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Abstract—Side-channel attacks impose a serious threat to cryptographic algorithms, including widely employed ones, such as AES and RSA, taking advantage of the algorithm implementation in hardware or software to extract secret information via timing and/or power side-channels. Software masking is a software mitigation approach against power side-channel attacks, aiming at hiding the secret-revealing dependencies from the power footprint of a vulnerable implementation. However, this type of software mitigation often depends on general-purpose compilers, which do not preserve non-functional properties. Moreover, microarchitectural features, such as the memory bus and register reuse, may also reveal secret information. These abstractions are not visible at the high-level implementation of the program. Instead, they are decided at compile time. To remedy these problems, security engineers often sacrifice code efficiency by turning off compiler optimization and/or performing local, post-compilation transformations. This paper proposes Secure by Construction Code Generation (SecConCG), a constraint-based compiler approach that generates optimized yet secure code. SecConCG controls the quality of the mitigated program by efficiently searching the best possible low-level implementation according to a processor cost model. In our experiments with ten masked implementations on MIPS32 and ARM Cortex M0, SecConCG speeds up the generated code from 10% to 10x compared to non-optimized secure code at a small overhead of up to 7% compared to non-secure optimized code. For security and compiler researchers, this paper proposes a formal model to generate secure low-level code. For software engineers, SecConCG provides a practical approach to optimize code that preserves security properties.

Index Terms—compilation, power side-channel attacks, code optimization, masking

I. INTRODUCTION

Cryptographic algorithms, symmetric/shared key or asymmetric/private key ones, rely on safeguarding the shared secret key or the private key, respectively. The exposure of these keys to unintended users compromises the security of these algorithms. Unfortunately, the software implementation of cryptographic algorithms may reveal information about their secret/private keys [1]. In particular, the attacker may observe what is termed side-channel information, notably observing the execution time [1] or the power consumption [2, 3]. during the execution of the algorithm to extract information about the secret keys. These attacks are attractive especially as they usually do not require expensive equipment.

Software masking is a widely-used approach to mitigate power side-channel attacks [4, 5], hiding secret information by splitting a secret into $n$ randomized shares. The attacker has to retrieve all shares in order to acquire the secret value. While software masking can be an effective mitigation, it can be invalidated by compiler code generation. Moreover, some of the leakage sources, such as register reuse or memory access, are decided at compile time by low-level transformations [6, 7, 8].

To mitigate these compiler-induced side-channel leaks at the binary level there are techniques based on compilation [7, 9, 10] and binary rewriting with hardware emulation [11, 12]. All these approaches mitigate compiler-generated leakages using local transformations [7, 11]. The methods that depend on hardware emulation are typically accurate but introduce significant overhead [11]. In particular, Rosita [11], an emulation-based approach, propose a mitigation that introduces an overhead of 24% to 64%. Wang et al. [7] perform their mitigation using a standard compiler with no optimizations (-O0). This is a common practice for security research to ensure the absence of compiler-induced mitigation invalidation [6, 13]. However, unoptimized code is highly inefficient. Moreover, unoptimized code may introduce additional leaks due to the heavy use of the program stack, as discussed in Section [7].

There are also approaches for secure optimization of code at a higher level [14, 15]. These approaches apply high-level compiler optimizations by disallowing secure-code removal and operand reordering (due to associativity of some operations). However, their high-level nature does not allow them to handle low-level leaks related to register reuse and instruction order.

The state-of-the-art approaches do not generate code that is both efficient and secure in the face of side-channel attacks. To address this challenge, this paper proposes Secure by Construction Code Generation (SecConCG), an optimizing compiler approach that provably preserves security properties. At the frontend, SecConCG handles code generated
using register promotion as a high-level optimization. Then, SecConCG uses a constraint-based method to generate code that is secure. SecConCG controls the quality of the mitigated program by efficiently searching the best possible low-level implementation according to a processor cost model [15]. The security model of SecConCG is hardware agnostic and can be extended with additional architectural constraints. In our experiments with ten masked implementations on MIPS32 and ARM Cortex M0, SecConCG improves the execution time of the generated code from 10% to a speedup of 10x compared to non-optimized secure code at a small overhead of up to 7% compared to non-secure optimized code. In summary, this paper makes the following contributions:

- a compiler approach to generate leak-free, low-overhead assembly code for high-level software-masked programs;
- a constraint model for optimized, secure code generation;
- a proof that the constraint model guarantees the generation of secure code for a non-trivial leakage model; and
- experimental results on two architectures showing that the overhead of our mitigation is low and its efficiency benefits are significant compared to current approaches.

II. Motivating Example

We consider an example of a first-order masked implementation to motivate our approach. First-order masking splits a secret value \( k \) into two shares, \((m, mk)\), where \( m \) is a uniformly distributed random variable sampled at every execution of the algorithm; \( mk = m \oplus k \) is also uniformly distributed (\( \oplus \) denotes the exclusive OR operation). Figure 1 shows a first-order masked C implementation of exclusive OR, where \( key \) is a secret value, \( mask \) is a uniformly random variable, and \( pub \) is a non-secret value. At line 2, the algorithm creates the second share, \( mk \), and at line 3, it performs the exclusive OR operation with the secret-independent value, \( pub \). At a high-level, the code of Figure 1 is secure but a binary implementation generated by a standard, security-unaware compiler may leak information about \( key \). For example, hardware-register reuse and memory-bus access may reveal secret information [7, 11, 6, 8]. These leaks are a result of transitional effects, i.e., the power effect of bits switching between one and zero.

Figure 3a shows the ARM Cortex M0 assembly code generated by the standard compiler LLVM [16] for the C code in Figure 1. The first three \texttt{str} instructions store the function arguments that reside in registers \( r0-r2 \) to the stack (lines 3-5). Line 6 loads (\texttt{idr}) the value of \( rand \) from the stack into register \( r1 \). Line 7 performs the first exclusive OR (line 2 in Figure 1) and stores the result in register \( r1 \). Here, there is a transition for register \( r1 \) from value \( mask \) to \( mk \), which leaks the secret \( key \). Line 8 stores the content of \( r1 \) to the stack and the value of the memory bus that contains the \( mask \) at line 6 transitions to \( mk \). This leads to another leak due to the transitional effect in the memory bus. The rest of the code performs the second exclusive OR (line 10) and stores the final result on the stack (line 11).

Figure 3b shows the mitigation produced by the security backend of SecConCG that eliminates leakages that appear in the LLVM unoptimized code. The mitigation is based on instruction scheduling and register allocation transformations. In particular, changing the order of operands at line 7 results in a transition from \texttt{sec to mk} that leaks the value of \( mask \), which is not secret. Changing the order of the instructions hides the memory-bus leakage. More specifically, because there are no data dependencies between lines 3-6, the \texttt{idr} instruction that causes the leak in Figure 3a may be scheduled earlier (line 4 in Figure 3b). Then, another memory instruction that stores the secret value in memory (line 6 in Figure 3b) is scheduled just before the store instruction at line 8. This causes a transition from \texttt{sec to mk} in the memory bus that leaks the value of \( mask \). These transformations are global, considering possible available memory instructions and register assignments to mitigate transitional leakages without introducing any overhead.

However, unoptimized code leads to poor performance. In general, compiler optimizations may invalidate high-level software mitigations [13]. Fortunately, this is not the case for register promotion (\texttt{mem2reg} in LLVM), a simple high-level optimization that enables efficient register allocation by promoting program variables from memory to registers. The register promotion optimization preserves the instruction ordering and does not remove any redundant operations. Equipped with improved high-level code, the SecConCG backend optimizes low-level transformations and generates optimized code. Figures 2a and 2b show the code of Figure 1 compiled with register promotion. Figure 2a leaks the same secret information as Figure 3a due to register reuse, namely the first exclusive OR operation \( eors \), but contains no memory-bus secret leak. To mitigate the register-reuse leak at line 2, SecConCG changes the order of the arguments and the result is now stored in register \( r2 \).

As we see in Figure 3a, unoptimized code may introduce additional leaks due to the heavy use of the program stack. Instead, SecConCG uses register promotion to remove unnecessary memory accesses that may cause additional leaks. Then, SecConCG’s backend generates low-level optimized code that does not leak secret information and does not introduce significant overhead.

