the execution order, focusing on three types of vulnerabilities: buffer-overflow, double-free, or use-after-free. Unfortunately, the static analysis tool utilized by ConAFL is not available [37]. AutoInter-fuzzing [38] is a very recent thread-aware GBF that also employs static analysis to locate sensitive operations. Specifically, it isolates pairs of instructions that access the same memory location across different threads. During fuzzing, synchronization barriers are used to control the order of execution of the two instructions in the pair, thus allowing the fuzzer to explore different interleavings. Unfortunately, this strategy makes AutoInter-fuzzing suffer from low path coverage in comparison with other fuzzers. Similarly to MUZZ and ConAFL, AutoInter-fuzzing is not publicly available.

III. PROBLEM STATEMENT

In general, BMC and GBF tackle the problem of finding vulnerabilities in fundamentally different ways. Consequently, it is natural to ask whether combining the two techniques can lead to better coverage of the search space. More precisely, in this study, we ask the following research question:

Research Question. Does an ensemble of bounded model checkers and gray-box fuzzers discover more concurrency vulnerabilities and do it faster than either approach on their own?

In addressing this question, we are confronted with many practical design challenges, the solution of which is central in the remainder of our paper:

- Concurrency-aware gray-box fuzzer. As detailed in Section IV-A, there are some recent existing efforts to fuzz concurrent programs, but no mature open-source tool exists. Consequently, designing such a tool is an important step towards answering our research question. In doing so, we aim to draw from the lessons learned in the literature and implement a tool that is representative of state-of-the-art concurrency-aware GBF. We do so in Section V.

- Aggregating BMC and GBF results. By creating an ensemble of different tools, we run into the risk of them returning conflicting results. The main reason is that BMC relies on abstractions of the program execution states and symbolic execution (see Section II-B), whereas GBF tests concrete inputs and execution schedules. When the two approaches disagree, we have an opportunity to make an informed choice about the verification outcome. We propose to do so via a decision matrix, as detailed in Section V.

- Resource allocation trade-off. The main drawback of using an ensemble of different tools is that they all compete for the same computational resources. We must choose how many resources to allocate to each tool for applications with limited time, memory, or computational power. In general, our decisions depend not only on the problem at hand but also on the partial results we obtain from the tools in the ensemble. We discuss strategies to optimize our ensembles in Section V.

Note that the design challenges listed above are not orthogonal. We clarify when our choices impact multiple of them in Sections V and VI. Furthermore, we mention reasonable alternatives; these are left as future work.

IV. DESIGNING A STATE-OF-THE-ART CONCURRENCY GRAY-BOX FUZZER

This section describes the main design challenges we address in implementing our concurrency-aware gray-box fuzzer. Namely, we discuss how we control the thread interleavings (Section IV-B) and how we generate witness information when a violation is found (Section IV-C). Both of these goals require the instrumentation of the program under test (PUT) as detailed in Sections IV-A and IV-D.

A. Custom LLVM Pass Instrumentation

We build our concurrency-aware fuzzer on top of the widely used gray-box fuzzer AFL++ [39], which is designed to find vulnerabilities in sequential programs. AFL++ minimizes the fuzzing overhead by instrumenting the program under test (PUT) via an LLVM pass [40]. The LLVM pass is an essential framework of the LLVM compiler. It works with the program translated into the LLVM intermediate representation (IR) language and adds additional code to monitor the program behavior [41].

We combine the standard LLVM pass of AFL++ with our custom independent LLVM pass to make our fuzzer aware of concurrent execution (see Algorithm 2). More specifically, we inject five different function calls: a delay function (see line 4), two thread-monitoring functions (see lines 6 and 8) and two information-collecting functions (see lines 10 and 12). The first function controls the interleaving schedule, and we explain its implementation details in Section IV-B. The second and the third functions monitor the number of active threads (see Section IV-C) in the PUT during run-time by tracking when the functions pthread_create and pthread_join are called. The last two functions record the information required to generate a witness file containing the execution trace. We present a full example of instrumented code in Section IV-D.

We bundle these five instrumentation functions in a runtime library. We compile and link both the runtime library and the instrumented PUT using the AFL++ clang wrapper. The resulting executable can be fuzzed to detect reachability and memory corruption bugs in the default setting. Optionally, the

---

**Algorithm 2**

```python
// Algorithm 2: LLVM Pass Instrumentation

def instrument(llvm_module):
    # Delay function
    delay_code =
    # Thread-monitoring functions
    monitoring_code =
    # Information-collecting functions
    collecting_code =
    return instrumented_module =
```

---

Note that the design challenges listed above are not orthogonal. We clarify when our choices impact multiple of them in Sections V and VI. Furthermore, we mention reasonable alternatives; these are left as future work.
Algorithm 2 LLVM Pass Instrumentation

Input: PUT – program under test.
Output: $M$ – instrumented program.

