

From Input Coverage to Code Coverage: Systematically Covering Input Structure with k -Paths

NIKOLAS HAVRIKOV, CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Germany

ALEXANDER KAMPMANN, CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Germany

ANDREAS ZELLER, CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Germany

Grammar-based testing uses a given grammar to produce syntactically valid inputs. Intuitively, to cover program features, it is necessary to also cover input features. We present a measure of input coverage called k -path coverage, which takes into account the coverage of individual syntactic elements as well as their combinations up to a given depth k . A k -path coverage with $k = 1$ prescribes that all individual symbols be covered; k -path coverage with $k = 2$ dictates that all symbols in the context of all their parents be covered; and so on. Using the k -path measure, we make a number of contributions.

- (1) We provide an *algorithm for grammar-based production* that constructively covers a given k -path measure. In our evaluation, using k -path during production results in a significantly higher code coverage than state-of-the-art approaches that ignore input coverage.
- (2) We show on a selection of real-world subjects that coverage of input elements, as measured by k -path, *correlates with code coverage*. As a consequence, k -path coverage can also be used to predict code coverage.
- (3) We show that one can *learn associations between individual k -path features and coverage of specific locations*: “Method `distributive_rule()` is invoked whenever both `+` and `*` occur in an expression.” Developers can interpret these associations to create suitable inputs that focus on selected methods, or have tools generate inputs that immediately target these methods.

The above approaches have been implemented in the `TRIBBLE` and `CODEINE` prototypes, and evaluated on a number of processors for JSON, CSV, URLs, and Markdown. All tools and data are available as open source.

CCS Concepts: • **Software and its engineering** → **Software testing and debugging**; *Syntax*.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: test coverage, test generation, test selection

1 INTRODUCTION

Testing programs with randomly generated inputs, or “fuzzing”, is a cost-effective means to test programs for robustness: If a program has not been subjected to random inputs before, the chances are high that some input will cause the program to fail.

To reach deeper layers of a program though, inputs must be *syntactically valid* because invalid inputs would be rejected already during initial input processing. To this end, recent fuzzing approaches make use of *grammars* to specify the language of program inputs. A grammar-based test generator uses a grammar to expand a start symbol into further symbols (often selecting from alternatives), which it would repeatedly expand until only terminal symbols are left. For the grammar shown in Figure 1, for instance, the `Expr` start symbol may expand into an `AddExpr` and then a `MulTExpr`, which again may expand into a `UnaryExpr`, which would eventually become a string of digits.

While the concept of producing inputs from grammars is simple, practical applications face a number of problems.

Authors’ addresses: Nikolas Havrikov, nikolas.havrikov@cispa.de, CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Stuhlsatzenhaus 5, Saarbrücken, Germany, 66123; Alexander Kampmann, alexander.kampmann@cispa.de, CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Stuhlsatzenhaus 5, Saarbrücken, Germany, 66123; Andreas Zeller, zeller@cispa.de, CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Stuhlsatzenhaus 5, Saarbrücken, Germany, 66123.

```

Expr := AddExpr;
AddExpr := MultExpr
         | AddExpr ("+" | "-") MultExpr;
MultExpr := UnaryExpr
         | MultExpr ("*" | "/" | "%") UnaryExpr;
UnaryExpr := Identifier
         | "+" UnaryExpr
         | "-" UnaryExpr
         | "++" UnaryExpr
         | "--" UnaryExpr
         | "(" AddExpr ")"
         | DecDigits;
DecDigits := DecDigit+;
DecDigit := "0" | "1" | "2" | "3" | "4"
         | "5" | "6" | "7" | "8" | "9";
Identifier := "x" | "y" | "z";

```

Fig. 1. Grammar for JavaScript expressions (simplified).

- The first problem is *input coverage*. Intuitively, a high variation in the inputs (say, different JavaScript operators in our example) induces a high variation in program behavior. Conversely, if some specific element is not present in the input (say, "+"), the part of the code that is responsible for processing it will not be executed. It is therefore desirable to *cover* as many different input elements and productions as possible. However, we also want to cover their *combinations*, since some code may be triggered only given specific structures—say, specific operator combinations in Figure 1 that trigger term rewrite rules. Therefore, we need a *measure* of input coverage.
- The second problem is *code coverage*. We want to be able to target specific parts of the code—say, code that has recently changed, or is particularly critical. For this, we need to know under which *conditions* a particular location of the code is reached. For instance, assume the program under test has a method `distributive_rule()` that splits an expression of the form $a \times (b + c)$ into $a \times b + a \times c$ such that the subterms can be optimized individually. Reaching this method requires a specific combination of multiplication and addition operators to be present in the input.

Both problems are strongly related—because both require a means to characterize which input elements (and which combinations thereof) are present in the input. In this paper, we therefore introduce *k*-paths—a novel measure to characterize the presence of input elements and their combinations. Specifically, we make the following contributions:¹

A novel measure for grammar coverage. We introduce a novel measure for grammar coverage called *k*-paths, capturing whether an input covers individual input elements from a grammar or combinations of these elements. Its single parameter *k* controls the depth of the combinations to be covered— $k = 1$ implies coverage of all input elements, $k = 2$ coverage of all nested pairs of input elements, $k = 3$ coverage of all triples, and so on. The *k*-path

¹The concept of *k*-paths and the coverage-aware generation algorithm were originally published in our 2019 paper “Systematically Covering Input Structure” [44]. This article extends this conference publication by the association of grammar and code coverage, targeted fuzzing, and coverage prediction, which are all original contributions.

measure allows to systematically cover individual and structural input features, leading to systematic grammar-based test generation and association of code locations with specific input features.

A coverage-aware generation algorithm. We present a novel algorithm for input generation within a fuzzing campaign.

- The algorithm is *grammar-coverage aware*, systematically choosing expansion alternatives that lead to input elements not yet covered and thus fulfilling k -path requirements.
- The algorithm covers *combinations of elements*, controlled by the single parameter k —on Figure 1, for instance, it produces additions within multiplications, multiplications within additions, unary minuses within parentheses, and all combinations one would like to see when testing, e.g., an optimizing compiler.
- The algorithm restricts inputs from *growing beyond bounds*. If the number or depth of elements produced exceeds a certain threshold, the generation algorithm will always choose alternatives that eventually end in terminal symbols, thus ensuring a quick closure of production.

Grammar coverage implies code coverage. In our evaluation on JSON, CSV, URL, and Markdown subjects, we show that the algorithm is effective and surpasses the state of the art, especially as it comes to higher k values. Most notably, we find that k -path coverage strongly correlates with code coverage.

Associating grammar coverage and code coverage. Using a grammar as a parser allows to determine the k -paths of a given input and associate them with coverage of individual methods in the program under test. These associations can be *learned automatically*, resulting in a set of *classifiers* that model the relationship between input elements and resulting coverage. These associations are explicit, user-facing, and reusable. For example, for `distributive_rule()`, an associated feature could be the presence of an addition as part of a multiplication.

Targeted fuzzing. Using the above classifiers, we can specifically construct inputs that satisfy their conditions and thus are set to cover the method in question. A fuzzer can thus target individual methods without requiring guidance from the program, which is especially useful if executing the program is expensive.

Coverage prediction. The learned classifiers can take an arbitrary input (given or generated), parse it into its elements, and predict the code coverage from the input features only. This yields a very cost-effective method for selecting inputs that cover a particular method.

The concept of k -paths and the associated generation algorithms can be applied to all kinds of grammar-based testing, which in turn can be applied to any program whose input can be decomposed into sequences and hierarchies of individual elements—be it text inputs, user interactions, network events, or service invocations. If one were, for instance, to use k -path-based input generation with a grammar describing program settings, our approach would systematically produce a set of inputs that cover all pairs, triples, or other tuples of configuration settings. Likewise, if one were to use k -paths in a grammar describing valid sequences of user interactions as a basis for learning program behavior, one would obtain, for each method m in the program, the sequence of user interactions that lead to m being covered—and thus could directly fuzz m with targeted inputs.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give the necessary background on grammars, in Section 3 we leverage grammars to define a notion of grammar coverage using the k -path construct, upon which we base a systematic input generation algorithm in Section 4. We investigate how we can associate k -paths to code locations to enable code coverage prediction

```

Grammar := Production+;
Production := NonTerminal " := " Alternation ";";
Alternation := Concatenation (" | " Concatenation)*;
Concatenation := Atom+;
Atom := (" (" Alternation ") " | Literal | Reference) Quantifier?;
Quantifier := "?" | "+" | "*"
            | "{, " num "}"
            | "{ " num ", }"
            | "{ " num ", " num "}"

```

Fig. 2. A grammar for context-free grammars (excerpt).

and targeted input generation in Section 5. After discussing threats to validity (Section 6), we list related work in Section 7. Section 8 concludes and provides an outlook on future work.

2 GRAMMARS AND DERIVATIONS

In this work, we consider test generation based on *context-free grammars* [32]. We assume the reader is familiar with the concept of context-free grammars; for the purpose of precision, we introduce their syntax, semantics, and composition as used in this paper.

2.1 Composition

To name and define the individual elements of the grammars as used in this paper, we use—well—a grammar that describes their names and syntax. As detailed in Figure 2, a *grammar* consists of *productions*, each of which expands a *non-terminal* into an *alternation*. The grammar in Figure 1, for instance, has seven such productions, one for each non-terminal.

An alternation is a sequence of *alternatives* over non-empty sequences of *concatenations*. A concatenation consists of *atoms*, which can be parenthesized alternations, literals, or references (which serve to express non-terminals on the right side of a production). In Figure 1, an `AddExpr` non-terminal expands into either a `Mul tExpr`, or a concatenation of another `AddExpr`, or an operator (plus or minus) and a `Mul tExpr`.

Optional *quantifiers* allow to express that an atom can be repeated zero or once ([?]), once or more (⁺), or zero or more (^{*}) times; ^{n,m} indicates at least n repetitions and at most m repetitions. One can also write ^{n} for at least n repetitions and no upper limit, or ^{m} for zero to m repetitions. In Figure 1, `DecDigit s` is a non-empty sequence of `DecDigit` literals.

In the remainder of this paper we will collectively refer to references and literals as *symbols*. Additionally, we assume that all grammars have exactly one *start symbol*: a non-terminal which no reference refers to. In Figure 1 the start symbol is `Expr`, while in Figure 2 it is `Grammar`.

2.2 Graph Representation

A grammar can also be seen as a directed graph, to which we shall refer as the *grammar graph* of this grammar. Its nodes can be seen as manifestations of some of the grammar parts described in Figure 2, while its edges represent derivations. As an example, consider Figure 3, which shows an excerpt from the grammar graph, obtained from the grammar in Figure 1.