III. Threat Model and Modeling Background

This section describes the Hamming Distance (HD) model (Section III-A), the threat model (Section III-B), an HD-based type-inference algorithm (Section III-C), a constraint-based compiler backend model (Section III-D), and the running example for the constraint-based compiler backend (Section III-E).

A. Hamming-Distance Model

The Hamming Weight (HW) model [17, 2, 18] corresponds to the number of active bits in a data word. We assume the following encoding of the binary data, \( d = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} 2^i d_i \), where \( d_i \) is one if the \( i_{th} \) bit of an N-bit word is set and zero.
otherwise. The HW of this data is the number of bits that are set: $HW(d) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} d_i$. The HD leakage model assumes that the observed leakage when flipping the bits of a memory element from a value $d_1$ to a value $d_2$ is $HW(d_1 \oplus d_2)$, where $\oplus$ denotes the exclusive OR operation. If one of the values $d_1$ is a uniform random variable, then $d_1 \oplus d_2$ is also a uniform random variable and $HW(d_1 \oplus d_2)$ has the same mean and variance as $HW(d_1)$ \[\text{[18]}\]. This means that by masking (exclusive bitwise OR) a secret value $k$ with a uniform random variable $m$, the HD of the new variable has the same mean and variance as $m$. In this way, masking hides the information of $k$ from the power consumption traces.

We assume a program $P(IN) = i_1; i_2; \ldots; i_n$ that takes as input a set of variables IN and consists of a sequence of $n$ instructions $i_j$. We assume that the program has a leakage at every execution step when there is bit flipping in the hardware registers or the memory bus. We represent the leakage as a set of observations in the power trace. To calculate the observed leakage $L(P(IN))$ for an instance $IN$ of the input variables, we use the HD leakage model. We write $P = P'; i_n$ to denote a program $P = i_1; i_2; \ldots; i_{n-1}; i_n$, with a prefix $P' = i_1; i_2; \ldots; i_{n-1}$ ($IN$ is omitted for simplicity).

Equations [16] present the leakage model. In the formulas, an expression $e$ is $e := r \mid bop(e_1, e_2) \mid uop(e_1) \mid mem(e_a, e)$, where $r$ is a register, $bop$ is a binary operation, $uop$ is a unary operation, and $mem(e_a, e)$ is a memory load operation accessing address $e_a$ with data $e$. An instruction is $i = r \leftarrow e \mid mem(e_1, e_2)$, where $r \leftarrow e$ denotes that an expression is assigned to register $r$, and $mem(e_a, e)$ is a store memory operation. Equation [1] describes the leakage when two instructions write the value of their result to the same register and no other instruction between them writes to the same register. Note that the first equation deals also with instructions in the form $r \leftarrow bop(r, r')$, where $bop$ is a binary operation. These two-address instructions are common in ARM Thumb and x86 architectures. Equation [2] describes the leakage of a memory instruction that writes a value to the memory, given that another memory instructions precedes this memory instruction. Equation [3] describes the leakage when a memory instruction loads a value from memory to a register. Here, we have two leaked values, one from the memory bus and one from the register reuse. Finally, Equations [4] describe the leakage when no (known) preceding operations write to the same register or use the memory bus.

### B. Threat Model

We assume that the attacker has access to the software implementation and the public data but not the secret data. The goal of the attacker is to extract information about the secret data, by measuring the power consumption of the device that the code runs on. The attacker may accumulate a number of traces and perform statistical analysis, such as Differential Power Analysis (DPA) [2]. At every execution, new random values are generated and the attacker has no knowledge of the values of these variables. Our goal is to eliminate any statistical dependencies between the secret data and the measured power traces.

---

### C. Implementation Details

#### Fig. 1: Masked exclusive OR implementation in C

```c
1 u32 Xor(u32 pub, u32 mask, u32 key) {
2  u32 mk = mask ^ key;
3  u32 t = pub ^ mk;
4  return t;
5 }
```

#### Fig. 2: Compilation of function Xor applying register promotion

(a) Insecure (LLVM)

```c
1 @ r0: public, r1: random, r2: secret
2  eors r1, r2
3  eors r0, r1
4  eors r2, r1
5
```

(b) Secure (SecConCG)

```c
1 @ r0: public, r1: random, r2: secret
2  eors r1, r2
3  eors r0, r1
4  eors r2, r1
5
```

#### Fig. 3: Compilation of function Xor with no optimizations

(a) Insecure (LLVM)

```c
1 @ r0: public, r1: random, r2: secret
2  eors r1, r2
3  eors r0, r1
4  eors r2, r1
5
```

(b) Secure (SecConCG with no register promotion)

```c
1 @ r0: public, r1: random, r2: secret
2  eors r1, r2
3  eors r0, r1
4  eors r2, r1
5
```
Symbolic execution is accurate but has scalability issues when used with the help of Satisfiability Modulo Theory (SMT) solvers. Symbolic execution executes different paths of a program symbolically and verifies or invalidates specific properties of the program under analysis. In particular, they consider a hierarchy of three types based on the properties of the distribution they follow: uniformly random distribution, secret independent distribution, or finally unknown distribution. We define the Leakage Equivalence security condition for the generated programs as follows:

**Definition 1 (Leakage Equivalence).** Given a program \( P(IN) \) that has a set of secret input variables, \( IN_{sec} \subseteq IN \), a set of random input variables, \( IN_{rand} \subseteq IN \), and a set of public input variables, \( IN_{pub} \subseteq IN \). We assume two instances of the input variables, \( IN \) and \( IN' \). These two instances differ with regards to the set of secret variables \( IN_{sec} \) and \( IN'_{sec} \), i.e. for all public variables, \( \forall v \in IN_{pub} \) and \( \forall v' \in IN'_{pub} \), we have \( v \neq v' \). Let \( r \in IN_{rand} \) and \( r' \in IN'_{rand} \) be sampled from a uniform random distribution. Let \( L_p = L(P(IN)) \) and \( L'_p = L(P(IN')) \). Then, we say that a program is leakage equivalent if the distributions of the leakage of the two executions do not differ, i.e.

\[
\sum_{l \in L_p} E[l] = \sum_{l' \in L'_p} E[l'] \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{l \in L_p} Var(l) = \sum_{l' \in L'_p} Var(l'),
\]

where \( E[l] \) and \( Var(l) \) are \( l \)'s expected value and variance.

C. HD-based Vulnerability Detection

In our approach, we need a technique to analyze whether two values leak secret information or not. There are different ways to identify whether there is a leak at some part of the code. One approach is to use symbolic execution \([6, 3]\). Symbolic execution executes different paths of a program symbolically and verifies or invalidates specific properties with the help of Satisfiability Modulo Theory (SMT) solvers. Symbolic execution is accurate but has scalability issues when the number of problem variables or program paths increases. On the other end, type-based approaches are typically efficient but at the price of accuracy. \([7]\) propose a type-inference algorithm to infer security types to the variables of the program under analysis. In particular, they consider a hierarchy of three types based on the properties of the distribution they follow: uniformly random distribution, secret independent distribution, or finally unknown distribution. We call these, Random, Public, and Secret, respectively. The type-inference algorithm assigns a type to each program variable. To infer the program variable types, \([7]\) define a logic model and solve it using an SMT solver. The complexity of this approach is low compared to symbolic execution, at the price of lower accuracy. However, the accuracy is sufficient for loop-free, linearized programs, such as many masked implementation \([7]\). Because of this, our approach uses type-inference analysis, adapted with some accuracy improvements (see Appendix, Section [4]).

D. Constraint-based Compiler Backend

A compiler backend performs three main low-level transformations to optimize and generate low-level code: instruction selection, instruction scheduling, and register allocation. A combinatorial compiler backend \([15, 19, 20]\) uses combinatorial solving techniques to optimize software using the aforementioned transformations. Different approaches may implement one or more low-level transformations. This section focuses on Constraint Programming (CP) \([21]\) as a combinatorial solving technique.