Shorthands:
$\lambda_d$ – delay\_function();
$\lambda_a$ – pthread\_add();
$\lambda_j$ – pthread\_release();
$\lambda_e$ – EBF\_add\_store\_pointer();
$\lambda_l$ – EBF\_alloca();

1: $M \leftarrow$ PUT
2: for all Function $F \in$ PUT do
3: for Instruction $I$ in $F$ do
4: $M \leftarrow$ instrument ($\lambda_d, I, M$) \{insert a call to delay\_function() (Algorithm 5) after each instruction to run a delay at run-time\}
5: if $I$ == pthread\_create() then
6: $M \leftarrow$ instrument ($\lambda_a, I, M$) \{insert a call to pthread\_add() (Algorithm 4) to increase the active threads counter at run-time\}
7: else if $I$ == pthread\_join() then
8: $M \leftarrow$ instrument ($\lambda_j, I, M$) \{insert a call to pthread\_release() (Algorithm 5) to decrease the active threads counter at run-time\}
9: else if $I$ is DECLARATION then
10: $M \leftarrow$ instrument ($\lambda_l, I, M$) \{insert a call to EBF\_alloca() function (Algorithm 6) to record a pair of the name and address of the variable declaration.\}
11: else if $I$ is STORE then
12: $M \leftarrow$ instrument ($\lambda_e, I, M$) \{insert a call to EBF\_add\_store\_pointer() (Algorithm 7) function to record the assignment information for witness generation\}
13: end if
14: end for
15: end for
16: return $M$

The above design choices have been incorporated into the implementation of function delay\_function, whose definition is illustrated in Algorithm 5. In lines 24, we implement our strategy for limiting the number of active threads. If the number of active threads $N$ is greater than the given threshold $T_r$ or the 1% exit chance is triggered, then the fuzzer exits this analysis normally (see line 3) and starts a new run with different interleavings (i.e., different delay values). Otherwise, we check whether the current thread owns the global mutex (line 5), and if so, we let it finish its execution and release the mutex (lines 6 and 7). If the global mutex is not released before the timeout (line 9), we also allow the fuzzer to exit this analysis normally (line 11). This is done to prevent deadlocks if the global mutex is never released. Finally, the delay is executed by running a sleep function for the duration value produced by the fuzzing engine (line 13).

Additionally, the number of active threads in the PUT is monitored by the functions pthread\_add and pthread\_release, whose definitions are shown in Algorithms 4 and 5 respectively. The former (the latter) increments (decrements) the active threads counter $T_n$ (see line 3) atomically by locking the current thread (see line 2) before changing the value of $T_n$ and unlocking it afterwards (see line 4).
Algorithm 3 Function delay_function()

Global: \( T_T \) - thread threshold, \( T_N \) - number of threads running, \( T_C \) - current thread, \( EBF_mutex \) - global mutex.

1: Function delay_function()
2: if \( T_N > T_T \) or random(0,99) == 1 then
3: \( \text{exit} \) \{exit this analysis normally\}
4: end if
5: if \( T_C == EBF_mutex \) then
6: \( \text{run\_instruction} \) \{run the current instruction\}
7: \( \text{return} \)
8: end if
9: \( \phi \leftarrow \text{wait\_for\_timeout} \) \{wait until \( EBF_mutex \) is released\}
10: if \( \phi \) is timeout then
11: \( \text{exit} \) \{exit this analysis normally\}
12: end if
13: \( \text{sleep(*)} \) \{run a delay for \( \ast \) nanoseconds\}
14: \( \text{EndFunction} \)

Algorithm 4 Function pthread_add()

Global: \( Mutex_lock \), \( T_N \) - active threads counter.

1: Function pthread_add()
2: lock thread \( \leftarrow Mutex_lock \)
3: \( T_N \leftarrow T_N + 1 \)
4: unlock thread \( \leftarrow Mutex_lock \)
5: \( \text{EndFunction} \)

Algorithm 5 Function pthread_release()

Global: \( Mutex_lock \), \( T_N \) - active thread counter.

1: Function pthread_release()
2: lock thread \( \leftarrow Mutex_lock \)
3: \( T_N \leftarrow T_N - 1 \)
4: unlock thread \( \leftarrow Mutex_lock \)
5: \( \text{EndFunction} \)

C. Witness Generation

If our concurrency-aware gray-box fuzzer finds a violation, we need to support the users and tools in reproducing the identified bug. To do so, we generate a crash report file with all the necessary information to reproduce the property violation. We use functions \( EBFalloca \) and \( EBFadd_store\_pointer \) to record all the information needed for automated witness generation: assumption values, thread ID, variable names, and function names as shown in Algorithms 6 and 7.

As the fuzzing process begins, we run an initialisation function before the main method is called in the PUT. This function creates a witness file uniquely identified by the current process ID (i.e., \( witnessInfoAFLpid \)) and sets the environment (i.e., initialises the global mutex \( EBF_mutex \), getting process id \( \text{pid} \)). Then, our custom LLVM pass inserts a function call to \( EBFalloca \) (see line 10 in Algorithm 2) after each declaration instruction in the PUT, and a function call to \( EBFpointer\_add\_store\_pointer \) (see line 12 in Algorithm 2) after each loading store instruction.

Algorithms 6 and 7 demonstrate the definitions of functions \( EBFalloca \) and \( EBFadd\_store\_pointer \), respectively. The former records the declared variable’s name, its address, and the name of the function where it has been declared in the PUT (see line 3). The latter records the assigned variable’s address, the assigned value, the name of the function and the line of code where the assignment takes place in the PUT (see line 9). Both functions record information atomically – the thread is locked (see line 2) before the writing occurs and unlocked afterwards (see line 3). If the fuzzing run finishes normally (i.e., a timeout is reached or the process finishes with the exit code 0), we delete the created witness files in a destructor function (42). If the fuzzer causes a crash in one of the PUT executions, we save the ID of the process that has crashed and generate a crash report by extracting the data from the witness file associated with this process ID. The resulting crash report contains the exact sequence of operations (i.e., memory accesses) that led to the PUT’s crash (see Appendix B for more details).