A grammar graph is constructed from the productions of a grammar by applying the following rules to their right-hand sides:

- (1) For each alternation, a synthetic alternation node $\textcircled{1}$ is created, whose children are the graph representations of its corresponding alternatives. If there is only one alternative, no node is created for the alternation, and its only alternative takes its place instead.
- (2) Analogously, concatenations become synthetic $\textcircled{\sim}$ nodes with their atoms as children, while handling single atoms as in the case of alternations.
- (3) Each quantifier becomes a dedicated node (e.g., $\textcircled{+}$), whose child is the graph representation of the atom the quantifier is attached to.
- (4) Literals become nodes with no children.
- (5) References to non-terminals become nodes that have as their child the graph representation of the production they refer to.
- (6) All nodes are assigned a unique numeric identifier. Some nodes are indistinguishable, because they belong to similar – but not identical – grammar elements. E.g., there could be more than one reference to the same non-terminal. The numeric identifiers are used to uniquely identify such cases.

Not unlike a tree, the resulting graph has a single “root” node corresponding to the right-hand side of the production of the grammar’s start symbol, that has no incoming edges, which lends the graph a familiar, tree-like appearance. We use $\text{root}(G)$ to refer to this node.

Possibly the most significant difference between the grammar graph and the textual grammar representation is the introduction of unique numeric identifiers to all nodes of the grammar. The addition of such a seemingly small technical detail enables us to distinguish between multiple occurrences of the same (symbolic) node in different contexts. As an example, consider the terminal “+” as it occurs in Figure 1. Without identifiers, we have no way to specify that we mean the binary “+” operator that occurs between the `AddExpr` and `MultExpr` as opposed to the unary “+” which precedes a `UnaryExpr`. Using the identifiers, we can easily differentiate between these cases by writing “+”₁₀ or “+”₂₇, respectively.

Additionally, because edges are directed, we can conveniently call the node at the start of an edge the *parent* node, and the one on the end the *child* node. However, very much unlike a tree, a grammar graph can have cycles because references can occur in multiple derivation rules. This is also the reason why nodes may have multiple parents. In Figure 3, the edges corresponding to such additional occurrences are marked as dashed lines, to leave the underlying tree-like structure clearly visible.

We refer to nodes corresponding to alternations, concatenations, and quantifiers as *synthetic* nodes, while all others are *symbolic* nodes. This serves to indicate the purpose of the nodes: While the symbolic nodes are parts of the textual representation of a grammar that were explicitly named by its creator, presumably a human, synthetic nodes only serve the purpose of orchestrating how the former relate to each other.

2.3 Derivation Trees

We can now lean on the model provided by the grammar graph whenever we parse or generate inputs. Hereby, we will not stray far from literature [23], which defines parse trees and derivation trees for the two use cases above, respectively. Since they only differ in naming and purpose, and, in fact, effectively describe the same structure, we will refer to them as derivation trees, for simplicity.

In the classical definition, a derivation tree represents the syntactic structure of an input according to a given grammar. Specifically in our case, derivation trees shall describe the structure according to the *graph* of a grammar. Thus, the nodes and edges that make up the derivation trees conveniently come from the same set as the nodes and edges in the graph of the grammar at hand. This definition




Fig. 3. An excerpt from the graph representation of the (partial) grammar from Figure 1. The root node is AddExpr_0 because it is the right-hand side of the production of the start non-terminal Expr . The backward dashed lines indicate derivations of references that prevent the graph from being a tree or even a DAG. Numeric identifiers are only shown for symbolic nodes.

provides us with the useful property that every path in a derivation tree is simultaneously also a path in its grammar graph.

As an example of a derivation tree, consider Figure 4, which shows the derivation tree for the input “x+42”, parsed according to the grammar from Figure 1, or, more accurately, its graph representation




Fig. 4. A derivation tree representing the input string “x+2” according to the grammar graph from Figure 3

as shown in Figure 3. Observe how it is perfectly valid for a derivation tree to contain multiple occurrences of the same node. This can happen if the derivation contains multiple references to the same non-terminal as is the case with the `UnaryExpr8` node, or when a quantification node has multiple occurrences of its subject, like the two `DecDigit42` nodes.

Further, we say that a tree node has numbered *slots*, which are said to be filled with their children:

Definition 2.1 (Slots). A slot is a tuple $(parent, child, index, depth)$, where *parent* is the node whose child this slot represents, *child* is the node that can fill the slot, *index* signifies the position of this child node among its siblings, and *depth* corresponds to the number of derivations from the root to the child node.

Informally, it may be helpful to think of slots simply as the edges in a derivation tree. We also say that the child node of a slot is its *expansion*.

3 GRAMMAR COVERAGE

When producing strings from a grammar, we want to *cover* individual features of the grammar. The intuition of coverage is that if some feature of the grammar is never exercised during testing,

```

DecDigit := S0;
S0 := "0" | S1;
S1 := "1" | S2;
S2 := "2" | S3;
...
S8 := "8" | S9;
S9 := "9";

```

Fig. 5. A deeply nested grammar, where a naive random generator will get “stuck” early. The chances of reaching the terminal “9” are very low in a uniform selection setting.

```

Identifier := Character | Character Identifier;
Character := ASCIICharacter | UnicodeCharacter;
ASCIICharacter := ASCIIUpper | ASCIILower | "_";

```

Fig. 6. An Identifier rule that is hard to cover fully (excerpt from a real JavaScript grammar.)

neither will the code be executed that processes this very feature; and if code is not executed, it cannot reveal faults during testing. In Figure 1, for instance, if the generated inputs miss out the “++” operator, we will not be able to exercise the associated code. In this section, we introduce grammar coverage as used in this paper.

3.1 Purdom’s Grammar Coverage

The concept of grammar coverage was introduced by Purdom [64]. He suggested that during generation, *uncovered production alternatives* would be preferred over covered production alternatives. Hence, in Figure 1, we would first expand `AddExpr` into the first alternative (`MultiExpr`), and the next time into the second alternative. Likewise, once we have covered the “+” alternative, we would go for the “-” alternative the next time. Over time, Purdom’s approach would cover all alternatives.

Unfortunately, there exist grammars for which neither random generation nor Purdom’s approach succeed in achieving coverage. This becomes apparent when we reformulate the `DecDigit` rules as shown in Figure 5. Now, the digits are no longer uniformly chosen and produced.

When choosing a `DecDigit` expansion using a naive random approach, the probability of generating a “0” is 0.5, the probability of generating a “1” is $(1 - 0.5) \times 0.5 = 0.25$, then it is $(1 - (1 - 0.5) \times 0.5) \times 0.5 = 0.125$ for a “2”, and so forth up to 0.000 976 562 5 or 1/1024 for a “9”.

Purdom’s approach helps a bit, but is far from perfect; in the first expansion of `S0`, it would mark “0” as covered, then expand `S1` the next time. However, after having both covered “0” and `S1`, it would no longer prefer one over the other, still yielding “0” in 50 % of expansions.

If Figure 5 feels a bit too artificially constructed, consider Figure 6, listing possible rules for identifiers in JavaScript. In this example, Purdom’s approach would quickly mark both `Identifier` alternatives as covered, leading to 50 % of identifiers consisting of one character only. In other words, our fuzzer would have no incentive to systematically cover identifier characters or their categories. The deeper the grammar, the greater the extent of this coverage problem.

3.2 k-path Coverage

To address the issues with Purdom’s coverage and to ensure overall effective and adequate grammar coverage, we introduce a *contextual* approach to grammar-based input generation that not only covers symbols individually, but also *in the context of other symbols*.

This is based on the intuition that some input elements have different meaning in different contexts, and programs may thus process them differently. For arithmetic expressions (Figure 1), for instance, it may be useful to test various combinations of AddExpr expressions within MultExpr expressions and vice versa because we could then cover program features like applying distributive laws.

In principle, one would like to see *all combinations* of symbols covered; however, this quickly leads to a combinatorial explosion. We thus introduce the notion of *k-path coverage*, which mandates that all unique *symbol paths* up to a length of k be covered.

Definition 3.1 (k-Path). Let x be a grammar graph or a derivation tree, and k a positive natural number. Then a k -path shall be a path in x , containing exactly k symbolic nodes, and whose beginning and end are symbolic nodes.

For example, walking along the left edges in the graph in Figure 3 starting from its root, we end up with the 5-path $\text{AddExpr}_0 \rightarrow \text{MultExpr}_2 \rightarrow \text{UnaryExpr}_8 \rightarrow \text{Identifier}_{16} \rightarrow \text{"x"}_{39}$. Note that k -paths need not start at the root. In fact, a tree must have at least depth k to contain k -paths in the first place.

In the following definition we leverage the fact that the definition of k -paths applies to both grammar graphs and derivation trees.

Definition 3.2 (Unique k-Paths). Let x be a grammar graph or a derivation tree, and k a positive natural number. Then $\text{paths}_k(x)$ shall be the set of unique k -paths that exist in x .

Armed with this definition, we can express the concept of *k-path coverage* of any given input, provided that it is valid according to our grammar:

Definition 3.3 (k-Path Coverage). Let k be a positive natural number, G a grammar graph, and d a derivation tree of the given input i that was parsed according to G .

Then $\text{pathcov}_k(i)$ shall be the k -path coverage of i computed as follows:

$$\text{pathcov}_k(i) = \frac{|\text{paths}_k(d)|}{|\text{paths}_k(G)|}$$

In other words, the k -path coverage of an input is the fraction of unique k -paths of the grammar graph that are present in its derivation tree.

As an example, revisiting the input “ $x + 42$ ” and its derivation tree in Figure 4, we can compute its 2-path coverage. Let us start by enumerating the unique 2-paths contained in the derivation tree:

- | | |
|---|---|
| (1) $\text{AddExpr}_0 \rightarrow \text{AddExpr}_5$ | (7) $\text{AddExpr}_0 \rightarrow \text{MultExpr}_7$ |
| (2) $\text{AddExpr}_5 \rightarrow \text{MultExpr}_2$ | (8) $\text{MultExpr}_7 \rightarrow \text{UnaryExpr}_8$ |
| (3) $\text{MultExpr}_2 \rightarrow \text{UnaryExpr}_8$ | (9) $\text{UnaryExpr}_8 \rightarrow \text{DecDigits}_{22}$ |
| (4) $\text{UnaryExpr}_8 \rightarrow \text{Identifier}_{16}$ | (10) $\text{DecDigits}_{22} \rightarrow \text{DecDigit}_{42}$ |
| (5) $\text{Identifier}_{16} \rightarrow \text{"x"}_{39}$ | (11) $\text{DecDigit}_{42} \rightarrow \text{"4"}_{48}$ |
| (6) $\text{AddExpr}_0 \rightarrow \text{"+"}_{10}$ | (12) $\text{DecDigit}_{42} \rightarrow \text{"2"}_{46}$ |

As we can see, the tree contains twelve distinct 2-paths. The grammar graph, on the other hand, contains 125 unique 2-paths. This leaves us with $\text{pathcov}_2("x + 42") = \frac{12}{125}$, or a 2-path coverage of 9.6 %.