1) Constraint Model: The constraint-based compiler backend generates a constraint model that captures the program semantics, the low-level compiler transformations, and the hardware architecture. This paper focuses on two compiler transformations, register allocation and instruction scheduling, that are crucial for our mitigation. The backend can...
be modeled as a Constraint Optimization Problem (COP), \( P = (V, U, C, O) \), where \( V \) is the set of decision variables of the problem, \( U \) is the domain of these variables, \( C \) is the set of constraints among the variables, and \( O \) is the objective function. A constraint-based backend aims at minimizing \( O \), which typically models the code’s execution time or size.

A program is modeled as a set of basic blocks \( B \), pieces of code with no branches apart from their entry and exit. Each block contains a number of optional operations, \( o \in Operations \), that may be active or not. The set of hardware instructions that implement operation \( o \) is denoted by \( Ins_o \). Each operation includes a number of operands \( p \in Operands \), each of which may be implemented by different, equally-valued temporaries, \( t \in Temps \). Temporaries are either not live or assigned to a hardware register.

Figure 4 shows a simplified version of the constraint-based compiler backend model for Figure 1. Temporaries \( t0, t1, \) and \( t2 \) contain the input arguments \( pub, mask, \) and \( key \), respectively. Copy operations \( o2, o3, o4, o6, o8 \) enable copying program values from one register to another and are critical for providing flexibility in register allocation. For example, \( o2 \), allows the copy of the value \( pub \) from \( t0 \) to \( t3 \). However, in the final solution, a copy operation may not be active (shown by the dash in the set of instructions). The two \( \text{xor} \) operations \( o5, o7 \) take two operands each, and each of these operands can in its turn use different but equally-valued temporary variables, e.g. \( t1 \) and \( t4 \).

Figure 5 shows a valid solution to the register allocation of the previous example. All copy operations are deactivated and \( t0, t1, \) and \( t2 \) are assigned to registers \( R0, R1, R2 \). Temporary \( t6 \) is assigned to \( R1 \) and temporary \( t8 \) is assigned to \( R0 \). This register assignment is problematic because it induces a transition in register \( R1 \) from the initial value that holds the mask to the masked value \( mask \oplus key \), which leads to a leakage \( L(R1 \leftarrow \text{rand}; R1 \leftarrow \text{rand} \oplus \text{sec}) = \{HW(mask \oplus (mask \oplus key))\} = \{HW(key)\} \) that leaks information about \( key \).

The model of instruction scheduling assigns issue cycles to each operation. This assignment imposes an ordering of the operation and is constrained by the program semantics. For example, in Figure 4, scheduling \( o6 \) before \( o5 \) is not allowed because \( o6 \) depends on \( o5 \) but scheduling \( o4 \) before \( o3 \) is possible. In Figure 3b, the store instruction at line 6 leads to a leakage \( \text{E} \), which typically models the code’s execution time or size.

The decision variables of the constraint problem are:

1. \( r(t) \in Regs_t, t \in Temps \) denotes the hardware register assigned to temporary \( t \);
2. \( a(o) \in [\text{false}, \text{true}], o \in Operations \) denotes whether operation \( o \) is active or not;
3. \( i(o) \in Ins_o, o \in Operations \) is the instruction that implements operation \( o \);
4. \( c(o) \in [0, \text{maxc}], o \in Operations \) is the cycle at which an operation \( o \) is scheduled, bounded by \( \text{maxc} \);
5. \( y(p) \in Temps_p, p \in Operands \) is the selected temporary among all possible temporaries for operand \( p \).

In addition to these, \( l(t) \in [\text{false}, \text{true}], t \in Temps \) represents whether a temporary is live or not, \( ls(t) \in [0, \text{maxc}], t \in Temps \) represents the cycle at which \( t \) becomes live, and \( le(t) \in [0, \text{maxc}], t \in Temps \) represents the last cycle at which \( t \) is live, with \( ls(t) > le(t) \). \( t \in Temps \). An important constraint of register allocation is that the register live ranges of a specific hardware register \( r_i \) do not overlap:

\[
\forall t_1, t_2 \in Temps . \ l(t_1) \land l(t_2) \land r(t_1) = r(t_2) \implies \begin{cases} \text{ls}(t_1) \geq \text{le}(t_2) \lor \text{ls}(t_2) \geq \text{le}(t_1). \end{cases} \tag{7}
\]

Moreover, when a temporary is live, its last live cycle \( (le) \) is strictly greater than its live start \( (ls) \):

\[
\forall t \in Temps . \ l(t) \implies \text{ls}(t) < \text{le}(t). \tag{8}
\]

2) Objective Function: A typical objective function of a constraint-based backend minimizes different metrics such as code size and execution time. These can be captured in a generic objective function that sums up the weighted cost of each basic block:

\[
\sum_{b \in B} \text{weight}(b) \cdot \text{cost}(b).
\]

The cost of each basic block consists of the cost of the specific implementation and is a variable, whereas weight is a constant value that represents the contribution of the specific basic block to the total cost.

E. Example in a Constraint-based Compiler Backend

Low-level transformations, like register allocation and instruction scheduling, affect the security of programs. Figure 6a shows the high-level masked implementation of exclusive OR in C (same as Figure 1). The code takes three inputs: \( p \) (a
SecConCG guarantees that no exposure of a secret value can take place during run-time, even when the attacker only observes the exclusive OR between the initial value and updated value of a hardware register. Using the register the attacker observes the exclusive OR between the initial value and updated value of a hardware register. According to the leakage model, the attacker observes the exclusive OR between the initial and updated value of a hardware register. Using the register allocation of Figure 6b, the leakage reveals information about the secret: HW(mk ⊕ k) = HW((m ⊕ k) ⊕ m) = HW(k). Value k is a secret value, and thus, a leak occurs.

A constraint-based compiler backend is able to generate all legal register assignments for a program. Figure 6c shows an alternative register allocation for function xor. Here, the result of mk is written in hardware register R2, giving a HD leakage HW(mk ⊕ k) = HW((m ⊕ k) ⊕ m) = HW(m). The leakage here corresponds to the value of m, which is not a sensitive value. In a similar way, instruction scheduling may be able to remove leakages as seen in Figure 3. By changing the schedule of the instructions, the model is often able to generate a secure solution with no code quality overhead.

This example shows that low-level transformations can be responsible for the introduction of HD vulnerabilities and have thus to be taken into account to provide effective mitigations.

IV. SecConCG

SecConCG is a constraint-based optimizing secure compiler, i.e. it extends a constraint-based compiler backend with security constraints. It takes two inputs: 1) a C or C++ program, and 2) a security policy denoting which variables are Secret, Random, or Public. SecConCG performs a security analysis (see Section III-C). The results are used to impose constraints that prevent HD vulnerabilities. Given the secure model, the approach generates an optimized solution.

Section IV-A presents the security analysis. Section IV-B presents the secure constraint model that extends the constraint-based compiler backend.

A. Security Analysis

SecConCG performs a security analysis to extract the security types of each program variable and, subsequently, generates constraints that prohibit insecure low-level implementations. The security analysis identifies the security type (Random, Public, or Secret) of each intermediate variable. In the compiler constraint model, the program variables are the input operands and the result of each operation. Each operand can use a number of alternative temporary values \( t \in Temps \) and each temporary value is assigned to a register (see Section III-D). The type-inference rules do not handle such program constructs. However, cryptographic implementations that are free from power-side channels are often linearizable [7].

The security analysis uses a type-inference algorithm based on Wang et al. [7]. We extend this algorithm with additional definitions that improve the accuracy of the type inference (Section A). At the end of the analysis, all temporary variables have an inferred type. Figure 8 shows the inferred security types for each of the temporaries in our running example. Temporaries \( t_0 \) and \( t_3 \) are Public, \( t_2 \) and \( t_5 \) are Secret, and \( t_1, t_4 \) and \( t_6-t_{10} \) are Random.

The type-inference algorithm is conservative. Function \( type(t) : Temps \rightarrow \{R, S, P\} \) returns the type assigned to temporary variable \( t \). This section abbreviates the types as follows: type \( R \) corresponds to Random, \( S \) corresponds to Secret, and \( P \) corresponds to Public.