D. Full illustrative Example

To tie all these design choices together, we present an illustrative example. Assume that we have a concurrent PUT that has one reachability bug, as illustrated in Listing 1. The program contains a function named \texttt{foo}, which has a variable declaration \( a \), which receives a non-deterministic value from an external function called \texttt{nondet_int} (e.g., user inputs or read from standard input). Line 4 consists of a conditional
statement that checks whether the value of \( a \) is 42. If that condition holds, then we reach the error statement, reporting it as a property violation. In line 7, we have the main function, which first declares a variable called \( \text{thread} \_id \), then it calls \text{pthread} \_create to create a thread and invoke the function \text{foo}. Lastly, it calls \text{pthread} \_join, which blocks the calling thread until the \text{thread} \_id is terminated.

Recall that we instrument the PUT at the LLVM-IR level. For our example of Listing 1 we report the LLVM-IR encoding for function \text{foo} in Listing 2. In line 6 we call the \text{nondet} _int() function and allocate a non-deterministic 32-bit integer value. Listing 3 illustrates the IR after the instrumentation. In line 7 we call the function EBF \_add \_store \_pointer, which is inserted after each load instruction and saves the variable name and value in a file to use it for generating the witness file. In line 10 we call a function called EBF \_alloca, which stores the metadata of any variable declared in the PUT, and we use them later to generate witness files. In line 11 we instrument the instruction by inserting a function call to the \_delay \_function() that we described in Algorithm 3.

Listing 1: Original multi-thread C code

```c
void reach_error() { assert(0); }
extern int nondet_int();
void *foo(void * arg)
int a = nondet_int();
if((a) == 42) reach_error();
}
int main()
  pthread_create(&t1, 0, foo, 0);
  int a = nondet_int();
  if((a) == 42) reach_error();
  pthread_join(t1, 0);
  return i8* %10,
```

Listing 2: Fragment of correspond IR before instrumentation

```c
define dso_local i8* @foo(i8* %0) #0 { %2 = alloca i8*, align 8 %3 = alloca i8*, align 8 %4 = alloca i32, align 4 store i8* %0, i8* %3, align 8 %5 = call i32 (...) @nondet_int(), store i32 %5, i32* %4, align 4, %6 = load i32, i32* %4, align 4, %7 = icmp eq i32 %6, 42, br i1 %7, label %8, label %9, call void @reach_error(), br label %9, ret i8* %10,
```

Listing 3: Fragment of correspond IR after instrumentation

```c
define dso_local i8* @foo(i8* %0) #0 { %2 = alloca i8*, align 8 %3 = alloca i8*, align 8 %4 = alloca i32, align 4 %typecast_store_double = bitcast i8* %0 to i1* %bitcast_ptr = bitcast i8* %3 to i8* call void @EBF_add_store_pointer(i8* %bitcast_ptr, i64 0, i8* %typecast_store_double ← %typecast_store_double inbounds ((4 x i18), (4 x i18) • %0, i32 0, i32 0), i8* %typecast_store_double)
  store i8* %0, i8* %3, align 8 %bitcast_ptr1 = bitcast i8* %3 to i8*
call void @EBF_alloca(i8* getelementptr inbounds
  (4 x i18), (4 x i18) • %0, i32 0, i32 0), i8* %bitcast_ptr1),
call void @delay_function();
b%bitcast_ptr2 = bitcast i32* %4 to i8*
call void @EBF_alloca(i8* getelementptr inbounds
  (2 x i18), (2 x i18) • %0, i32 0, i32 0), i8* %typecast_store_double ← %typecast_store_double inbounds ((4 x i18), (4 x i18) • %0, i32 0, i32 0), i8* %bitcast_ptr2), %5 = call i32 (...) @nondet_int(), %typecast_store_double3 = sext i32 %5 to i64 %bitcast_ptr4 = bitcast i32* %4 to i8*
call void @EBF_add_store_pointer(i8* %bitcast_ptr4, i64 8, i8* %typecast_store_double ← %typecast_store_double inbounds ((4 x i18), (4 x i18) • %0, i32 0, i32 0), i64 %typecast_store_double3), store i32 %5, i32 4, align 4, call void @delay_function(); %6 = load i32, i32* %4, align 4, %7 = icmp eq i32 %6, 42, br i1 %7, label %8, label %9, call void @EBF_closing(), call void @reach_error(), br label %9, call void @delay_function(); %10 = load i8*, i8* %2, align 8, ret i8* %10,
```

V. EBF: ENSEMBLES OF BMC AND FUZZING

Thanks to our concurrency-aware gray-box fuzzer, we now have access to both state-of-the-art BMC and GBF. This section explains how we combine them in EBF and maximize their effectiveness in finding vulnerabilities in concurrent software. As we mentioned in Section III there exist two main design challenges. First, the BMC and GBF tools in the ensemble might report conflicting results (e.g., BMC reports that the PUT is safe, while GBF reports a violation). Second, the tools in the ensemble compete for the same computational resources, which might reduce the ability of each tool to find violations.