Further, we can extend the definition of k -path coverage so that it applies to a set of inputs instead of just one:

Definition 3.4 (k -Path Coverage of an Input Set). Let k be a positive natural number, G a grammar graph, and D a set of derivation trees corresponding to the inputs S , parsed according to G .

Then $\text{pathcov}_k(S)$ shall be the k -path coverage of S computed as follows:

$$\text{pathcov}_k(S) = \frac{\left| \bigcup_{d \in D} \text{paths}_k(d) \right|}{|\text{paths}_k(G)|}$$

By definition, the k -path coverage will always produce values that are in the $[0, 1]$ range. Notably, zero is included because a derivation tree needs a depth of at least k to contain k -paths for a given k , whereas the grammar graph can fit them just fine by going through a cycle. We say that a set of inputs S achieves *full k -path coverage* if $\text{pathcov}_k(S) = 1$.

It might also be worth noting that while the number of k -paths in a grammar graph is always finite, it tends to increase exponentially with the value of k . For example, our JavaScript expression grammar graph from Figure 3 contains 39 1-paths, 125 2-paths, 523 3-paths, 2331 4-paths, and 10 245 5-paths.

4 COVERAGE-DRIVEN INPUT GENERATION

From the way we introduced k -paths in Definition 3.2 we can see that the set of k -paths is readily available to be enumerated for any given grammar. Therefore, it should also be possible to construct an algorithm that systematically produces a forest of derivation trees that, together, contain all k -paths. An algorithm for doing just that is given as Algorithm 1.

Let us now familiarize ourselves with how the algorithm works. Given a positive natural number k and a grammar graph G , the algorithm begins by storing all k -paths available in G into a list P . It then iterates over this list, generating for each k -path p a new derivation tree t , whose root node r is the same as the root node of the grammar graph.

For each such tree, the algorithm maintains the current slot s that needs to be filled next to reach p . Initially, it is the single child slot of the root node r .

As long as the algorithm has not yet succeeded in deriving the k -path p as part of the current tree in Line 11, it proceeds to expand the slot s into the node n and if it is indeed equal to the next element of the targeted k -path (i.e., $\text{head}(p)$), and not just a synthetic node on the way to it, we remove n from the k -path p , thus shortening it so that we come closer to completing our current target.

The newly created node n is added to the tree t by filling slot s , but it comes with unfilled slots of its own, one of which now must replace s . For this, in Line 17 the algorithm chooses the one slot that brings it to the next missing node fastest.

After the loop in Lines 11 to 17 finishes, we are left with a partial tree t which contains only the derivation of our targeted k -path, and which must be completed to represent a valid input. This task is handed off to a close-off algorithm in Line 18. This allows for some flexibility: The k -path algorithm can be used with different close-off algorithms.

Finally, the completed tree is added to our growing *forest*, which will be returned as the output, and the algorithm is ready to target the next not yet reached k -path.

Algorithm 1 The k -Path Algorithm

```

1: function GENERATEKPATHS(grammar graph  $G$ , positive natural number  $k$ )
2:    $forest \leftarrow \{\}$ 
3:    $r \leftarrow root(G)$ 
4:    $P \leftarrow paths_k(G)$   $\triangleright$  Enumerate all  $k$ -paths as per Definition 3.2
5:   while  $P \neq \{\}$  do
6:      $t \leftarrow tree(r)$   $\triangleright$  Start new derivation tree rooted at  $r$ 
7:      $s \leftarrow$  child slot of  $r$ 
8:      $p \leftarrow$  remove next  $k$ -path from  $P$   $\triangleright$  Select next  $k$ -path to pursue
9:     if  $head(p) = r$  then
10:       $p \leftarrow tail(p)$ 
11:     while  $p$  is not empty do
12:        $n \leftarrow$  expansion of  $s$ 
13:       Add  $n$  to  $t$  by filling slot  $s$ 
14:       if  $n = head(p)$  then
15:          $p \leftarrow tail(p)$ 
16:       if  $p$  is not empty then
17:          $s \leftarrow$  child slot of  $n$  with shortest derivation path to  $head(p)$ 
18:        $t \leftarrow CLOSEOFF(G, t)$   $\triangleright$  Finalize  $t$  by expanding all unfilled slots
19:        $forest \leftarrow forest \cup \{t\}$ 
20:     Remove from  $P$  all  $k$ -paths found in  $t$ 
21:   return  $forest$ 

```

However, in Section 3, we observed that the number of k -paths may grow exponentially with the size of the grammar graph. If we were to generate one file per k -path, the number of generated files would grow out of hand quickly. But then, we accidentally generate some k -path on our way to generating p , or while closing off the tree. We leverage this in Line 20, where we remove from P all k -paths that we happened to produce “by accident”. This simple trick dramatically reduces the number of trees generated by this algorithm.

4.1 Example Generation Walkthrough

As an example of how the algorithm works, let us assume that we have called the algorithm with G being the JavaScript expression grammar graph from Figure 3 and $k = 2$, and that in Line 8 the value of p has become the 2-path $AddExpr_0 \rightarrow "+"_{10}$. Then, our target path is removed from the set of not yet reached 2-paths P , and a new derivation tree is created starting with an $AddExpr_0$ node, whose slot for its only child node $\textcircled{1}$ becomes s .

Here, we have triggered the edge case in Line 9, where the first node in our targeted 2-path is the root node, so we remove it from p before proceeding because our tree already contains r by definition.

At this point, the remaining not yet reached path p consists only of the $"+"_{10}$ node. In Line 12 s is expanded into a $\textcircled{1}$ node n , which we then add to t in Line 13.

Since p still contains the $"+"_{10}$ node, we have to choose which of the child slots of n will replace s in Line 17. Looking at the graph in Figure 3, in this case it is the slot for the $\textcircled{\sim}$ node because its distance to $"+"_{10}$ is two, as opposed to the alternative $MultiExpr_2$, whose distance is nine.

In the next iteration, we enlarge t by the \odot node, and have to choose the next s in Line 17 from its child slots for AddExpr_5 , another \odot , and MultExpr_7 . Here, we choose the slot for the \odot node because it leads us to $"+"_{10}$ fastest.

In a later iteration, we get to expand the \odot node to be the $"+"_{10}$ node, which lets us remove it from p in Line 15, thus rendering the currently targeted 2-path empty and exiting from the loop.

Since we have already reached our current goal, we hand off the task of completing the tree by expanding all outstanding slots to a close-off algorithm in Line 18. For instance, if we are interested in creating inputs that are terse, we might opt to use an algorithm that always produces the shortest possible derivations.

After the close-off procedure is finished and we have obtained a complete tree in t , which in our example could correspond to an input like “x+y”, we add it to our collection in *forest*, and very importantly, prune all 2-paths found in t from P .

In this case, t would contain such paths as $\text{AddExpr}_0 \rightarrow \text{AddExpr}_5$ and $\text{AddExpr}_0 \rightarrow \text{MultExpr}_7$, for which we no longer have to create their own trees.

4.2 Avoiding Boundless Growth

So far, we have left the choice of the close-off procedure in Algorithm 1 entirely open. However, in practice, we are usually interested in avoiding boundless growth and useless repetitions. For example, we might want to consider a global threshold depth, which our inputs must not exceed. Algorithm 2 presents a way to achieve such bounded generation.

Algorithm 2 Bounded Tree Generation

```

1: function BOUNDEDTREE(grammar graph  $G$ , derivation tree  $t$ , depth limit  $d$ )
2:    $Q \leftarrow \{ \text{unfilled slots in } t \}$ 
3:   while  $Q \neq \{ \}$  do
4:      $s \leftarrow$  a slot removed from  $Q$  at random
5:      $n \leftarrow$  expansion of  $s$ 
6:     Add  $n$  to  $t$  by filling  $s$ 
7:      $Q \leftarrow Q \cup \{ \text{a child slot of } n \text{ fitting in } d \}$ 
8:     if  $n$  is an alternation or optional quantification then
9:       else
10:     $Q \leftarrow Q \cup \{ \text{child slots of } n \}$ 
11:  return  $t$ 

```

This algorithm is given a grammar graph G , an incomplete derivation tree t , and a global depth threshold d as inputs. It begins by identifying the set Q of all outstanding slots that still need to be filled for the tree to become complete. Its main loop in Line 3 proceeds to fill these slots until none remain. Whenever a new node n is instantiated to grow the tree t , its child slots are inspected and added to Q if appropriate.

Specifically, if n is an alternation node, only one of its children may exist in a valid derivation tree. The choice of the child slot for alternations in Line 7 is limited to those alternatives whose shortest required subtree will certifiably fit into the depth limit, considering the depth at which the parent node itself is located. This same condition is applied to the single child slot of a quantification whose minimal repetition count is zero. Note that fitting child slots of quantifications may be added multiple times. If no subtree fits into the depth limit, the algorithm terminates with an error, indicating that it should be called with a larger limit.

Table 1. Grammars and Sizes

| Grammar | Productions | Average # of inputs generated | | | |
|---------------|-------------|-------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | $k = 1$ | $k = 2$ | $k = 3$ | $k = 5$ |
| JSON [30] | 17 | 40 | 35 | 58 | 201 |
| CSV [9] | 12 | 42 | 38 | 51 | 221 |
| URL [15] | 27 | 43 | 45 | 72 | 552 |
| Markdown [59] | 236 | 653 | 980 | 1880 | 11409 |

In all other cases all child slots of n are added to Q , as they represent the necessary expansions that make up a valid derivation tree and are thus indispensable.

4.3 Evaluation

Now that we have established a way of systematically covering k -paths, we want to study its effects on testing as compared to regular grammar-based fuzz testing. We compare our approach implemented in a Java tool called `TRIBBLE`² against the grammar-based input generator `GRAMMARINATOR` [46].

`GRAMMARINATOR` expects its grammars to be in the format defined by the ANTLR parser generator [62]. Therefore, for our experiments we selected the grammars of popular and well known languages, among other sources, from a popular GitHub repository hosting a variety of ANTLR grammars [36], and manually translated them into the format required by `TRIBBLE` as consistently as possible, i.e., only changing their notation and refraining from any refactoring or optimizing. Specifically, we chose the grammars for JSON [30], URL [15], CSV [9], and Markdown [59].