In the following, we define the data that the security analysis provides to the constraint model, which the latter requires to impose security constraints. According to the leakage model, when a hardware register changes from one value to another, the exclusive OR of the two values is exposed. \( Rpairs \) is the set of temporary variable pairs that when xor:ed together

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{u32 Xor(u32 p, u32 m, u32 k) } & \{ \\
\text{u32 mk = m ^ k; } & \\
\text{u32 rs = mk ^ p; } & \\
\text{return rs; } & \\
\} 
\end{align*}
\]

Fig. 6: The exclusive OR example, illustrating a HD vulnerability and alternative register assignments
reveal secret information:

\[ R_{pairs} = \{(t_1, t_2) \mid t_1 \in \text{Temps} \land t_2 \in \text{Temps} \land (\text{type}(t_1) \in \{R, P\}) \land (\text{type}(t_2) \in \{R, P\}) \land (\text{type}(t_1 \oplus t_2) = S)\}. \]

(9)

In the running example (Figure 8), \( R_{pairs} = \{(t_1, t_6), (t_1, t_7), (t_1, t_8), (t_1, t_9), (t_4, t_6), (t_4, t_7), (t_4, t_8), (t_4, t_9), (t_6, t_7), (t_6, t_8), (t_6, t_9), (t_7, t_8), (t_7, t_9), (t_8, t_9)\}\). For every pair of temporaries in \( R_{pairs} \), a constraint is added to prohibit their contiguous assignment to the same register (like \( m \) and \( mk \) in Figure 6b).

\( R_{pairs} \) do not consider secret values. Instead, if the type of a temporary variable \( t \) is \( \text{Secret} \), we impose a different constraint because the secret information will always result in a leak. In this case, we impose the constraint that another random variable should precede the definition of the secret variable to mask the secret information. \( S_{pairs} \) is a set of pairs, each of which consists of a secret temporary variable \( t \) and a set of random temporary variables \( ts \) that are able to hide the secret information, i.e. \( \forall t' \in ts \cdot \text{type}(t' \oplus t) = R \):

\[ S_{pairs} = \{(t, ts) \mid t \in \text{Temps} \land \text{type}(t) = S \land ts = \{t' \mid t' \in \text{Temps} \land \text{type}(t') = R \land \text{type}(t' \oplus t) = R\}\}. \]

(10)

In the example (Figure 8), \( S_{pairs} = \{(t_5, [t_4, t_6, t_7, t_8, t_9])\}\).

Memory operations may also reveal secret information. We assume the same leakage model (HD model) for the memory bus as for the register-reuse transitional effects. This means that the leakage corresponds to the exclusive OR of two subsequent memory operations. \( M_{pairs} \) includes the memory operations that result in memory-bus transitional leakage, i.e. if the sequence of this pair of memory operations when scheduled subsequently leads to a secret leakage.

\[ M_{pairs} = \{(o_1, o_2) \mid o_1 \in \text{MemOperations} \land o_2 \in \text{MemOperations} \land \text{type}(\text{tm}(o_1)) = \{R, P\} \land \text{type}(\text{tm}(o_1)) = \{R, P\} \land \text{type}(\text{tm}(o_1) \oplus \text{tm}(o_2) = S)\}. \]

(11)

Here, \( \text{tm}(o) \in \text{Temps} \) is the temporary that corresponds to the memory data of the operation. In the example (Figure 8), \( M_{pairs} = \{(o_3, o_6), (o_3, o_8), (o_6, o_8)\} \), in case \( o_3, o_6, o_8 \) are memory spills. Note that Figure 8 does not include all copies for memory spilling as we would need to duplicate the copies for first storing and then loading the variables.

The same leakage as in the case when a secret value was written to a register applies here. If a memory operation stores/loads a secret value at/from the memory, a random memory operation that is able to hide the secret information should precede this operation. \( M_{spairs} \) is a set of pairs, each of which consists of the memory operation that accesses secret data, \( o \), and a set of memory operations that access random data and are able to hide the secret information, i.e. \( \text{type}(\text{tm}(o') \oplus \text{tm}(o)) = R \):

\[ M_{spairs} = \{(o, os) \mid o \in \text{MemOperations} \land \text{type}(\text{tm}(o)) = S \land os = \{o' \mid o' \in \text{MemOperations} \land \text{type}(\text{tm}(o')) = R \land \text{type}(\text{tm}(o') \oplus \text{tm}(o)) = R\}. \]

(12)

In the example (Figure 8), \( M_{spairs} = \{(o_4, [o_3, o_6, o_8])\} \), in case \( o_4, o_3, o_6, o_8 \) is spilled in memory.

The security analysis provides \( R_{pairs} \), \( S_{pairs} \), \( M_{pairs} \), and \( M_{spairs} \) to the constraint model, which enables constraining code generation to generate secure implementations.

**B. Constraint Model**

The constraint model takes as input the four sets computed by the security analysis (\( R_{pairs} \), \( S_{pairs} \), \( M_{pairs} \), and \( M_{spairs} \)) and uses them to generate appropriate constraints that prohibit insecure solutions.
Predicate $\text{samereg}$ tells whether the two input temporaries are active ($l(t) = 1$) and are assigned to the same register.

$$\text{pred samereg}(t_1, t_2) :$$
$$l(t_1) \land l(t_2) \land (r(t_1) = r(t_2))$$

In Figure 5, constraint $\text{samereg}(t_0, t_8) = \text{true}$, $\text{samereg}(t_1, t_6) = \text{false}$, and $\text{samereg}(t_1, t_7) = \text{false}$ ($t_7$ is not live).

1) $\text{Rpairs}$ Constraints: The following constraint ensures that a pair of random (or public) temporaries in $\text{Rpairs}$ are either not assigned to the same register or they are not subsequent ($\text{subseq}$ constraint, defined in Section IV-B3).

$$\forall (t_1, t_2) \in \text{Rpairs}:$$
$$\neg \text{subseq}(t_1, t_2) \lor \neg \text{subseq}(t_2, t_1)$$

In Figure 5, this constraint is not satisfied for $t_2$ and $t_6$.

2) $\text{Spairs}$ Constraints: The following constraint ensures that for each pair $(t_s, t_{rs}) \in \text{Spairs}$, one of the random temporaries $t_r \in t_{rs}$ precedes the secret temporary $t_s$ and another random temporary succeeds $t_s$, if $t_s$ is live.

$$\forall (t_s, t_{rs}) \in \text{Spairs}:$$
$$\exists t_r \in t_{rs}:$$
$$l(t_s) \Rightarrow (l(t_r) \land \text{subseq}(t_r, t_s))$$
$$\lor$$
$$\exists t_r \in t_{rs}:$$
$$l(t_s) \Rightarrow (l(t_r) \land \text{subseq}(t_s, t_r))$$

Figure 9 shows a solution to the model in Figure 4 where both the $\text{Rpairs}$ and the $\text{Spairs}$ constraints are satisfied.

3) $\text{Mpairs}$ Constraints: The following constraint ensures that a pair of non-secret memory operations in $\text{Mpairs}$, are either not active or not subsequent memory operations ($\text{msubseq}$ constraint). Constraint $\text{msubseq}$ (defined in Section IV-B5) is similar to $\text{subseq}$ but considers consecutive memory operations instead of temporaries.

$$\forall (o_1, o_2) \in \text{Mpairs}:$$
$$a(o_1) \land a(o_2) \Rightarrow$$
$$\neg \text{msubseq}(o_1, o_2) \land \neg \text{msubseq}(o_2, o_1)$$

4) $\text{Mspar}$ Constraints: Finally, the following constraint ensures that for each pair $(o_s, o_{rs}) \in \text{Mspar}$ a random memory operation $o_r \in o_{rs}$ precedes the secret-dependent memory operation $o_s$.

This constraint works similarly as the register equivalent, where instead of register operations, we have memory operations. In particular, we need to have memory spilling, i.e. store to the stack, and then load from the stack (only one of the operations is shown in Figure 9).