A. Seeding

Before discussing our solution to the two problems of aggregation and resource sharing, let us propose a further optimization of the ensemble. Specifically, if sequential execution of the ensemble is possible, we can improve the GBF seeds by initializing them with the counterexample produced by BMC. This is only possible when BMC reports a failed verification outcome. These seeds are concrete values that cause an assertion to fail. However, if our BMC engine timeouts, proves (partial) correctness or produces Unknown, then we generate the fuzzer seed with pseudo-random numbers, ranging between 0 to 5000. This range provides a good trade-off between functionality and efficiency since larger numbers (e.g., more than 5000) will make the compiled program slower or hang during fuzzing. Specifically, parsing larger numbers consumes more time and memory by the tested binary [43], and reduces the probability of randomly finding the right pattern for detecting the bug within the given time frame.
TABLE I: EBF declares a program Safe, Unknown or Bug-reachable by aggregating the outputs of BMC and GBF.

| Table II: The results demonstrated by EBF 2.3 and CBMC 5.43 in the Concurrency Safety category of SV-COMP 2022. |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|
| Verification outcome                      | Tool         | Score per benchmark |
| Correct True                              | EBF 2.3      | 139 × 2             |
| Correct False                             | CBMC         | 148 × 1             |
| Correct False Unconfirmed                 | EBF 2.3      | 234 × 0             |
| Incorrect True                            | CBMC         | 55 × -32            |
| Incorrect False                           | EBF 2.3      | 0 × -16             |
| Unknown                                   | CBMC         | 0 × 0               |
| Overall SV-COMP 2022 score                | CBMC         | 496 × 460           |

B. Aggregation

After running all ensemble members, we need to aggregate their outcomes. This is especially challenging since BMC and GBF may disagree on the safety of the PUT (cf. Section III). We summarize our aggregation rule in the decision matrix in Table I. Some decisions are straightforward: we must trust the other when either method cannot conclude. Accordingly, when GBF reports Unknown, our decision matrix aligns with the outcome of BMC. Vice versa, when BMC cannot prove or disprove the PUT’s safety, we trust the bugs found by GBF. A more interesting scenario happens when there is a conflict in the ensemble: BMC can declare a PUT as Safe, but GBF may still be able to find a bug. In general, we report such instances as Unknown.

C. CPU time allocation

CPU time allocation is another important design choice in optimizing the performance of EBF. More specifically, we need to split the available CPU time between the two components of the ensemble in order to increase the search space coverage as much as possible for each of them. In Section VI-B4, we discuss how different CPU time distribution strategies affect the overall EBF performance.

VI. EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

In this section, we demonstrate the effectiveness of BMC and GBF ensembles in a diverse set of scenarios. We will reiterate our experimental objectives before detailing the deployed benchmarks and our results.

A. Objectives

The present experimental evaluation has the following goals:

EG1 - Detection of violations in concurrent programs
- Demonstrate that EBF can detect more violations in concurrent programs than state-of-the-art BMC tools on their own.

EG2 - Real-world performance of our concurrency-aware fuzzer
- Demonstrate that the concurrency-aware GBF we implement in EBF can find violations in real-world programs.

EG3 - Parameter trade-offs in our concurrency-aware fuzzer
- Demonstrate that EBF produces consistent results across a wide range of parameter settings.

Note that the latter two objectives EG2 and EG3 are oriented towards demonstrating that our concurrency-aware GBF (see Section IV) is representative of state-of-the-art gray-box fuzzing techniques.

B. Results

We gathered our experimental results over a substantial period, beginning in February 2021. During this period, the design of EBF has evolved and improved. To avoid confusion, we report our results separately for each version of EBF. Namely, we start with the participation of EBF 2.3 in the Concurrency Safety category of SV-COMP 2022 (see Section VI-B1). This EBF version was based on CBMC v5.43 and a more rudimentary implementation of our concurrency-aware fuzzer. For comparison, we also report the performance of our latest version EBF 4.0 on the same set of benchmarks (see Section VI-B2). EBF 4.0 includes the full implementation of GBF described in Section IV and a large number of different BMC tools. Then, we demonstrate the ability of our fuzzer to find a data race in the wolfMQTT cryptographic library (see Section VI-B3). Historically, we first found this bug in February 2021 with an earlier version of our fuzzer. Here, we repeat our previous experiment with the latest version of GBF included in EBF 4.0. Finally, we run an extensive comparison of the performance of EBF 4.0 across a wide range of parameter settings (see Section VI-B4).

1) EBF 2.3 participation in SV-COMP 2022: EBF 2.3 took part in SV-COMP 2022 in the Concurrency Safety category [44]. This category features a set of 763 concurrent C programs, 398 of which are safe. The bugs in the remaining 365 programs are formulated in terms of reachability conditions: the program is deemed unsafe if a predefined error function is reachable within the given program, and safe otherwise. These programs contain a number of intrinsic functions [45]. We explain how we model them in Appendix A.