Table 1 provides the number of productions for each grammar, as well as the average number of inputs produced by the k -path algorithm (Algorithm 1). We used bounded random generation (Algorithm 2) as the tree completion stage invoked at Line 18 in the k -path algorithm.

An interesting observation about Table 1 is the fact that for JSON and CSV fewer files are required to cover $k = 2$ than for $k = 1$. As we have established in Section 3, 1-path coverage corresponds to simply covering all symbols in the grammar. This means that when generating trees, the k -path algorithm is only trying to derive single symbolic nodes regardless of their context. As soon as a targeted node is reached, the close-off takes over. As both these grammars are rather shallow, the close-off phase terminates soon and does not cover many outstanding 1-paths “accidentally”. This way, the main algorithm happens to create many trees to reach every symbol. This effect disappears for larger values of k because the k -path algorithm is now required to produce trees that are at least of depth k , which is why more k -paths are encountered along the way.

4.3.1 Test Subjects. We carry out our experimental investigation on the open-source projects listed in the leftmost column of Table 2. The selection consists of some of the top search results among open-source Java projects consuming the previously selected formats.

For the JSON language, almost all our subjects are parsers, except for some notable exceptions: `jackson-databind`, `genson`, `gson`, `fastjson` additionally allow data-binding for automatic serialization and deserialization of JSON objects from and into data classes. This involves generating Java classes that correspond to the data declarations in the input files as well as producing APIs for interacting with these classes. The subjects `json-flattener` and `pojo` serve the purpose of flattening a JSON structure and generating Java source code, respectively.

²<https://github.com/havrikov/tribble>

The subjects for CSV are all parsers capable of data-binding. However, our tests only engage the part of their functionality related to parsing because it is impractical to pre-generate data classes for dynamically generated inputs. The same holds for the data-binding JSON subjects.

For URL, the projects `galimatias` and `jur1` are pure parsers, while `autolink` and `url-detector` additionally detect URLs inside arbitrary plain text before parsing them into their constituent parts.

Our subjects for the Markdown format concern themselves with rendering their inputs into HTML fragments that are suitable for display inside a web browser.

Since most of the subjects are libraries, they require a test harness to process inputs. For each of the subjects we implemented a launcher which instantiates the necessary structures, sets any available options, and feeds an input file into the main API functions covering the documented use cases. In cases where the subject is an executable, the launcher is simply a wrapper around its main method.

4.3.2 Experimental Setup. Our competitor fuzzer `GRAMMARINATOR` requires two parameters: d and n , the maximum depth and number of the derivation trees to be generated, respectively. For a fair comparison, we first run the k -path algorithm with a given k , and take the number of the generated inputs to be n for a corresponding run of `GRAMMARINATOR`. We set the depth d to 30 for both tools because we found this number in the configuration repository [16] provided by the authors of `GRAMMARINATOR`. Further, we set the parameter `--cooldown` to 0.9 and add a `simple_space_transformer` as described in [46]. Due to randomness, we repeat the invocation of each algorithm 50 times. We repeat the above setup for several different values of k to investigate the influence of the path length.

4.3.3 Code Coverage. Table 2 shows the average branch coverage achieved by each tool over 50 runs. Since all our subjects are targeting the Java platform, we use the `JaCoCo` tool [47] to gather coverage data by means of offline bytecode instrumentation. The subjects are given in Table 2 and are grouped by the grammar describing the language of their inputs: JSON, CSV, URL, and Markdown. The columns labeled as k -path show the average branch coverage achieved with inputs generated by the k -path algorithm with the given value of k .

The columns labeled as gram_k show the average branch coverage for runs of `GRAMMARINATOR` that were carried out with the n parameter mirroring the number of inputs that were produced by runs of k -path with the given k . For example, if an invocation of 2-path produced a set of 10 inputs, the corresponding gram_2 run would also consist of 10 inputs.

Note that for each k , the values in Table 2 represent the average of 50 such corresponding pairs rounded to three decimals. To investigate if these average values do, in fact, indicate that one of the approaches consistently outperforms the other, we carried out a statistical significance analysis using the two-sided Mann–Whitney U test [60] as implemented in the Python `SciPy` library [50]. For all comparisons, the larger value is shown in bold if the difference was significant. This was the case for all but six entries.

Our findings in Table 2 show that for $k = 1$ the average coverage achieved by inputs generated by the k -path algorithm roughly equates the one produced by `GRAMMARINATOR`'s inputs across all subjects.

When considering only subjects consuming JSON inputs, `GRAMMARINATOR` still outperforms `TRIBBLE` on all but three subjects. This is due to the 1-path algorithm not being interested in actively covering any combinations and nesting of JSON arrays and objects, which are responsible for triggering additional behavior in the subjects.

When the context depth k is set to 2, however, this disadvantage disappears as `TRIBBLE` now covers more code in all but two subjects. Because this time 2-path actively tries to cover pairs of elements, its code coverage is much higher than the one achieved by 1-path.

Table 2. Average branch coverage achieved by TRIBBLE and GRAMMARINATOR

| | Subject | 1-path | gram ₁ | 2-path | gram ₂ | 3-path | gram ₃ | 5-path | gram ₅ |
|-----------|-----------------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| JSON | argo [18] | 0.4116 | 0.400 | 0.4187 | 0.396 | 0.4197 | 0.409 | 0.4242 | 0.419 |
| | fastjson [17] | 0.036 | 0.0376 | 0.0404 | 0.037 | 0.0413 | 0.039 | 0.0431 | 0.041 |
| | genson [31] | 0.084 | 0.0866 | 0.0886 | 0.086 | 0.0902 | 0.088 | 0.0916 | 0.091 |
| | gson [19] | 0.208 | 0.2215 | 0.2264 | 0.221 | 0.2294 | 0.227 | 0.235 | 0.237 |
| | jackson-databind [11] | 0.089 | 0.0926 | 0.0932 | 0.092 | 0.094 | 0.094 | 0.094 | 0.0952 |
| | json-flattener [20] | 0.504 | 0.6246 | 0.6828 | 0.624 | 0.7127 | 0.661 | 0.7809 | 0.748 |
| | json-java [56] | 0.109 | 0.1377 | 0.1457 | 0.131 | 0.1661 | 0.144 | 0.1890 | 0.173 |
| | json-simple [2] | 0.443 | 0.4695 | 0.4870 | 0.466 | 0.4931 | 0.484 | 0.5093 | 0.506 |
| | json-cliftonlabs [58] | 0.336 | 0.333 | 0.3445 | 0.330 | 0.3446 | 0.341 | 0.348 | 0.3546 |
| | minimal-json [71] | 0.4158 | 0.397 | 0.4267 | 0.394 | 0.4163 | 0.405 | 0.417 | 0.417 |
| pojo [57] | 0.125 | 0.1414 | 0.1428 | 0.142 | 0.160 | 0.143 | 0.2112 | 0.146 | |
| CSV | commons-csv [8] | 0.3828 | 0.377 | 0.3903 | 0.377 | 0.3984 | 0.377 | 0.4034 | 0.380 |
| | jackson-csv [12] | 0.1665 | 0.153 | 0.1666 | 0.152 | 0.1700 | 0.153 | 0.1777 | 0.157 |
| | jcsv [1] | 0.3287 | 0.317 | 0.3337 | 0.315 | 0.3374 | 0.320 | 0.3400 | 0.327 |
| | sfm-csv [13] | 0.063 | 0.0686 | 0.066 | 0.0686 | 0.068 | 0.0686 | 0.068 | 0.0686 |
| | simplecsv [14] | 0.3472 | 0.338 | 0.3482 | 0.337 | 0.3481 | 0.340 | 0.3489 | 0.344 |
| | super-csv [5] | 0.1560 | 0.143 | 0.1589 | 0.142 | 0.1646 | 0.144 | 0.1646 | 0.147 |
| URL | autolink [72] | 0.4514 | 0.286 | 0.4673 | 0.286 | 0.5716 | 0.286 | 0.6265 | 0.289 |
| | galimatias [10] | 0.0879 | 0.034 | 0.0897 | 0.034 | 0.0875 | 0.035 | 0.0873 | 0.036 |
| | url [68] | 0.679 | 0.6854 | 0.681 | 0.6872 | 0.693 | 0.690 | 0.7095 | 0.701 |
| MD | url-detector [65] | 0.4057 | 0.327 | 0.4083 | 0.324 | 0.4188 | 0.334 | 0.4352 | 0.346 |
| | commonmark [6] | 0.6678 | 0.625 | 0.6991 | 0.632 | 0.7183 | 0.642 | 0.7335 | 0.663 |
| | markdown4j [4] | 0.677 | 0.6817 | 0.7094 | 0.685 | 0.7162 | 0.693 | 0.7313 | 0.713 |
| | txtmark [7] | 0.602 | 0.6144 | 0.6291 | 0.617 | 0.6348 | 0.624 | 0.6498 | 0.641 |

Values show the fraction of branches covered. All results are averages over 50 runs.

The notation gram _{k} denotes a GRAMMARINATOR run configured to generate as many files as k -path does.

Bold values indicate significantly higher values according to the Mann–Whitney U test [60]. ($p < 0.005$)

Setting $k = 3$ further strengthens the performance of k -path as it is now seeking to cover all contexts of depth 3. Once again, there is an improvement over the previous configuration.

Increasing the context depth to a value of 5 improves the achieved coverage over the previous configurations, however, more inputs had to be generated by the 5-path generator (see Table 1), and so GRAMMARINATOR also has a much higher generation budget n . As a consequence, GRAMMARINATOR is beginning to catch up.

With those results, we can form a theory of what is going on. Which code processes an input element likely depends on the context it appears in. Therefore coverage initially increases with growing k . However, at a certain threshold, deeper contexts do not lead to variations in the executed code any longer, and therefore there is no additional coverage any more.

For instance, in a typical recursively descending JSON parser, there is not much difference in executed control flow between parsing nested JSON structures that are nested two, three, or more times. However, there can still be some notion of context encoded in the flow of data instead. For example, a counter could be keeping track of the current nesting depth used for matching the correct number of closing brackets. Changes in its state would not be reflected in code coverage, even though it might still make sense to strive for testing some of the values the counter can assume.

For $k = 2$ and $k = 3$, TRIBBLE covers more branches than GRAMMARINATOR on 22 out of 24 and 23 out of 24 subjects.

Our empirical investigation shows that the advantage of TRIBBLE over GRAMMARINATOR can be quite large. In the cases of `autolink` and `galimatias`, TRIBBLE achieves about twice the coverage of GRAMMARINATOR, even for 1-path already. There are no cases in which GRAMMARINATOR would outperform TRIBBLE by the same margin.