5) Modeling $\text{subseq}$: To define the $\text{subseq}$ constraint, we first define an auxiliary predicate $\text{is_before}$ and a set of auxiliary problem variables $l_k$. Predicate $\text{is_before}(t_1, t_2)$ tells whether $t_1$ is assigned to the same register as $t_2$ and $t_1$’s life range ends ($l(t_1)$) before the beginning of the life range of $t_2$ ($l(t_2)$).

$$\text{pred is_before}(t_1, t_2):$$
$$\text{same_reg}(t_2, t_1) \land$$
$$l(t_2) \leq l(t_1)$$

Variable $l_k(t)$ captures the end live cycle of the temporary that occupied the same register as $t$ ($r(t)$) before $t$ was assigned. If $t' = l_k(t)$, then the values of $t$ and $t'$ result in a transitional effect that may reveal information to the attacker.

$$\forall t \in \text{Temps}:$$
$$l_k(t) = \max$$
$$\{\text{ite}(\text{is_before}(t', t), l(t'), 1);$$
$$\forall t' \in \text{Temps}\}$$

Then, the definition of the $\text{subseq}$ predicate is as follows:

$$\text{pred subseq}(t_1, t_2):$$
$$\text{samereg}(t_1, t_2) \land$$
$$l_k(t_2) = l(t_1)$$

**Theorem 1 (Subseq Constraint).** The subseq constraint is true only for pairs of temporary variables that are subsequently assigned to the same register:

$$\text{subseq}(t_1, t_2) \iff P = P'; t_1 \leftarrow e_1; P''; t_2 \leftarrow e_2; P''' \land r(t_1) = r(t_2) \land \forall i \in P'' . i = t \leftarrow e \Rightarrow r(t) \neq r(t_1).$$

**Proof.** ($\Leftarrow$) Assume $P = P'; t_1 \leftarrow e_1; P''; t_2 \leftarrow e_2; P''' \land r(t_1) = r(t_2) \land \forall i \in P'' . i = t \leftarrow e \Rightarrow r(t) \neq r(t_1).$ We consider all register assignments in $P$: $P = \ldots; t_i \leftarrow e_i; \ldots; t_1 \leftarrow e_1; t_2 \leftarrow e_2; \ldots; t_j \leftarrow e_j; \ldots$ all these assignments are live because they appear in the final program. For all assignments $t_j$ following $t_i$, we have that $l(t_j) > l(t_i)$, which implies that $\text{is_before}(t_j, t_i) = \text{false}$, and thus all $t_j$ contribute with -1 to max in $l_k(t_2)$. The same applies for all registers that are assigned to a different register, they contribute with -1 because $\text{is_before}(t_j, t_i) = \text{false}$. Then, $l_k(t_2) = \max(l(t)) | t \in \{t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_1\}$, where all $\{t_{i_1}, t_{i_2}, \ldots, t_1\}$ are assigned the same register, $r(t_2)$. Because these temporaries are assigned to the same register, their live ranges do not overlap (Equation 7), i.e. $\forall t, t' \in \{t_{i_1}, t_{i_2}, \ldots, t_1\} . l(t) \geq l(t') \lor l(t') \geq l(t)$. Because $t_1 \leftarrow e_1$ is scheduled last $\forall t \in \{t_{i_1}, t_{i_2}, \ldots, t_{i_n}, t_1\} . l(t_1) \geq$...
le(t). Also, from Equation \[8\] le(t_1) \geq ls(t_1). This implies that \(\forall t \in \{t_1, t_2, ..., t_n\}: le(t_1) > le(t)\), so we have \(lk(t_2) = le(t_1)\) and \(\forall t \in \{t_1, t_2, ..., t_n\}: lk(t_2) > le(t)\). Therefore only for \(t_1\), \(subseq(t_1, t_2) = true\).

(\(\Rightarrow\)) Assume \(subseq(t_1, t_2)\). This implies that \(sameq(t_1, t_2) \land lk(t_2) = le(t_1)\). Constraint \(sameq(t_1, t_2)\) implies that \(r(t_1) = r(t_2)\) and \(l(t_1) \land l(t_2)\), which means that they appear in the final code, \(P\), and are assigned to the same register. Because \(lk(t_2) = le(t_1)\), \(t_1\) is scheduled before \(t_2\) or \(P = P' \land t_1 \leftarrow e_1; P'' \land t_2 \leftarrow e_2; P''\). Now, we only need to prove that there is no other assignment of \(r(t_1)\) in \(P''\), i.e. \(\forall i \in P''\) \(t \leftarrow e \land r(t) \neq r(t_1)\). If \(\exists i \in P''\) \(t \leftarrow e \land r(t) = r(t_1)\), then, because live ranges do not overlap, \(le(t) > le(t_1)\), which means that \(lk(t_2) = le(t), \neq le(t_1)\), which is invalid. 

For the definition of \(msubseq\), we define an auxiliary predicate is\_before\_mem and auxiliary problem variables ok. Predicate is\_before\_mem \((o_1, o_2)\) tells whether \(o_1\) is scheduled before \(o_2\).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pred is\_before\_mem} & : \ a(o_1) \land (c(o_1) \leq c(o_2))
\end{align*}
\]

In Figure 9, \(is\_before\_mem(o_4, o_3)\) is true. Variable ok \((o)\) captures the issue cycle of memory operation \(o \in MemOperations\) that was issued before \(o\).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{forall o in MemOperations: ok(o) = max} & \{ \
\text{ite} \text{is\_before\_mem(o', o), c(o'), -1}\n\mid \text{forall o' in MemOperations}\} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Similar to predicate subseq, msubseq is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pred msubseq} & : \ a(o_1) \land a(o_2) \land ok(o_2) = c(o_1)
\end{align*}
\]

**Theorem 2** (Msubsec Constraint). The msubseq constraint is true only for those instructions that are subsequently accessing the memory: \(msubseq(o_1, o_2) \iff P = P' \land \text{mem} ; P'' \land \text{mem} ; P''' \land \exists i \in P'' : i = \text{mem}(e_i, e_3) \lor i = t \leftarrow \text{mem} (e'' , e_3), \text{where } i_{\text{mem}} \text{ and } i'_{\text{mem}} \text{ are memory operations, } i_{\text{mem}} = \text{mem}(e, e_1) \lor i_{\text{mem}} = \text{mem}(e, e_1) \text{ and } i'_{\text{mem}} = \text{mem}(e', e_2) \lor i'_{\text{mem}} = \text{mem}(e', e_2)\) and \(i_{\text{mem}} = \text{mem}(e, e_1)\) and \(i'_{\text{mem}} = \text{mem}(e', e_2)\).

Proof. Similar to Theorem 1

Theorem 3 shows that SecConCG generates secure code for our threat model.

**Theorem 3** (Secure Modeling). A program \(P\), generated by SecConCG, satisfies the leakage equivalence condition in Definition 7. This means that given two input instances \(IN\), \(IN'\) that differ only with regards to the secret variables, \(IN_{sec} \subseteq \forall IN', IN'_{sec} \subseteq \forall IN'\), the distributions of the leakages do not differ.

Proof. We assume that the type-inference algorithm overapproximates the actual distribution of each variable. Then, we perform structural induction on the program \(P\) to prove that security constraints we introduce lead to secure programs. The proof is available in the Appendix (Section B).
3) **Benchmarks:** To evaluate our approach, we use a set of small benchmark programs, up to 100 lines of C code, which were made available by [Wang et al.][7]. Table I provides a description of these benchmarks, including the number of lines of code (LoC), and the program variables, i.e. the input variables (IN) and the number of secret (IN_{sec}), public (IN_{pub}), and random (IN_{rand}) input variables. These benchmark programs constitute different masked implementations from previous work and are linearized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progr.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>LoC</th>
<th>Input Variables (IN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>Xor (Listing 1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>AES Shift Rows [6]</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Messengers Boolean [6]</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Goubin Boolean [6]</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>SecMultOpt_wires_1 [4]</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>SecMult_wires_1 [4]</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>SecMultiLinear_wires_1 [4]</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>CPRR13-lut_wires_1 [5]</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1 1 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>CPRR13-OptLUT_wires_1 [5]</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1 1 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>CPRR13-l_wires_1 [5]</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1 1 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE I:** Benchmark Description

### B. Optimality Overhead

SecConCG builds on a constraint-based compiler backend to generate a program that satisfies security constraints for software masking. This means that our approach might compromise some of the code quality of the non-mitigated code to mitigate the software masking leaks. To evaluate the overhead of our method compared to non-secure optimization, we compare the execution time of the optimized solution (optimal or suboptimal solution) that Unison [15] generates compared with SecConCG’s optimized and secure code. The overhead is computed as (cycles(SecConCG) – cycles(Unison))/cycles(Unison).