In the SV-COMP 2022 Concurrency Safety category, each participating tool is asked to produce one of the following six verification outcomes for a given concurrent benchmark (see the first column in Table II):

- Correct True. The tool correctly confirms that the program is safe.
- Correct False. The tool correctly confirms the presence of a bug.
• Correct False Unconfirmed. The tool correctly confirms the presence of a bug, but the associated counterexample cannot be reproduced by the witness validator tool developed by the competition organizers.

• Incorrect True. The tool confirms that a program is safe when it contains a bug.

• Incorrect False. The tool confirms that the program contains a bug when it is, in fact, safe.

• Unknown. The tool cannot conclude within the given CPU time and memory limit.

Every verification outcome is assigned a score value (see the fourth column in Table II), which strongly discourages incorrect results. The resulting score for each tool is comprised of the sum of the scores obtained for all benchmarks.

The competition took place on the SV-COMP servers featuring 8 CPUs (Intel Xeon E3-1230 v5 @ 3.40 GHz) and 33 GB of RAM. Each benchmark verification task was limited to 15 minutes of CPU time and 15 GB of RAM.

The version of our tool that we submitted to the competition, EBF 2.3, is based on CBMC v5.43 as a BMC engine and an earlier implementation of our GBF fuzzer. Namely, we selected CBMC as it is a state-of-the-art BMC tool that has consistently been achieving high rankings in the concurrency category of SV-COMP over the past decade. Also, the GBF implementation we used in EBF 2.3 injects random delay values, which are not controlled by the mutation engine, thus making it impossible for the fuzzer to execute a promising schedule multiple times (the current EBF 4.0 version does not suffer from such limitation).

EBF 2.3 reached 7th place out of 20 participants in SV-COMP 2022, by scoring a total of 496 points. Crucially, EBF 2.3 outperformed CBMC 5.43, which finished 10th with 460 points. We report the official SV-COMP 2022 results of these two tools in Table II. Note that CBMC achieved a higher score than EBF in predicting programs safety (148 vs 139, respectively). This is an expected outcome, since EBF dedicates only 6 minutes out of 15 minutes to BMC, and the rest are used by our concurrency-aware GBF, which cannot prove whether a program is safe. At the same time, EBF was better than CBMC at detecting bugs that could be confirmed by the witness validator (234 vs 212), thus scoring extra points.

Moreover, EBF reported only one Incorrect False outcome, while CBMC produced 3 incorrect verdicts resulting in 48 penalty points. Interestingly, the latter three incorrect outcomes were also generated during the BMC stage of EBF, but then rejected during the GBF stage resulting in an Unknown outcome. In contrast, the only incorrect outcome produced by EBF was caused by a bug inside our concurrency-aware GBF which made it generate a spurious counterexample. This issue has been resolved in our most recent EBF 4.0 version.

Overall, EBF 2.3 improved the competition result of CBMC 5.43 by ∼7.8%. In addition, EBF could detect and confirm a property violation in one benchmark, which could not be detected by any other dynamic tool in the competition. These results are a first positive answer to goal EG1; we present further experimental evidence in Section VI-B2.

2) EBF 4.0 with different state-of-the-art BMC tools: After the participation of EBF in SV-COMP 2022, we improved our concurrency-aware GBF following the algorithmic ideas we describe in Section IV. Here, we present the results of further experiments that test whether any BMC tool can be improved by adding our latest GBF on top of it (goal EG1).

To avoid confusion, we refer to the latest implementation of our ensemble technique as EBF 4.0.

In our evaluation, we run EBF 4.0 over the same benchmarks from the SV-COMP 2022 Concurrency Safety category (see Section VI-B1). However, we omit the SV-COMP aggregate scoring system (see Table II), since its different weights can obfuscate the advantages of each verification technique. Instead, we focus on analyzing the trade-off between proving safety (BMC only) and bug-finding abilities (both BMC and GBF) from the raw results.

Furthermore, we consider three additional BMC tools in our experiments (see Table III), rather than just CBMC [32]. Namely, ES BMC [1] is a powerful BMC tool that has been successfully participating in SV-COMP over the past decade. Similarly, Deagle [46] and Cseq [53] achieved 1st and 2nd place, respectively, in the Concurrency Safety category at SV-COMP 2022.

We conduct all our experiments on a virtual machine running Ubuntu 20.04 LTS with 160 GB RAM and 25 CPU cores of Intel Core Processor (Broadwell, IBRS) @ 2.1 GHz. Moreover, we run EBF 4.0 with the following parameters: maximum thread threshold 5, delay range from 0 [µs] to 10^5 [µs]. Additionally, we distribute the available runtime in the following way: we allocate 6 minutes to the BMC engine, 5 minutes to our concurrency-aware GBF, and 4 minutes for the seeding, aggregation, and witness file generation. These parameter setting is optimal for the SV-COMP 2022 benchmark we are using, as we discuss in Section VI-B4.

Note that the user can specify the time distribution between the tools in the ensemble in EBF via command-line arguments.