As an aside, when it comes to performance considerations, both tools have approximately the same wind-up time that includes parsing the grammar, building the in-memory model, and precomputing static information such as minimal required derivation depth for all nodes. And while in theory the additional computations that TRIBBLE has to perform to obtain its k -path generation agenda has worst case runtime in $O(|V|^2)$ with V being the set of all nodes in the grammar graph, we found no perceptible slowdown for the grammars used in our experiments, which is why we did not deem it necessary to capture concrete timings.

In practice, when generating input sets, TRIBBLE profits from the shortcuts in the k -path algorithm: Once a deep derivation tree has been attained, all its k -paths are removed from the generation agenda, and thus we explicitly avoid having to generate similar deep trees, as opposed to GRAMMARINATOR, where there is no mechanism to adaptively constrain the depth of the generated trees.

In our experiments, most time was spent on executing the test subjects, with the evaluation process spending upwards of 99% of its time on this task. It is for this reason, and because it is more convenient, that we ensure the fairness of our comparison by equating the number of input files instead of the wall clock time.

4.3.4 Defect Detection. While code coverage is a well-known proxy measure of test quality, equally as important is the tests' ability to reveal defects. A test suite may consistently achieve high coverage throughout the lifetime of a project without ever detecting a single error or bug. Such a test suite is not impactful for the project and may end up generating more maintenance costs than it is worth.

During our experiments, we found a number of exceptions thrown by our test subjects. In our setting, all of these faults are triggered by system inputs, so they indicate real internal errors, that can occur in regular production use. When considering which exceptions are indeed defects and not legitimate errors in usage, we filter out those exception classes that are defined inside the subjects' own packages assuming they represent expected user-facing error behavior.

Our observations are given in Table 3: For each subject in which exceptions could be triggered, the exception class name, its origin, as well as its detection rate are given for both TRIBBLE and GRAMMARINATOR. The detection rate indicates in what fraction of runs a given exception was triggered at least once at the given location.

The *location unknown* entry in the `json-flattener` subject is a result of our test harness failing to provide a stack trace for this particular failure. The `InvalidSyntaxException` thrown by `argo`, and `ParseException` thrown by `json-flattener`, which are triggered exclusively by GRAMMARINATOR indicate a bug in GRAMMARINATOR's implementation of input generation rather than in the subjects themselves. Specifically, in this case GRAMMARINATOR erroneously produces a backslash immediately followed by a number, which is an invalid escape sequence in JSON. A similar effect can be observed in TRIBBLE for both exceptions thrown by `galimatias`, which can be attributed to the grammar being too permissive.

If we discount the four of these likely non-issues, we see that in the configuration with $k = 1$, the k -path algorithm is able to trigger three exceptions exclusively: Two `NullPointerException`s and

Table 3. Exception Detection Rates

| | Subject | Exception Location | Detection Rate | | | | |
|-----------|---------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| | | | 1-path gram ₁ | 2-path gram ₂ | 3-path gram ₃ | 5-path gram ₅ | |
| JSON | argo | ISynE ...SyntaxRuntime\$3:60 | 0% 76% | 0% 76% | 0% 84% | 0% 100% | |
| | genson | NPE JsonWriter:414 | 100% 100% | 100% 100% | 100% 100% | 100% 100% | |
| | json-flattener | PE Flattener:122 | 0% 76% | 0% 76% | 0% 84% | 0% 100% | |
| | | NPE Unflattener:393 | 88% 90% | 94% 88% | 100% 94% | 100% 100% | |
| | | Unflattener:409 | 4% 0% | 6% 6% | 10% 4% | 22% 26% | |
| | | location unknown | 0% 0% | 0% 0% | 0% 0% | 2% 0% | |
| pojo | SIOOBE NameHelper:46 | 98% 100% | 100% 100% | 100% 100% | 100% 100% | | |
| CSV | commons-csv | IOE Lexer:281 | 100% 100% | 100% 100% | 100% 100% | 100% 100% | |
| | | Lexer:288 | 100% 100% | 100% 100% | 100% 100% | 100% 100% | |
| | jackson-csv | CCE CsvDecoder:429 | 0% 0% | 0% 0% | 2% 0% | 4% 0% | |
| | | ...Bootstrapper:383 | 0% 0% | 0% 0% | 2% 0% | 4% 0% | |
| | | ISE TokenizerImpl:73 | 100% 30% | 100% 22% | 100% 46% | 100% 78% | |
| | sfm-csv | ISE No...WriterDSL:449 | 100% 100% | 100% 100% | 100% 100% | 100% 100% | |
| super-csv | NPE AbstractCsvWriter:177 | 0% 0% | 0% 0% | 0% 0% | 2% 0% | | |
| | util.Util:187 | 34% 0% | 38% 0% | 76% 0% | 52% 0% | | |
| URL | galimatias | MUE galimatias.URL:527 | 100% 0% | 100% 0% | 100% 0% | 100% 0% | |
| | | USE galimatias.URL:509 | 92% 0% | 94% 0% | 96% 0% | 96% 0% | |
| | jur1 | SIOOBE PercentEncoder:176 | 100% 0% | 100% 0% | 100% 0% | 100% 0% | |
| Markdown | markdown4j | SIOOBE M...4jProcessor:53 | 30% 100% | 100% 100% | 100% 100% | 100% 100% | |
| | txtmark | SIOOBE txtmark.Block:106 | 8% 34% | 8% 30% | 6% 62% | 6% 98% | |
| | | txtmark.Emitter:282 | 4% 100% | 2% 100% | 12% 100% | 82% 100% | |
| | | txtmark.Emitter:303 | 0% 0% | 0% 0% | 0% 0% | 0% 4% | |
| | txtmark.Line:520 | 22% 76% | 100% 88% | 100% 98% | 100% 100% | | |

Values show the percentage of runs in which the given exception was detected.

Higher percentages are shown in **bold**. Exceptions are abbreviated as follows:

ISynE – InvalidSyntaxException, NPE – NullPointerException, PE – ParseException,

SIOOBE – StringIndexOutOfBoundsException, IOE – IOException, CCE – CharConversionException,

ISE – IllegalStateException, MUE – MalformedURLException, USE – URISyntaxException

one `StringIndexOutOfBoundsException`, none of which should ever be allowed to be thrown into user code as they indicate fatal errors in the internal state.

With increasing k , the detection rate increases for both approaches, but it does so more reliably for `TRIBBLE`: There are only two cases of regression for `TRIBBLE`, both in the `txtmark` subject, while there are four for `GRAMMARINATOR`, distributed over three subjects expecting three different input formats.

For the 5-path configuration, out of the 23 exceptions triggered, 3 are unique to `GRAMMARINATOR`, 8 are unique to `TRIBBLE`, and the remaining 12 were found by both.

Our evaluation shows that in the average case, thanks to the systematic approach to generating its inputs, `TRIBBLE` can be expected to detect issues more reliably than an approach like `GRAMMARINATOR`, which is inherently randomized in its generation choices.

Compared to GRAMMARINATOR, TRIBBLE found more unique exceptions.

4.4 Correlating Grammar and Code Coverage

The results from Section 4.3 leave open the question whether there is a dependency between k -path coverage and code coverage. Therefore, in this section we would like to analyze the nature of the relationship between k -path coverage and code coverage.

In the following experiment, we are guided by the following question: If *high* k -path coverage leads to high code coverage, does, conversely, *low* k -path coverage lead to low code coverage (i.e., is this dependency monotonic)? We now aim to find out details of any such relationship if it exists.

4.4.1 Generating Inputs. To gather any empirical evidence, we first require a sufficient number of sets of inputs that have k -path coverage ranging from almost none to full so that we can measure the code coverage they induce in subject programs. As it happens, we can adapt the original k -path algorithm to produce just such a batch of sets.

In the k -path algorithm, as given in Algorithm 1, the main loop in Line 4 iterates over *all* k -paths contained in the given grammar graph. We can instead produce subsets of this initial set of k -paths, and then use the rest of the algorithm as is to generate inputs that reach these subsets. Of course, we cannot guarantee that the derivation trees generated in this way will not contain any additional k -paths that are not contained in the requested subsets. Nevertheless, this approach presents a practical solution for our purposes of acquiring test data.

4.4.2 Experiment Setup. To acquire a significant number of forests displaying varying k -path and code coverage, we repeat the invocation of our modified generation algorithm ten times. Table 4 shows the number of forests that were generated for each grammar after ten invocations. As for our test programs, we fall back on our previous subjects which we have already seen in Table 2.

The experiment itself is quite straightforward: We execute every subject program with every forest generated with the appropriate grammar and measure the code coverage induced. By construction, we also know the k -path coverage of each forest we generated. For the purposes of our evaluation, we consider values of k from one to five. With this information about coverage collected for every forest, we can attempt to calculate a *correlation* and assess its strength.

As we have no reason to assume that any such correlation need necessarily be strictly linear, we must not use Pearson’s correlation coefficient. We do, however, suspect that there might be a monotonic correlation instead, i.e., the higher the k -path coverage of a forest, the higher its resulting code coverage. Therefore, we compute Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient [70]. Its value $\rho \in [-1, 1]$ signifies how well a monotonic function describes the relationship between two variables. When ρ is close to 1, there is a perfectly monotone *increasing* relationship, whereas a value close to -1 signifies a perfectly monotone *decreasing* relationship. Values between those extrema indicate a correlation of ever diminishing strength, with a value of zero meaning no correlation at all.