Table II shows the execution time for each of the benchmark programs and architectures. In particular, for each of the architectures, we compare the execution time in number of cycles of the solution that Unison produces against SecConCG’s solution. The final column shows the overhead of SecConCG compared to Unison.

The results show zero overhead for MIPS32, and a maximum 7% overhead in ARM Cortex M0. More specifically, ARM Cortex M0 has a non-zero overhead for programs P7-P9. The observed overhead in ARM Cortex M0 depends partially on the mitigation itself that may require redundant or non-optimal operations. However, the main reason for the overhead that appears in larger benchmarks is that the constraint model becomes larger compared to the original model due to the introduction of additional constraints and problem variables. This leads to an increase in the search space and hinders the constraint model to locate better solutions.

To summarize, SecConCG does not introduce significant overhead over the non-secure optimized solution that Unison generates. This means that in most cases, there is space for generating secure code without affecting the quality of the generated code.

### C. Execution-time Improvement

To evaluate the execution-time speedup of our approach, we compare SecConCG with the work by [Wang et al.][7]. Wang et al. perform vulnerability identification on non-optimized code from LLVM 3.6. This is a common approach by different security mitigations, because compilation passes might violate the security properties of a program. However, non-optimized code leads to high performance overhead.

We select the approach by [Wang et al.][7] as the baseline for the evaluation for three main reasons, 1) their tool is available freely, 2) they propose an architecture-agnostic approach that applies to both Mips and ARM, and 3) they mitigate transitional effect caused by register reuse, a subset of our mitigation. Table III compares the execution time in number of cycles (based on a LLVM-derived cost model) of the mitigated code by [Wang et al.][7] and SecConCG, for each of the programs and architectures. Speedup is computed as cycles(SecConCG)/cycles(Baseline).

For ARM Cortex M0, the improvement ranges from 8% for P8 to 83% for P1. We notice that for the smaller benchmarks, SecConCG achieves increased improvement over the baseline, whereas for the largest benchmarks P7-P9, the improvement is smaller. These results are consistent with the results in Section V-C, where the larger benchmarks, P7-P9, are not able to reach the same quality level as in the absence of the security constraints. The main reason for this, is the increased size of the program under analysis that consists of one large function. As future work, we plan to investigate decomposition techniques for better scalability.

For MIPS32, the improvement ranges from 75% to 10x speedup. The improvement is larger for smaller benchmarks due to the large overhead of load and store instructions that are present in the absence of optimizations in the baseline. In contrast to the non-optimized code, the code generated by SecConCG does not require memory spilling. In particular, the generic cost model for MIPS32 that we use (derived from LLVM) has a one cycle overhead compared to linear instructions. For larger programs, P7-P9, the speedup is still significant (>2x).

This experiment shows a clear difference between the two architectures with regards to the improvement over the baseline, with SecConCG achieving a larger improvement for MIPS32 than for ARM Cortex M0. There are two reasons for this difference. First, the load and store instructions in the timing model of ARM Cortex M0 do not introduce addition overhead (the actual latency of memory instructions may be higher depending on the specific hardware implementation). In contrast, The MIPS32 timing model adds one cycle overhead for every load instruction.

The second reason for this difference is the characteristics of each architecture. ARM Cortex M0 has twelve general-purpose registers, with only five of them non-callee-saved (the function does not have to preserve their previous results). MIPS32 has 32 general-purpose registers, from which more than 15 are non-callee-saved. This allows the constraint model
### Table II: Optimal solution with and without security constraints in cycles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>ARM Cortex M0</th>
<th>MIPS32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table III: Execution-time comparison between the non-optimized Baseline and SecConCG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>ARM Cortex M0</th>
<th>MIPS32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline [7]</td>
<td>SecConCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To select among multiple registers to assign to a temporary, avoiding non-secure register reuse. In addition to that, ARM Cortex M0 implements the Thumb instruction set, which contains many instructions, where one of the operands shares the same register as the result. This increases the complexity of the constraint model further.

To summarize, for both MIPS32 and ARM Cortex M0, SecConCG improves the non-optimized but secure baseline [7]. We notice a large improvement for MIPS32 ranging from 75% to 10x speedup and a smaller but still significant improvement for ARM Cortex M0 ranging from 10% to 83%. This observable difference in the improvement metric between MIPS32 and ARM Cortex M0 depends on architectural characteristics like the number of general-purpose registers, and other register allocation constraints.

### D. Threat to Validity

Our model considers the HD leakage model and generates code that mitigates these leakages. However, it is not certain that the removed vulnerabilities are observable by an attacker on a real device and that the mitigated program does not lead to further leakages in the actual hardware. For example, we do not handle transitional effects through value interaction in the pipeline stage registers. We leave further improvement of the hardware model as a future work.

SecConCG is not a verified compiler approach like CompCert [26]. Unison, the constraint-based backend that SecConCG depends on is based on a formal model that implements standard optimizations but the external solvers and the tool implementation are not verified. Different approaches attempt to verify solver global constraints.

### VI. Related Work

This section discusses related work in binary-code hardening against side-channel attacks, combinatorial compiler backends, and optimized security compilation approaches.

**Code Hardening Against Side-Channel Attacks:** Wang et al. [7] identify leaks in a masked implementation using a type system and perform local register allocation and instruction selection transformations to mitigate these leaks in LLVM. They identify transitional effects due to register reuse. Their approach is efficient because it allows the analysis of large linearized functions and the mitigation introduces small overhead. However, they depend on a non-optimized compilation in order to preserve the security properties of the high-level program, which leads to code generation of non-optimized but secure code.

Rosita [11] is a recent approach to mitigate transitional effects that may lead to power side-channel attacks using an emulation-based technique. Rosita performs an iterative process to identify power leakages in software implementations for ARM Cortex M0. Then, it identifies transitional effects due to register reuse, memory-bus access, and pipeline stage-register reuse. Rosita uses a more accurate model but introduces an overhead of 24% to 64%.

Other approaches perform mitigations at design time [28, 29, 30]. The availability of open hardware architectures and, more specifically, RISC-V, has enabled approaches, such as Coco, which apply software-hardware co-design techniques to mitigate power side-channel attacks [29].

Verified software against side channels is an active research topic. Zinzindohoué et al.'s [31] present HACL*, a cryptographic library in C that is verified for memory safety, mitigations against timing side-channels, and functional correctness.
with regards to a high-level specification. However, the output code is in C and the compilation procedure cannot guarantee the preservation of non-functional properties.

In summary, there are compiler-based and binary rewriting approaches to mitigate power-side channel attacks and timing attacks but none of these approaches is able to provide optimization properties for the result.

**Combinatorial Compiler Backend:** Compiler backend optimizations, like instruction selection, instruction scheduling, and register allocation are known to be hard combinatorial problems. Hence, solving such problems completely does not scale for large sizes. Therefore, popular compilers, like GCC [32] and LLVM [16], use heuristics that throughout the years have proved to improve program performance. However, these heuristics do not guarantee finding the optimal solution or the best solution to these backend optimizations.

For critical code and code aimed for compiler-demanding architectures, combinatorial methods may be able to find an optimized version of the code that may lead to reduced power consumption and/or high performance benefits. Different works [15, 19, 20] aim to optimize critical code at different levels, like loops [19], locally [20] or at function level [15]. The optimization goals range from execution time, code size, or estimated energy consumption [19, 15, 20]. The main drawback of these approaches is scalability. However, a recent work, Unison [15], allows the optimization of functions with almost 1000 instructions.

To summarize, many combinatorial compiler backend techniques allow low-level code optimization but, to our knowledge, none of them considers the preservation of security properties.

**Optimized Secure Compilation:** There is little work on secure optimized compilation. A recent approach [13, 14] deals with the problem that modern compilers do not guarantee preservation of security properties and optimization passes may invalidate security mitigations at the software level. Security developers have to either deactivate all optimizations (–O0 in GCC and LLVM) or use special techniques, like the use of volatile in C to forbid the compiler to optimize out a specific variable. However, both approaches increase the execution-time overhead of the security mitigations.