Table III reports a pair-wise comparison between EBF 4.0 and the four different BMC tools on their own. The results demonstrate that EBF finds more bugs than all four BMC engines on their own while reducing the number of Unknown instances. More in detail, EBF achieves the best improvement concerning ES BMC, by finding ∼14.9% more bugs and correcting one wrong outcome while reducing the number of safety proofs by only ∼7.6%. Similarly, the ability to double-check any counterexample produced by BMC allows EBF to correct all three erroneous outcomes produced by CBMC while showing a marginal difference between the improvement in bug-finding (∼5.6%) and the degradation in safety proof (∼5%). In contrast, when compared to Deagle, EBF shows no decrease in the Correct True outcomes, but can increase the number of discovered bugs by ∼5.3%. As for Cseq, the number of safety proofs produced by EBF declines by only

2The term “prove safety” means that the BMC procedure could verify all reachable states and could not find an execution path that violates the safety property.
Overall, EBF provides a better trade-off between bug-finding and safety proving than each BMC engine. On average, EBF finds over 8% more concurrency bugs while reducing the number of programs declared safe by only 3.8%. Hence, this evaluation achieves our first experimental goal (EG1).

3) Detecting a data race in wolfMQTT: We evaluate EBF 4.0 on the wolfMQTT library [47]. MQTT (Message Queuing Telemetry Transport) is a lightweight messaging protocol developed for constrained environments like the Internet of Things (IoT). It employs the publish-subscribe messaging pattern of publishing messages and subscribing to topics. The wolfMQTT library is a client implementation of the MQTT protocol written in C for embedded devices. We use its API to verify the concurrent part of the protocol implementation.

Our concurrency-aware GBF detects a data race in wolfMQTT after running for 15 minutes and consuming 24 MB of RAM. In detail, MQTT contains 4 packet structures (i.e., Connect, Publish, Subscribe and Unsubscribe). The Subscribe function accepts an acknowledgment from the server (i.e., broker). This acknowledgment was received through an unprotected pointer due to the data race detected in function MqttClient_WaitType, which can lead to an information leak or data corruption. This issue has been successfully replicated and consequently fixed by the wolfMQTT developers.

Our setup for the experiment is the following. We run EBF 4.0 on an Intel Core i7 2.7Ghz machine with 8 GB of RAM running Ubuntu 18.04.5 LTS. We use a Mosquito server for the communication with the wolfMQTT client [48]. We enable ThreadSanitizer on top of our concurrency-aware GBF for detecting the concurrency bugs that are not formulated explicitly in terms of reaching a predefined error function (i.e., like it is done in the SV-COMP 2022 concurrency benchmarks) or violating a safety assertion. Finally, we run our GBF with a thread threshold of \( Th = 5 \) and a delay range from 0 \([\mu s]\) to \( 10^5 [\mu s] \).

Other tools fail to discover the same vulnerability. More specifically, both bounded model checkers CBMC v5.4.3 and ESBMC v6.8 are unable to detect the data race within the given time limit. Moreover, the BMC tool Deagle v1.3 cannot parse the program correctly, since it is using an outdated version of C parser. Similarly, Cseq v3.0 does not support programs featuring multiple source files. Finally, neither the fuzzer AFL nor AFL++ can detect this bug in wolfMQTT.

As the result of this experiment, we can conclude that our second evaluation goal (EG2) has been achieved.

4) Optimising EBF’s settings: In the following experiments, we explore different settings for EBF and our concurrency-aware GBF. For the first two experiments, we run EBF with the BMC engine switched off, allowing the fuzzer to run for 11 minutes. While for the third evaluation, we run EBF with both engines enabled but with a different amount of time allotted (out of total 11 minutes) to each of them.

Maximum number of threads in our GBF. Figure 2 shows the result of choosing different values for the thread threshold on the number of bugs (i.e., the number of Correct False outcomes) discovered by our concurrency-aware GBF. We ran this experiment with the delay range from 0 \([\mu s]\) to \( 10^5 [\mu s] \). It can be seen that the most optimal value lies in the region around \( Th = 5 \), and raising the threshold value leads to fewer bugs being detected due to the increase in the number of computer resources required to maintain a more significant number of active threads. Perhaps, we can suggest that many bugs can be discovered without considering a large number of threads, which was also demonstrated by the wolfMQTT data race that was discovered with \( Th = 5 \). However, drawing a more robust conclusion applicable to any concurrent program requires a more extensive evaluation of our GBF on a larger set of benchmarks.

Maximum amount of delay in our GBF. Figure 3 illustrates the effect of the amount of delay we insert to force scheduling in our concurrency-aware GBF. We use a logarithmic scale to compare different delay ranges in our concurrency-aware GBF. Similar to the evaluations of different thread thresholds, we use the number of Correct False to assess the efficacy of a given delay bound. We set the thread threshold to 5 active threads in this experiment. We change the upper bound of the delay’s range from 0 \([\mu s]\) (i.e., no delay) to \( 10^7 [\mu s] \) (i.e., 10 seconds).

The results show that increasing the delay upper bound from 0 to \( 10^5 [\mu s] \) gradually improves the bug-finding capabilities of our concurrency-aware GBF from 52 to 78 benchmarks. When we set a large upper bound on the delay value, we increase the time range for a thread to stay inactive before it is rescheduled again, which increases the number of threads interleavings that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verification outcome</th>
<th>EBF</th>
<th>Deagle</th>
<th>EBF</th>
<th>Cseq</th>
<th>EBF</th>
<th>ESBMC</th>
<th>EBF</th>
<th>CBMC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct True</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct False</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect True</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect False</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III: Pair-wise comparison of the verification outcomes for EBF 4.0 with different BMC tools “plugged in” against their individual performance on the benchmarks from the Concurrency Safety category of SV-COMP 2022.

https://github.com/wolfSSL/wolfMQTT/issues/198
https://github.com/wolfSSL/wolfMQTT/pull/209
Number of benchmarks

Fig. 2: The number of bugs (i.e., Correct False outcomes) discovered by EBF 4.0 for different values of threshold on the maximum number of active threads.