4.4.3 Interpreting Results. Table 5 shows the results of the experiment for our subjects. Specifically, it shows the values of ρ indicating the correlations between branch coverage and k -path coverage for values of k ranging from one to five. We can see that all reported values are positive, indicating that the two coverage measures have an *increasing* monotonic relationship, which confirms our suspicions from earlier. Further, an overwhelming majority of all observed values of ρ are much closer to 1 than to 0, which means that the correlations tend to be strong to very strong. Perhaps the subjects `jur1` and `sfm-csv` deserve special commentary as they are the ones with the lowest correlation coefficients. In the case of `jur1`, this is due to code structure, which consists of straight-line control flow when parsing inputs, with occasional breakouts into individual methods to handle

Table 4. Experiment Size

| Grammar | Forests |
|----------|---------|
| JSON | 6421 |
| CSV | 111 |
| URL | 15711 |
| Markdown | 113266 |

Table 5. Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient ρ between k -path coverage and branch coverage. The results are statistically significant as $p < 0.001$ holds for all entries.

| Subject | Spearman’s ρ | | | | | |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | 1-path | 2-path | 3-path | 4-path | 5-path | |
| JSON | argo | 0.978030 | 0.979201 | 0.977254 | 0.978174 | 0.978391 |
| | fastjson | 0.890047 | 0.892101 | 0.892209 | 0.893562 | 0.894042 |
| | genson | 0.719465 | 0.717598 | 0.715875 | 0.715792 | 0.715761 |
| | gson | 0.785363 | 0.785659 | 0.783792 | 0.783663 | 0.783578 |
| | jackson-databind | 0.670651 | 0.668243 | 0.667306 | 0.667450 | 0.666918 |
| | json-flattener | 0.833893 | 0.832338 | 0.831641 | 0.833073 | 0.832902 |
| | json-java | 0.854792 | 0.855177 | 0.854317 | 0.855532 | 0.856643 |
| | json-simple | 0.936196 | 0.930950 | 0.926262 | 0.926458 | 0.926365 |
| | json-cliftonlabs | 0.922571 | 0.917751 | 0.912538 | 0.913879 | 0.914069 |
| | minimal-json | 0.869229 | 0.864461 | 0.859508 | 0.860689 | 0.860674 |
| pojo | 0.920923 | 0.917682 | 0.914856 | 0.916457 | 0.916649 | |
| CSV | commons-csv | 0.859999 | 0.848465 | 0.885169 | 0.883570 | 0.889543 |
| | jackson-csv | 0.844129 | 0.856202 | 0.818371 | 0.817048 | 0.801829 |
| | jcsv | 0.873245 | 0.822432 | 0.857961 | 0.858206 | 0.880407 |
| | sfm-csv | 0.516022 | 0.480904 | 0.461646 | 0.462265 | 0.463723 |
| | simplecsv | 0.861628 | 0.810861 | 0.821319 | 0.820035 | 0.828014 |
| super-csv | 0.917562 | 0.863296 | 0.881422 | 0.881525 | 0.888188 | |
| URL | autolink | 0.691730 | 0.790726 | 0.795617 | 0.796257 | 0.796721 |
| | galimatias | 0.681095 | 0.756954 | 0.773728 | 0.770310 | 0.769401 |
| | jur1 | 0.579468 | 0.572635 | 0.577823 | 0.578323 | 0.578463 |
| MD | url-detector | 0.680247 | 0.771222 | 0.775263 | 0.775710 | 0.775850 |
| | commonmark | 0.943132 | 0.942860 | 0.942707 | 0.942719 | 0.942711 |
| | markdown4j | 0.956469 | 0.955837 | 0.955491 | 0.955495 | 0.955472 |
| | txtmark | 0.955879 | 0.955071 | 0.954603 | 0.954600 | 0.954575 |

parts of URLs. In this setting, URLs containing most parts already suffice to achieve high coverage without much need for advanced combinations. For `sfm-csv`, our test driver does not exercise all of the numerous entry points of the library to their full extent, thus leaving the maximum absolute achievable coverage low. Together with CSV being a very simple format, this results in a less pronounced correlation.

Notably, this correlation holds approximately equally well across all values of k and all subjects. The strength of the correlation provides evidence that the connection between grammar coverage as represented by k -path coverage and code coverage as represented by branch coverage is not merely coincidental.

In our evaluation, k -path input coverage strongly correlates with code coverage.

But if covering more input structures means covering more code structures, it stands to reason that certain input structures “unlock” additional parts in the code. If some part of the code is guarded by a condition that reflects the presence of a specific structure in the input, then only those inputs will be able to execute the code, that do have this structure present.

As an example, consider a parser that turns JSON inputs into typed collection objects in memory. A JSON object with integer-valued properties would end up as a dictionary of type `Map<String, Integer>`, while a JSON array of strings would find its correspondence in a list of type `List<String>`. The allocation of these collections takes place in different parts of the code

Table 6. Inputs that cover `distributive_rule()`

| Input | Coverage | Input | Coverage |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 + 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (1 + 2) | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 * 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1 + 2 * 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | (1 + 2) * 3 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 1 * (2 + 3) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (1 + 2) * (3 + 4) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

that are executed independently of each other, but dependently on the presence of objects and arrays in the JSON input. Therefore, an input combining both structures in a nested context, which can be characterized by a longer k -path, will achieve more coverage than an input that contains at most one of them, and thus also a shorter k -path. In fact, we will investigate the connection k -paths have to locations in code in more detail in the upcoming Section 5.

5 ASSOCIATING INPUT FEATURES WITH CODE LOCATIONS

Having put in place an algorithm to systematically achieve k -path coverage, let us now consider yet another use case for the notion of k -paths as features of inputs, specifically in the context of performing targeted testing. In practice, the effectiveness of a fuzzer heavily depends on the execution time of the test. If a test takes a millisecond, then running a million random test inputs is no big problem. If a test takes seconds, though, then fuzzing with random inputs can quickly become unbearable.

In this section, we introduce an automated method to infer, for each method m in the program, which features an input has to fulfill such that m is executed—say, “Method `distributive_rule()` is invoked whenever both `+` and `*` occur in an expression.” These associations between input features and method invocations are *explicit* and therefore immediately usable by tools such as test generators. They are *user-facing* as they refer to the input domain and can be interpreted by testers—say, when designing test cases to target a set of methods. Solving the constraints over input features immediately *generates* inputs that are likely to reach the associated methods. And as a side effect, we can check whether a given input satisfies the features, *predicting* its method coverage without having to execute the program.

How does this work? As an example, let us assume we are testing a compiler, whose optimization pass includes a method `distributive_rule()`, which splits an expression $a \times (b + c)$ into $a \times b + a \times c$ such that the subterms can be optimized individually. For example, this transformation might enable the compiler to replace expensive computations with some cheaper alternatives, such as using precomputed multiplication tables for small values. We can now track under which conditions our method of interest was covered. Table 6 shows a set of expressions that do or do not invoke `distributive_rule()`. The astute reader, of course, will immediately be able to see a pattern here. But how can a computer infer such patterns?

We begin by decomposing inputs into their constituent elements using our grammar. To learn how input elements lead to specific coverage, we extend our previous ALHAZEN approach [51]. ALHAZEN *parses* inputs into individual elements, and then determines features of input elements. However, rather than learning and refining which input features cause a single failure, as ALHAZEN does, we learn the input features *that cause the invocation of individual methods*—and we learn them simultaneously for each method covered in a test run. Specifically, this learned knowledge takes shape in the form of a decision tree. A decision tree accepts data as vectors of numeric *features*, and predicts a binary target value called *class* for each vector. ALHAZEN derives those features from absence and presence of derivation rules in a parse tree as well as semantic properties of the inputs.




Fig. 7. Initial model for the coverage of `distributive_rule()`, trained from the inputs in Table 6.

This work, in contrast, uses k -paths as input features. While ALHAZEN trees predict failures, our trees predict whether a method will be covered or not.

Let us again consider the code coverage of `distributive_rule()`. Given the inputs from Table 6, or more precisely, the presence or absence of productions from Figure 1 in each input, a decision tree learner [73] will produce a tree like the one in Figure 7. Each node of the tree contains a constraint, which splits the set of observed inputs into two sets: Those that fulfill the derived constraint, and those that do not. Following a path in the tree, each node adds another constraint, until all inputs in the remaining set show the same behavior.

For example, the decision tree given in Figure 7 expresses the following constraints: If the input contains a multiplication (a production `MultExpr13 "*"23 UnaryExpr15`) and an expression in parentheses (a production `"("35 AddExpr36 ")"37`), then `distributive_rule()` will be covered, otherwise not.

The decision tree in Figure 7 is consistent with all observations from Table 6. However, for the input `"(x * 2)"`, it falsely predicts that `distributive_rule()` should be covered. This is because of two reasons:

- a) the features in this tree do not carry any ordering information, so an input containing a `MultExpr13 "*"23 UnaryExpr15` on the inside of a `"("35 AddExpr36 ")"37` is classified the same as one that has the proper expected `MultExpr13 "*"23 "("35 AddExpr36 ")"37` expression order, and
- b) the tree learner has not seen sufficient evidence to manifest the above distinction.

To address a), we opt to leverage k -paths, which express specific derivation contexts. As for b), the decision tree must be trained from more inputs. If we are in the fortunate situation, where we have a large body of regression test inputs available to us, we can directly profit from it to get more observations for our training data. Should this not be the case, however, remember that we still have the grammar and its generative capabilities at our disposal, e.g., as seen in Section 4. Note that while acquiring sufficiently much training data does require us to execute the program under test with many inputs, we can record the coverage of every observable method at once in a single pass.

Such an extended training results in a more refined tree, shown partially in Figure 8. This tree precisely expresses that a parenthesized expression (i.e., `AddExpr36`) must occur as an expansion (\rightarrow) of the right-hand side of a multiplication (i.e., `UnaryExpr15`). Further, the expression in question must not be a simple `MultExpr2`, which, guarantees by construction that it must involve an addition or a subtraction.

A predictor as in Figure 8 is useful on its own. For instance, if testers want to target a method m , they can retrieve its predictor and design a test input that satisfies its conditions. However, one can also have the computer solve the constraints, thus automatically generating test cases that all target m . For example, using the grammar from Figure 1 as a producer and constraining it towards




Fig. 8. Excerpt from a decision tree model for the coverage of `distributive_rule()`, obtained from 1000 generated inputs.

Table 7. Inputs generated from the decision tree in Figure 8 to cover `distributive_rule()`

| Input | Coverage | Input | Coverage |
|---------------|----------|---------------------|----------|
| $(1 - 2) / 3$ | ✓ | $(1 + 2) * 3$ | ✓ |
| $1 * (2 + 3)$ | ✓ | $(1 + 2) / (3 - 4)$ | ✓ |




Fig. 9. CODEINE in a nutshell. CODEINE starts with a program and a *grammar* describing its input structure. Using the grammar to *produce* inputs (and/or using *given* inputs), it determines *coverage* in the program. CODEINE then *parses* the inputs into individual elements and learns a *model* associating *input element features* with coverage. Using the model, CODEINE can either *produce* inputs set to reach a given coverage (green dashed lines) or *predict* coverage for given inputs (red solid lines).

the conditions in Figure 8, we obtain a set of inputs that cover `distributive_rule()` (Table 7). Such inputs can be used as tests in their own right, but also act as seeds for test generators to assist code exploration.

We have implemented the above approach in a tool named CODEINE³ (Figure 9). Given the Java bytecode of a program P and its input grammar G , CODEINE produces associations between input elements and code in three steps:

- (1) CODEINE automatically creates a *test suite* by generating inputs from G using a random grammar-based generation algorithm implemented in TRIBBLE. This step is optional as CODEINE can use any given set of inputs as well.
- (2) For each input from the test suite, CODEINE then automatically determines the *coverage* of all methods in P .
- (3) Using the data from the previous step, CODEINE trains a decision tree t_i for each method m_i , to predict whether an input covers m_i (✓) or not (□).