Vu et al. [13] build on LLVM and introduce the concept of opaque observations that disallows the compiler to remove security mitigations or rearrange operands in instructions, such as masking instructions. In their later work [14], they improve the performance of their optimizing compiler by reducing the requirement for serialization. To achieve this, they require source-code annotation that may be challenging for non-trivial programs [14].

Our approach, SecConCG considers a more fine-grained leakage model that involving information leakage through transitional effects. SecConCG does not restrict the compiler backend optimizations and does not require serialization because the constraint-based model is able to identify which instructions can be reordered to fulfill the security constraints. In addition to that, our approach does not require extensive source-level annotation but only the definition of security policy (secret, public, or random) for each input variable. However, Vu et al. are able to perform high-level optimizations, which is not in the scope of our approach.

To summarize, the work by Vu et al. deals with the same problem as our approach but at a different level of abstraction considering a weaker leakage model. We believe that the combination of these approaches could lead to more efficient secure code.

**VII. Discussion**

This paper proposes an architecture-agnostic method to generate high quality code against register-reuse and memory-bus transitional effects. We aim specifically at small-size embedded devices that have a predictable cost model and implement single-issued, non-speculative architectures. However, the current model does not protect against pipeline-register transitional effects or hardware implementation specific leakages. This is part of future work. In particular, we plan to extend our ARM Cortex M0 model, with additional constraints to enable a comparison with Rosita [11].

This paper proves that our model guarantees the absence of leakage based on the leakage model (Equations [16] and generates code that satisfies the leakage equivalence condition (Definition [1]). Currently, the verification of our results with different approaches is difficult because some tools are not available [6], while others [7] depend on the LLVM compiler internals.

**VIII. Conclusion and Future Work**

This paper proposes a constraint model to be embedded in a constraint-based compiler backend that allows the automatic generation of optimized code that is secure against power side-channel attacks. We prove that the generated code is secure according to a non-trivial leakage model, and show that our approach achieves high code improvement against non-optimized approaches ranging from 10% to a speedup of 10x for two embedded architectures, MIPS32 and ARM Cortex M0. At the same time, our approach introduces a maximum overhead of 7% from the optimal solution.

There are several future directions for our work. First, by improving the accuracy of the hardware model of SecConCG to model precisely a specific device, we will be able to improve the leakage model and compare our approach to approaches like Rosita [11]. A second direction of future work is to improve the scalability of SecConCG through decomposition. The challenge here is to find appropriate program points to split linearized code to different blocks. We also plan to extend our approach to other mitigations such as timing side channels of constant resource programs [9]. Finally, we believe that combining our approach with optimizing high-level approaches [13] can also be beneficial.
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algorithm by Wang et al. [7] due to its scalability compared with other approaches like symbolic execution [6]. This section describes the type inference algorithm starting with the definition of help functions. Although SecConCG uses multiple equivalent temporary (copy) values for each operation operand (see Figure 3), all definition use one temporary value \( t \). In reality, we unify these equivalent temporaries because they are semantically equal because they are just copies of the original program variables. In the following definition, the parts in bold denote the extensions to the origin type-inference algorithm [7].

The help function \( xor \), returns true if an expression only consists of exclusive OR operations. This function improves the precision of the type inference algorithm, when multiple exclusive OR operations remove the dependence on a secret value. The recursive definition of \( xor \) is as follows:

\[
xor(t_0) = \begin{cases} 
  \text{true} & \text{if } t_0 \in IN \\
  xor(t_1) & \text{if } t_0 = uop(t_1) \\
  xor(t_1) \land xor(t_2) & \text{if } t_0 = \oplus(t_1, t_2) \\
  \text{false} & \text{if } t_0 = bop(t_1, t_2), bop \neq \oplus 
\end{cases}
\]

Help function \( \text{supp} \) returns the support of each expression. That is, all the variables that are syntactically present in the expression. We add two cases for \( \text{supp} \), where some of syntactically present values are removed in the case of a simplification. This improves the precision of the analysis, because the type inference algorithm uses \( \text{supp} \) to decide on the type of a temporary variable. The recursive definition of \( \text{supp} \) is:

\[
\text{supp}(t_0) = \begin{cases} 
  \{t_0\} & \text{if } t_0 \in IN \\
  \text{supp}(t_1) & \text{if } t_0 = uop(t_1) \\
  (\text{supp}(t_1) \cup \text{supp}(t_2)) \setminus \{t_0\} & \text{if } t_0 = \oplus(t_1, t_2) \\
  (\text{supp}(t_1) \cap \text{supp}(t_2)) & \text{if } t_0 = bop(t_1, t_2) \\
  \text{supp}(t_1) \cup \text{supp}(t_2) & \text{if } t_0 = rand \in IN \setminus \{t_0\} \\
\end{cases}
\]

Help function \( \text{unq} \) returns the random input variables that appear only once in the expression. This means that if we have a binary operator \( bop \), with two operands \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \) then, if both operands are randomized with the same random value, then this random value cannot randomize the expression \( t_0 \). The recursive definition of \( \text{unq} \) is:

\[
\text{unq}(t_0) = \begin{cases} 
  \{t_0\} & \text{if } t_0 \in IN_{rand} \\
  \emptyset & \text{if } t_0 \in IN \setminus IN_{rand} \\
  \text{unq}(t_1) & \text{if } t_0 = uop(t_1) \\
  (\text{unq}(t_1) \cup \text{unq}(t_2)) \setminus \{t_0\} & \text{if } t_0 = \oplus(t_1, t_2) \\
  (\text{supp}(t_1) \cap \text{supp}(t_2)) & \text{if } t_0 = bop(t_1, t_2) \\
\end{cases}
\]
The last help function is $dom$ [7]. For each temporary 
variable $dom$ returns the random input variables that are xor-ed 
with that value. The recursive definition of $dom$ is:

$$
dom(t_0) = \begin{cases} 
\{t_0\} & \text{if } t_0 \in IN_{rand} \\
\{\} & \text{if } t_0 \in IN \setminus IN_{rand} \\
\text{dom}(t_1) & \text{if } t_0 = \text{uop}(t_1) \\
(dom(t_1) \cup dom(t_2)) & \text{if } t_0 = \oplus(t_1, t_2) \\
\{\} & \text{if } t_0 = \text{bop}(t_1, t_2) \land \text{bop} \neq \oplus 
\end{cases}$$

Finally, Figure [10] presents the type system. The first nine 
rules are described by [Wang et al. 12] and the rest of the 
rules are discussed in the same paper. Here, for space 
reasons, we have abbreviated Random to Rand, Public to Pub, and 
Secret to Sec. In particular, the first two rules are the basic 
rules, i.e. 1) if $dom$ for an expression contains a value, then, 
this temporary has type Rand, and 2) if the type is not Rand 
and the expression does not depend on secret values, then 
the expression has type Pub. The rest of the rules improve 
the precision of the analysis.

**APPENDIX B**

**SECURITY PROOF**

We assume that the type-inference algorithm [11] is 
conservative and sound. That is, if $type(t) = Rand$ this implies that 
t follows a uniform random distribution. If $type(t) = Pub$ this 
implies that $t$ follows a secret-independent distribution (might 
also be uniform random distribution). Finally, if $type(t) = Sec$ 
this implies that $t$ may be secret dependent.

SecConCG generates a solution to the constraint model, 
which we represent as an ordered sequence of instructions, 
$P = \{i_0, ..., i_n\}$. This means that instruction $i_j$ is executed 
before instruction $i_k$ for $j < k$.

To verify whether the generated program leaks secret 
information according to our leakage model (Equations [10]), 
we give a proof of Theorem [4] using structural induction on a 
magnified program, $P$. We start from the last instruction 
because preceding instructions are able to hide the secret values.

**Case 1** Assume $P = t \leftarrow e, e \neq \text{mem}(e_a, e')$.

**Case 1.a** Assume $type(e) \in \{Rand, Pub\}$.

From the leakage model (Equation [4]), we have 
$L(P(IN)) = \{HW(e)\}$. Because $type(e) \in \{Rand, Pub\}$, the distribution of $e$ is either random 
(uniformly distributed) or public, i.e. a constant value.

This means that the distribution is not dependent on the 
secret value. Thus, Definition [11] is satisfied.