Number of benchmarks

Fig. 3: The number of bugs (i.e., Correct False outcomes) discovered by EBF 4.0 for different upper bounds of the distributions for the random delay.

detects only 2 out of 365 (0.55%). This highlights the necessity of using concurrency-aware fuzzers in our EBF.

CPU time allocation inside EBF. In this experiment we compare different ways of distributing the total verification time (11 minutes overall) between the fuzzer and the BMC engines in EBF. The results demonstrate a relatively wide range of values (between 3 and 8 minutes per engine) within which EBF 4.0 produces identical results detecting 320 bugs out of 365. At the same time, when the entire 11 minutes are allocated to the BMC engine, the number of detected bugs drops by ~5% to 303 out of 365. Conversely, the overall bug-finding performance of EBF 4.0 decreases drastically by over 75% when all 11 minutes are devoted to our concurrency-aware GBF. On the whole, this result confirms that BMC tools are better than our GBF tool when used in isolation. However, combining them both in an ensemble is going to yield better results across a very different time allocation choices.

C. Limitations

We identify several possible limitations to our current work. Incompleteness of fuzzing for proving safety. Fuzzing works by executing the program along many concrete paths, hoping to find the one that leads to the vulnerability detection. Consequently, it cannot formally guarantee that we can exhaustively explore the entire state-space of the program. As a result, by design, EBF prioritises bug-finding over proving a program’s safety.

Sources of incorrect verdicts in EBF. Although EBF does not produce conflicting verdicts using the aggregation matrix from Table I, the correctness of EBF’s verification verdicts largely depends on the implementation of the tools used in the assembly. For example, if the BMC engine produces a wrong Safe outcome while the GBF cannot find any violations within the given time limit (thus returning Unknown) the final verification verdict becomes Safe. Similarly, our GBF may become a source of an incorrect Bug verdict when BMC
reports *Unknown* and the GBF crashes because of an internal bug within the GBF’s implementation, rather than an actual vulnerability inside the PUT. Fortunately, this is not critical since EBF generates a witness file which can be further evaluated using witness validators (see appendix [2]).

**Choice of parameter settings in EBF.** Despite the fact that we conduct our evaluations over a set of more than 700 multi-threaded C programs (see description in Section VI-B1), this benchmark might not be representative of the real-world picture of concurrent software. Thus, the optimal parameter settings for our GBF are likely to be different on another set of multi-threaded benchmarks. Nevertheless, we expect that the parameter tuning procedure on a different set of benchmarks will follow similar patterns to the ones shown in Figures 2 and 3.

**VII. RELATED WORK**

Throughout our paper, we describe various existing studies that cover relevant tools and techniques. In this section, we collate and expand on these references. Our goal here is to clarify the context in which our research occurs.

**A. Bounded Model Checking (BMC)**

Bounded model checking has been successfully applied to the verification of concurrent C programs over the past years [49]. There exist several state-of-the-art bounded model checkers, such as ESBMC [14] and CBMC [15] that can handle both sequential and multi-threaded C programs and detect concurrency bugs (e.g., data races, deadlocks, etc.) and other vulnerabilities (e.g., buffer overflows, dangling pointers, etc.). In particular, ESBMC handles concurrency by performing a depth-first search through all possible thread interleavings, up to the given maximum number of context switches [50]. In contrast, CBMC encodes each concurrent execution unit separately and joins them with partial order formulae [51].

Many other BMC tools demonstrate their efficacy in the verification of concurrent programs at the annual SV-COMP software verification competition [52]. For example, Lazy-CSeq [18], [53] - one of the leaders in the concurrency category at SV-COMP over the past decade - works by translating a multi-threaded C program into a non-deterministic sequential program that considers all round-robin schedules up to a given number of rounds. Then the obtained sequential program is verified using a bounded model checker for sequential programs (e.g., CBMC, ESBMC). Similarly, Deagle - the winner in the concurrency category in SV-COMP 2022 [54] - introduces a novel ordering consistency theory for multi-threaded programs [17], and implements a more efficient solver for this theory on top of CBMC (front-end) and MathSAT [55] (backend).

**B. Fuzzing**

Traditional fuzzing techniques do not translate well for concurrent programs since the fuzzer can only operate on the input of the program and cannot control its scheduling [23]. Still, some proposals toward concurrency-aware fuzzing exist. ConAFL [36] proposes to instrument the code of the program under analysis with assembly-level commands to set the priority of the threads. Several heuristic techniques are proposed to let the fuzzer explore different thread interleavings, including random exploration. As an alternative, the insertion of *sleep* commands in the code is mentioned by the authors but not used in their experimental evaluation. Similarly, the authors of *MUZZ* [23] mention that the natural non-determinism of the operating system may not be enough to explore a diverse range of schedules. Thus, they intervene in the PUT by assigning random priorities to its threads. The priorities are chosen uniformly at random.