³CODEINE = CODE covered by INput Elements

The set of decision trees (the *model*) can then be used for three purposes, all three of which are implemented in CODEINE:

Associating input elements and coverage. Using a *grammar* as a parser, we decompose an input into its constituent k -paths in order to associate them with coverage of individual methods, resulting in a set of classifiers that model the relationship between input elements and resulting coverage. While test generators always have determined and used conditions to reach particular code locations, ours is the first approach to make such associations explicit, user-facing, and reusable.

Targeted input generation without program guidance. The obtained decision trees can be used to specifically construct inputs that satisfy them and thus are set to cover the method in question. We can therefore target individual methods without requiring guidance from the program—which is especially useful if tests or instrumentation are expensive. To this end, we extend the algorithm from [51] to satisfy constraints on *combinations* of input elements. To the best of our knowledge, ours is the first approach to leverage and solve input features to specifically target individual methods during testing.

An input-based predictor for coverage. Our classifiers can take an arbitrary test input (given or generated), parse it into its elements, and predict the test coverage from the input features only. This yields a very cost-effective method for *selecting tests that cover a particular method*—for instance, because the method has changed or is critical. To the best of our knowledge, ours is the first work to unify coverage prediction and test generation guidance in a single model.

5.1 Extracting Features from Inputs

The first step in CODEINE is *feature extraction*. As we have noted in Section 5, we want to take into account the contextual ordering of input elements, which can be modeled reasonably well by k -paths. For this we choose our features to be the presence or absence of k -paths, and thus feature extraction means that we need to determine which k -paths are contained in a given derivation tree.

The naive algorithm for finding k -paths in a tree would traverse the tree depth-first and check whether any path ending at the current node corresponds to a k -path.

However, grammars can be *ambiguous*, with multiple derivation trees describing the same word. We therefore use an *Earley parser* [35], which generates *all* possible derivation trees (rather than just one) as a *derivation forest*—a concise representation of all derivation trees for a given input.

When we extract k -paths, we use the structure of this derivation forest to our advantage: A node which was reused in several trees should not be scanned more than once. We therefore use an algorithm which constructs not only k -paths, but l -paths for all $l \leq k$. For a terminal node, there is only one 1-path, consisting of the terminal itself. For every other node, we can recursively obtain the l -paths for its children and prepend them with the current node. This gives us a set of $l + 1$ -paths. We output every $l + 1$ -path for which $l + 1 \leq k$ holds. For a node group, we just output the union of the l -path sets for all contained nodes. Trees are acyclic by definition, so doing this recursively will always terminate.

This algorithm invokes itself recursively on all child nodes of the node it is invoked on. In a derivation forest, a node may have multiple parents, and therefore the algorithm may be invoked on the same node several times. Since there may even be an exponential number of parents, all results are cached to avoid repeated execution.

The algorithm yields a set of l -paths for every node, and we can define that a k -path *exists* in a forest if it is present in any of the l -path sets. The information whether a k -path exists in the forest of an input serves as a feature, which we then use to train decision trees. For some k -paths, the

structure of the grammar means that they are present in every derivation tree (e.g., the 1-path that contains the root node). We therefore discard features that have the same value across all observed inputs. They are useless for the decision tree learner.

5.2 Grammar Patterns

While having k -paths as features is perfectly fine for a classifier such as a decision tree, they do not give an intuitive understanding of the kind of input pattern they describe. Even in the presence of a grammar, it is difficult to mentally translate a k -path into something meaningful. However, the process required to do so is actually quite straightforward because it merely requires deriving a partial input by following the k -path.

For example, consider the k -path $\text{UnaryExpr}_{15} \rightarrow \text{AddExpr}_{36} \rightarrow \text{"-"}_{11}$. Reading from right to left and step by step, it describes a binary “-” operator in the context of an AddExpr . The "-"_{11} can be obtained by choosing the second alternative of the AddExpr derivation rule, and the AddExpr_{36} reference corresponds to the second to last alternative in the UnaryExpr rule. Working our way further up the k -path, we now need to locate the UnaryExpr_{15} reference, which resides in the second alternative of the MulTExpr rule.

With this, we can now evaluate the entire k -path into a single, synthesized derivation rule, which is not part of the original grammar. We begin by replacing the first element of our k -path, UnaryExpr_{15} , by the rule it is contained in, namely the second alternative of the MulTExpr rule:

$$\text{MulTExpr}_{13} (\text{"*"}_{23} \mid \text{" /"}_{24} \mid \text{" \%"}_{25}) \text{UnaryExpr}_{15}.$$

Next, we replace herein the UnaryExpr_{15} reference by the context of AddExpr_{36} , which is the next element in our k -path. After this step, we end up with a synthesized derivation rule of the form

$$\text{MulTExpr}_{13} (\text{"*"}_{23} \mid \text{" /"}_{24} \mid \text{" \%"}_{25}) (\text{" }_{35} \text{AddExpr}_{36} \text{"})_{37}.$$

Replacing AddExpr_{36} by its definition, we obtain the next step:

$$\text{MulTExpr}_{13} (\text{"*"}_{23} \mid \text{" /"}_{24} \mid \text{" \%"}_{25}) (\text{" }_{35} \text{AddExpr}_5 (\text{" +"}_{10} \mid \text{" -"}_{11}) \text{MulTExpr}_7 \text{"})_{37}.$$

Repeating this procedure one more time for the final k -path element "-"_{11} results in the following derivation rule:

$$\text{MulTExpr}_{13} (\text{"*"}_{23} \mid \text{" /"}_{24} \mid \text{" \%"}_{25}) (\text{" }_{35} \text{AddExpr}_5 \text{"-"}_{11} \text{MulTExpr}_7 \text{"})_{37}.$$

If we remove the identifiers and quotes, we end up with an easy to understand *pattern* of the form

$$\text{"MulTExpr (/ | * | \%) (AddExpr - MulTExpr)}."$$

In this pattern, the nonterminals MulTExpr and AddExpr are still placeholders for their respective grammar expansions.

For a developer, the pattern expresses that the associated location is covered whenever the input is of the form of a MulTExpr , followed by a $/$, $*$, or $\%$; and finally an expression “ $(\text{AddExpr} - \text{MulTExpr})$ ”. The pattern thus captures the *conditions* under which a particular location is covered; since these refer to properties of the input (and are expressed in terms of the input domain), they can be understood independently from the program structure.

Translating k -paths into patterns is implemented as part of `TRIBBLE`. Apart from helping with interpreting k -paths from our trained decision trees, such patterns also allow to conveniently check for changes in calling conditions of methods after large refactorings. For example, if a method designed to process inputs such as “ $++\text{Identifier}$ ” is now also suddenly connected to patterns like “ $++\text{DecDigits}$ ” after a refactoring, we might have forgotten to include a semantic checker on the path to this method.

We see that there is quite some potential in making k -paths user-facing. However, as in the rest of the paper, we will focus on their usage by test generators.

5.3 Feature-Oriented Input Generation

Having obtained a characterization of the call conditions of a method in the form of a decision tree, we would like to generate inputs exhibiting these characteristics. Therefore, the second step in CODEINE is *feature-oriented input generation*, where we extract constraints from the tree and generate samples which fulfill those constraints. To this end, we extend the algorithm presented in our previous work [51].

5.3.1 Obtaining Constraints from a Decision Tree. The constraints we seek to fulfill are conjunctions of the constraints in the nodes along a path leading to a covered classification in a decision tree. To collect a constraint, we follow the path from the root of the tree to a leaf that belongs to the class and create a single large constraint by constructing a conjunction. For every node we visit along the path, we add its constraint to the conjunction if the path follows the “yes” branch, otherwise we negate the constraint before adding it. In practice, most decision trees have multiple leaves, so in these cases we repeat the conjunction construction for all covering paths to obtain a set of tree constraints. This way we can say that a tree usually describes a set of inputs.

As an example, the tree in Figure 8 proposes that the constraint

$$\exists \text{UnaryExpr}_{15} \rightarrow \text{AddExpr}_{36} \wedge \nexists \text{UnaryExpr}_{15} \rightarrow \text{AddExpr}_{36} \rightarrow \text{MultExpr}_2$$

describes an input which covers `distributive_rule()`. Note how we negated the second clause to be \nexists because we were following the “no” branch.

5.3.2 Feasibility Check. The next processing stage we have to do before we can engage in the actual generation of inputs is filtering out infeasible constraints. Our decision tree learner optimizes to correctly classify as many *observed* inputs as possible. If some constraint is infeasible, there will be no input satisfying it for the learner to observe. Therefore, when assembling the decision tree, the learner is not deterred from including such constraints because doing so does not lead to any observable misclassification. Therefore, the learner may end up placing this constraint for either class (i.e., or). We remove such constraints by means of a dedicated check for incompatible k -paths. For example, a constraint of the form $\exists a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c \wedge \nexists a \rightarrow b$ is infeasible because the 2-path is contained in the 3-path, and therefore the 3-path cannot be instantiated without generating the 2-path. Note that similarly to our work in [51], we do not care about the completeness of this feasibility check. If we overlook an infeasible constraint, the algorithm will terminate without a result later on. A rigorous feasibility check does, however, speed up the approach significantly as the algorithm would otherwise exhaust its timeout.

5.3.3 Generating from Constraints. Having obtained a set of supposedly feasible constraints from a decision tree, we can move on to generate a derivation tree fulfilling each constraint in turn. The generation algorithm itself comprises two intertwined searches: The *outer search* is a heuristic search in the space of all possible partial derivation trees, while the *inner search* completes a partial tree and provides a heuristic value for the outer search.

The outer search is shown in Algorithm 3. The process starts by creating the root node from the given grammar, and then adds this node as a partial derivation tree to a priority queue. Within the loop in Line 6, the outer search takes one tree from this queue and for each open slot in this tree, it creates a clone of the tree which has this slot filled, and adds it to the queue. It is easy to see that this algorithm will enumerate all possible parse trees in the grammar. In each step, it expands all (partial) trees with all options that are allowed by the grammar. The number of parse trees for a grammar is usually infinite, so the algorithm terminates only if it finds a solution for the constraint. The actual runtime of the algorithm now depends on the order in which trees are evicted from the priority queue. The earlier a solution is found, the fewer iterations of the main loop are needed.