**Case 1.b** Assume $type(e) = Sec$.

From the definition of Spairs (Equation [10]), $type(e) = type(t) = Sec \iff \exists(t_1, ts) \in \text{Spairs}, t_i = t \wedge ts = [t' | t' \in \text{Tempx} \wedge type(t') = Rand \wedge type(t' \oplus t) = Rand]$. In this case we have a pair $(t, \emptyset)$, and thus, 
constraint in Section [IV-B2] is not satisfied, because $\not \exists t_i \in \emptyset$. 
So, $P$ is not a valid program.

**Case 2** Assume $P = \text{mem}(e_a, e)$.

**Case 2.a** Assume $type(e) \in \{Rand, Pub\}$ From the leakage 
model (Equation [5]), we have $L(P(IN)) = \{HW(e)\}$. 
Because $type(e) \in \{Rand, Pub\}$, the distribution of $e$ is either random 
(uniformly distributed) or public, i.e. a constant value. 
This means that the distribution is not dependent.
on the secret value. Thus, Definition 1 is satisfied.

Case 2.b Assume type(e) = Sec.

From the definition of Mspairs (Equation 12), type(e) = Sec \(\Rightarrow \exists (o, os) \in\) Mspairs. tm(o) = e \(\land\) os = \{o’|o’ \in MemOperations \(\land\) type(tm(o’)) = Rand \(\land\) type(tm(o’) \(\oplus\) tm(o)) = Rand\}. In this case we have a pair \((o, \varnothing)\), and thus, the constraint in Section IV-B is not satisfied, because \(\not\exists o_t \in \varnothing\). So, \(P\) is not a valid program.

Case 3 Assume \(P = t \leftarrow \text{mem}(e_a, e)\).

Case 3.a Assume type(mem(e_a, e)) \in \{Rand, Pub\} \(\land\) e \in \{Rand, Pub\}.

From the leakage model (Equation 5), we have \(L(P(IN)) = \{HW(e), HW(\text{mem}(e_a, e))\}\). Similar with Case 1.a and Case 2.a, Definition 1 is satisfied.

Case 3.b Assume type(mem(e_a, e)) = Sec.

Analogous to Case 1.b

Case 3.c Assume e \in Sec.

Analogous to Case 2.b.

Case 4 Assume P = P’; t \leftarrow e, e \neq \text{mem}(e_a, e’).

Case 4.a Assume type(e) = Sec.

From the definition of Spairs (Equation 10), type(t) = type(t’ = Sec \(\Rightarrow \exists (t_r, ts) \in\) Spairs. \(t_r = t \land ts = [t’|t’ \in Temps \land type(t’ = Rand \land type(t’ + t = Rand)\).

From the Spairs constraint in Section IV-B, we have that \(\exists t_r \in ts. l(t) \Rightarrow l(t_r) \land \text{subseq}(t_r, t), t\). From Theorem 1 we have that \(\text{subseq}(t_r, t) \Rightarrow P = P’; t_r \leftarrow e_r; P’; t \leftarrow e \land r(t) = r(t_r) \land \forall i \leftarrow P’; i = t’ \leftarrow e’ \land r(t’ \neq r(t)\). According to the leakage model (Equations 1), \(L(P) = L(P’; t_r \leftarrow e_r; P’; t \leftarrow e \land r(t) = r(t_r) \land \forall i \leftarrow P’; i = t’ \leftarrow e’ \land r(t’ \neq r(t)\). This means that \(t_r + t\) has a uniform random distribution, and thus, \(HW(t_r + t)\) does not leak. From the induction hypothesis, \(\sum_{l \in L(P’)}\text{E}[l] = \sum_{l \in L(P’(IN))}\text{E}[l] + \sum_{l \in L(P’(IN))}\text{var}[l]\). Thus, \(\sum_{l \in L(P’)}\text{E}[l] = \sum_{l \in L(P’(IN))}\text{E}[l] + \sum_{l \in L(P’(IN))}\text{var}[l]\). Therefore, \(\sum_{l \in L(P’)}\text{E}[l] = \sum_{l \in L(P’(IN))}\text{E}[l] + HW(t_r + t) = \sum_{l \in L(P’(IN))}\text{E}[l] + HW(t \oplus t)\). This is the constraint in Section IV-B, and thus, Definition 1 is satisfied.

Case 4.b Assume type(e) \in \{Rand, Pub\}.

Case 4.b.i Assume type(t) = \{R, P\}. The leakage model is \(L(P) = L(P’; t_r \leftarrow e_r; P’; t \leftarrow e \land r(t) = r(t’).\) Of the temporaries assigned to the same register, we select the temporary that is scheduled last before \(t\), i.e. \(P = P’; t_r \leftarrow e_r; P’; t \leftarrow e \land r(t) = r(t’).\) From the induction hypothesis, \(\sum_{l \in L(P’)}\text{E}[l] = \sum_{l \in L(P’(IN))}\text{E}[l] + \sum_{l \in L(P’(IN))}\text{var}[l]\). Thus, \(\sum_{l \in L(P’)}\text{E}[l] = \sum_{l \in L(P’(IN))}\text{E}[l] + HW(t \oplus t) = \sum_{l \in L(P’(IN))}\text{E}[l] + HW(t \oplus t)\). This is the constraint in Section IV-B, and thus, Definition 1 is satisfied.

Case 4.b.ii Assume type(t) = \{R, P\}.

The leakage model is \(L(P) = L(P’; t_r \leftarrow e_r; P’; t \leftarrow e \land r(t) = r(t’).\). Of the temporaries assigned to the same register, we select the temporary that is scheduled last before \(t\), i.e. \(P = P’; t_r \leftarrow e_r; P’; t \leftarrow e \land r(t) = r(t’).\) From the induction hypothesis, \(\sum_{l \in L(P’)}\text{E}[l] = \sum_{l \in L(P’(IN))}\text{E}[l] + \sum_{l \in L(P’(IN))}\text{var}[l]\). Thus, \(\sum_{l \in L(P’)}\text{E}[l] = \sum_{l \in L(P’(IN))}\text{E}[l] + HW(t \oplus t) = \sum_{l \in L(P’(IN))}\text{E}[l] + HW(t \oplus t)\). This is the constraint in Section IV-B, and thus, Definition 1 is satisfied.

Case 5 Assume P = P’; mem(e, e’).

Case 5.a Assume type(e) = Sec.

Analogous to Case 4.a.

Case 5.b Assume type(e) \in \{Rand, Pub\}.

Analogous to Case 4.b.

Case 6 Assume P = P’; t \leftarrow mem(e, e’).

Analogous to Case 4 and Case 5.

APPENDIX C

IMPLIED CONSTRAINTS

To improve the solver ability to find solutions, we add additional constraints that are logically implied by the imposed constraints. Implied constraints often improve the solving procedure by reducing the search space through propagation.

The following implied constraint is specifically relevant to ARM Cortex M0 but also to architectures that use accumulator for many operations, such as x86 architectures. In particular this constraint implies that if a pair of temporaries in Rpairs belong to the same operation \(o_1\) then the two operands (destination and source) have to be assigned to different registers or the operation operands should change. If the source and destination operands have to be assigned to the same register (accumulator) then, the operands have to be inverted. The constraint is as follows:
forall \ (t_1, t_2) \ in \ Rpairs: 
- o = def_oper(t_1)
- if \ (o \in \ user_opers(t_2)):
  - \neg \ same_reg(t_1, t_2)

Another implied constraint is related to preassigned operands. Preassigned operands, are preassigned to a specific register because of special hardware architecture properties or calling conventions. For this, we add an additional implied constraint that guides the solver to try to schedule a different temporary if the two preassigned temporaries are not allowed to be subsequent, i.e. they belong to \( Rpairs \).

forall \ (t_1, t_2) \ in \ Rpairs: 
if \ (t_2 \in \ preassign \land t_1 \in \ preassign): 
  samereg(t_1, t_2) \implies \ ( 
    \text{\textbf{exists}} \ t \in \ Temps: \ subseq(t_1, t) \lor 
    \text{\textbf{subseq}(t, t_1))} \land 
    \text{\textbf{exists}} \ t \in \ Temps: \ subseq(t_2, t) \lor 
    \text{\textbf{subseq}(t, t_2))}