A more advanced approach is implemented in the tool ConFuzz [56], [57], which lets the fuzzer control the scheduling indirectly. The authors ask the fuzzer to generate pseudo-random numbers that control the delays in the event-based programs they are testing. In this way, the evolutionary algorithm of the fuzzer can select both the program input and its schedule. However, a discussion on the advantage of this technique over random scheduling is missing. Recently, another concurrency-aware fuzzer has been proposed in [38]. This gray-box fuzzer, called *AutoInter-fuzzing*, uses static analysis to narrow the search space and identify pairs of instructions that access the same memory location but are executed by different threads. Then, the PUT is instrumented with additional synchronization operations that control the order of execution of the instruction in each pair. Every time one such pair is encountered during regular fuzzing, the PUT is re-run forcing a different execution order of the pair.

Our GBF (see Section IV) implements many of these ideas, including instrumenting the code with *sleep* instructions, forcing the exploration of random interleavings and letting the fuzzer control the randomness through its mutation engine. In the future, if the aforementioned concurrency-aware fuzzers become open source [27], it will be possible to test their efficacy when paired with BMC tools, as we do here with our GBF tool.

**C. Hybrid Techniques**

Recently, several efforts have combined fuzzing with various forms of symbolic execution and static analysis [58]. The rationale behind these efforts is that fuzzing alone struggles to find “deep” bugs and vulnerabilities because the random mutations introduced in the input have a low probability of hitting complex paths in the program. In contrast, if the fuzzer is given a set of input seeds that are already close to the correct target, the evolutionary algorithm has a higher chance of exposing the bugs and vulnerabilities.

To this end, Ognawala et al. [24] propose to increase the coverage of fuzzing by augmenting the set of input seeds with a round of concolic execution. With it, the code coverage rises significantly. Similarly, Chowdhury et al. [26] are concerned with the inability of off-the-shelf fuzzers to discover inputs that pass complex blocks of program logic. Their solution is using a bounded model checker to solve the corresponding reachability problem and produce concrete input seeds that
satisfy the complex conditions of the program under analysis. The fuzzier is then free to explore the search space beyond that. On a different note, Alshmrany et al. [25] employs a selective fuzzing tool if the model checker of their FuSeBMC tool fails to find all vulnerabilities. Such fuzzier uses the statistics collected by the model checker to create a particular set of input seeds.

EBF is similar to these hybrid tools in the sense that it exploits the combined advantages of fuzzing and model checking. However, the aforementioned hybrid tools are built around a close integration between the two techniques, often requiring specific assumptions about the verification task at hand. In contrast, our ensembles are more flexible and allow virtually any existing tool to be combined together. Finally, none of the existing hybrid approaches can verify concurrent programs.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

Discovering vulnerabilities in concurrent programs remains a challenging problem due to the extreme explosion of the search space in the number of possible interleavings. In this paper we focus on two existing approaches to this problem: Bounded Model Checking (BMC) and Gray-Box Fuzzing (GBF). When used on their own, each approach can only find a subset of the vulnerabilities present in state-of-the-art concurrent benchmarks. Our contribution is building ensembles comprising both BMC and GBF tools, thus exploiting the complementary advantages of these two approaches. We call such ensembles EBF.

A major hindrance to the use of EBF ensembles is the current lack of mature open-source GBF tools that support concurrent testing. For this reason, we first propose our own implementation of state-of-the-art concurrency-aware fuzzing techniques, and make our GBF tool publicly available. Then, we combine our GBF tool with a large variety of state-of-the-art BMC tools, and show that the EBF ensembles so created can find up to 14.9% more concurrency vulnerabilities than the BMC tools on their own. Furthermore, thanks to our GBF tool, we are able to discover a data race vulnerability in the open-source wolfMQtt library.

Overall, we demonstrate that EBF is an effective technique for finding vulnerabilities in concurrent programs. Still, the capability of each ensemble is directly related to the complementary qualities of its BMC and GBF building blocks. As a consequence, we believe that improving and specialising each of the two ensemble components is the most promising direction for future works. More in detail, we need faster BMC tools that rely on rougher approximations of the program under test, in order to produce a larger number of meaningful counterexamples that the GBF tool can exploit as seeds.

APPENDIX A

HARNESSING FUNCTION

Evaluating the SV-COMP 2022 benchmarks [45] requires specific functions that must be supported by every tool participating in the competition. As the result, we model some functions for non-determinism and synchronization. The non-determinism is used to get the value of the input from the fuzzer. The synchronization is implemented using a set of functions that guarantee atomicity (i.e., to ensure no thread interleavings during a block of instructions). In order to make AFL++ understand the SV-COMP specific semantics, we implement these functions as a run-time C library and link it with the benchmark at compilation time. We make the non-deterministic input functions to read the values from stdin (i.e., standard input) when AFL++ fuzzes the PUT. To support atomicity, we rely on functions EBF_atomic_begin and EBF_atomic_end described in Section IV-B.

APPENDIX B

COUNTER EXAMPLE EXTRACTION

EBF needs to convert the crash reports discussed in Section IV-C into GraphML-based format to allow automatic witness checkers to validate the produced witness by tracking the execution path leading to the reported bug [59]. This feature of EBF is utilized in two cases: 1) when our concurrency-aware GBF reports a bug, and/or 2) when the BMC engine produces a counterexample.
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