Algorithm 3 The Outer Search

```

1: function OUTERSEARCH(grammar graph  $G$ , constraint  $C$ )
2:    $Q \leftarrow$  a priority queue
3:    $s \leftarrow$  the start symbol of  $G$ 
4:    $r \leftarrow$  expansion of  $s$ 
5:   add  $r$  to  $Q$  with priority  $MAX$ 
6:   while  $Q \neq \{\}$  do
7:      $n \leftarrow$  a partial derivation tree removed from  $Q$ 
8:     if  $n$  is a complete tree and fulfils the constraint  $C$  then
9:        $\lfloor$  return  $n$ 
10:     $O \leftarrow$  all open slots in  $n$ 
11:    for  $d$  in  $O$  do
12:      for  $e$  in all candidate fillings of slot  $d$  do
13:         $t_1 \leftarrow$  a new tree created from  $n$  by filling  $d$  with  $e$ 
14:         $t_2 \leftarrow$  a new tree, created by the inner search as a completion of  $t_1$ 
15:         $p \leftarrow$  the number of subclauses of  $C$  not fulfilled by  $t_2$ 
16:        if  $t_2$  is a complete tree and fulfils the constraint  $C$  then
17:           $\lfloor$  return  $t_2$ 
18:        add  $d$  to  $Q$  with priority  $p$ 
19:   $\lfloor$  return unsolvable

```

The order in which trees are removed from the queue depends on a heuristic: Trees with a better heuristic value are evicted earlier. The inner search proceeds in a greedy manner and serves as such a heuristic. When it needs to fill a slot, it chooses the option which locally seems most fitting. If a completion of a given partial tree fulfils many subclauses of the constraint, there is a good chance that some variant fulfils all subclauses of the constraint. Therefore, such a partial tree is prioritized for the outer search.

The inner search has no influence on the *completeness* of the algorithm: The outer search will always enumerate all possible derivation trees. It does, however, influence the *run time* by ordering the trees in the priority queue such that candidates which are more likely to be a solution are found earlier.

Let us now take a closer look at how this search tandem works in detail. Staying with our current example, we assume the algorithm is solving the constraint $\exists \text{UnaryExpr}_{15} \rightarrow \text{AddExpr}_{36} \wedge \nexists \text{UnaryExpr}_{15} \rightarrow \text{AddExpr}_{36} \rightarrow \text{MultExpr}_2$ that we have obtained from the decision tree excerpt given in Figure 8.

The outer search begins with a tree that contains only the root node. The empty slot on the node can be filled by one of MultExpr_2 or AddExpr_5 (" $+$ "₁₀ | " $-$ "₁₁) MultExpr_7 . The outer search generates both partial trees, and adds them to the priority queue. The priority queue needs a priority for each tree, and so the algorithm calls upon the inner search to acquire one. Figure 10 shows the state up to now in its upper part, above the dashed line.

Let us observe how the inner search completes the first partial tree, the one which expands AddExpr_0 to MultExpr_2 . Its first decision is whether to expand MultExpr_2 into a UnaryExpr_8 or a MultExpr_{13} (" $*$ "₂₃ | " $/$ "₂₄ | " $\%$ "₂₅) UnaryExpr_{15} . The first clause in the constraint requires a k -path that begins with UnaryExpr_{15} . The second option generates a UnaryExpr_{15} directly, and therefore the greedy search uses it. At this point, the greedy search deviates from the order given by the grammar⁴ and immediately derives the UnaryExpr_{15} , instead of proceeding left-to-right to a MultExpr_{13} . All nodes can be easily added to the tree in the correct order regardless, thanks to the

slot system as introduced in Definition 2.1. In turn, `UnaryExpr` expands into one of the following alternatives:

- | | |
|---|--|
| (1) <code>Identifier₁₆</code> | (5) <code>"-"₃₃ UnaryExpr₃₄</code> |
| (2) <code>"+"₂₇ UnaryExpr₂₈</code> | (6) <code>"(""₃₅ AddExpr₃₆ ")"₃₇</code> |
| (3) <code>"-"₂₉ UnaryExpr₃₀</code> | (7) <code>DecDigits₂₂</code> |
| (4) <code>"++"₃₁ UnaryExpr₃₂</code> | |

Given that we are generating a subtree for a `UnaryExpr`, and the first clause of the constraint requires an `AddExpr36`, the algorithm takes option 6 at this point.

Now, `AddExpr` needs to be derived, and again the algorithm faces the decision between `MultiExpr2` and `AddExpr5 ("+"10 | "-"11) MultiExpr7`. The first clause in our disjunction provides no further guidance as the requested 2-path is already in the tree, regardless of which decision is taken here. The second clause, however, *prohibits* a k -path. We are in a subtree below `AddExpr36`, and there is a `UnaryExpr15` immediately above it, therefore the first two elements of the 3-path are present. The second clause of the constraint would be violated if we chose `MultiExpr2` at this point. Therefore, the algorithm chooses the other alternative. Note how the prohibited k -path can only be considered at its last element: Simply prohibiting `MultiExpr2` would also render the first clause infeasible.

The partial derivation tree below the dashed line in Figure 10 shows the result of the inner search so far. The tree is still not complete as there are several unfilled slots, which we have skipped along the way. However, we can simply invoke a close-off procedure as we did in Section 4.2 to obtain a complete tree with all elements required by our constraint. The priority for the partial tree we started with is therefore 0, and it will be chosen and returned by the next iteration of the outer search.

In fact, the inner search discovered a solution for the constraint. This does not happen in all cases. Complex interplay between different parts of the constraint, especially situations where prohibited and required k -paths overlap, can lead to constraints which cannot be solved by the inner search. In such cases, the outer search may need to consider another partial tree from the queue.

If, as in the example, the inner search discovers a solution for the constraint, we take a shortcut and return this solution directly (Line 16), instead of going through several iterations of the loop in Line 6. In practice, we observed that k -path constraints, in contrast to some of the more involved constraints implemented in `ALHAZEN`, lead to termination after one round of the outer search in many cases.

With this targeted generation algorithm in place, we now have a working solution to address our use case. Given our target method, we can deploy the described procedure to generate inputs that are likely to trigger its execution.

5.4 Evaluation

Seeing as the learned model in the form of decision trees is at the heart of our approach, we are foremost interested in their characteristics. Therefore, in our experimental evaluation, we aim to answer questions relating to the extent of their applicability to guide targeted input generation as well as their suitability for prediction of code coverage.

5.4.1 Evaluation Setup. Table 8 lists the subjects we used in this experiment. In contrast to the previous experiments, in this one, we exclude the CSV formats due to the small size of the grammar

⁴If the greedy search proceeded in the order given by the grammar, cases like the one in the example would trigger an endless loop by always going for the nearest derivation of `MultiExpr`.




Fig. 10. Outer and inner search working together to generate a derivation tree that fulfills a constraint gathered from a decision tree predictor. The dotted edge signifies the hand-off from the outer search to the inner search.

Table 8. Test subjects used in the CODEINE experiment

| Subject | Number of Methods | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| | Observed | Trainable |
| argo [18] | 408 | 132 |
| fastjson [17] | 1404 | 101 |
| genson [31] | 986 | 113 |
| gson [19] | 632 | 148 |
| json-flattener [20] | 60 | 41 |
| json-java [56] | 202 | 44 |
| json-simple [2] | 54 | 17 |
| json-cliftonlabs [58] | 78 | 17 |
| minimal-json [71] | 199 | 100 |
| pojo [57] | 451 | 150 |
| autolink [72] | 43 | 20 |
| jur1 [68] | 50 | 38 |
| url-detector [65] | 92 | 39 |
| rhino [21] | 4531 | 599 |

and subject code, and Markdown due to the fact that this language has quite literally no invalid words, which makes it infinitely ambiguous. Ambiguous grammars present a big performance challenge for ALHAZEN because they admit multiple derivation trees for the same input, and so ALHAZEN tries to consider all of them at once. To make up for the loss, however, we introduce the Mozilla rhino subject, which is a JavaScript interpreter implemented in the Java language. Table 8 provides a full list of the subjects used in this experiment. The input formats are the same that we have used in Table 1, only the JavaScript grammar is a new addition in the heavyweight category with a total of 228 productions [3].

The experiment orchestration is implemented in Python by means of a pipeline process built on top of Spotify’s Luigi framework [27]. The pipeline structure allows for an automated experiment that is easily run in parallel and is able to recover from errors.

Table 9. Coverage fractions achieved by CODEINE versus grammar-random

| Subject | Relative | | Absolute | |
|-----------------------|----------|--------------|----------|--------------|
| | Random | CODEINE | Random | CODEINE |
| argo [18] | 0.111 | 0.800 | 0.606 | 1.000 |
| fastjson [17] | 0.286 | 0.857 | 0.713 | 0.960 |
| genson [31] | 0.300 | 0.700 | 0.717 | 0.956 |
| gson [19] | 0.000 | 1.000 | 0.486 | 0.966 |
| json-flattener [20] | 0.000 | 1.000 | 0.463 | 1.000 |
| json-java [56] | 0.000 | 1.000 | 0.250 | 1.000 |
| json-simple [2] | 0.000 | 1.000 | 0.471 | 1.000 |
| json-cliftonlabs [58] | 0.857 | 1.000 | 0.941 | 1.000 |
| minimal-json [71] | 0.125 | 1.000 | 0.560 | 0.980 |
| pojo [57] | 0.000 | 0.500 | 0.240 | 0.680 |
| autolink [72] | 0.500 | 0.886 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| url | | | | |
| jur1 [68] | 0.948 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| url-detector [65] | 0.833 | 0.852 | 0.949 | 1.000 |
| JS | | | | |
| rhino [21] | 0.000 | 0.692 | 0.392 | 0.928 |

The *Observed* column in Table 8 gives the number of methods CODEINE observed while executing each subject on the training input set. This number excludes constructors and static class initializers because we do not deem them to be targets of particular interest.

Our experimental pipeline is set up in a way that allows us to answer all research questions in a single pass. First, the subjects are compiled and instrumented to report which methods are covered during execution and how often. Then, for each input language, we create a set of 1000 initial input files generated at random from the grammar using the GRAMMARINATOR approach [46] like we did in Section 4.3. We also adopt GRAMMARINATOR’s default limit of 30 derivation steps as it seems to generate sufficiently diverse inputs across all our languages. And just to avoid any potential confusion, throughout this evaluation, the term “random” refers to *grammar-random* inputs generated this way.

We ran CODEINE with those input sets. After the second step – the collection of coverage data – we also filter out methods that are never executed because there is no way to train a decision tree for something we have not observed. Likewise, we ignore methods that are always triggered because we do not even need a tree to explain their calling conditions. Table 8 gives the method numbers resulting from this filtering in its *Trainable* column (limited to 1000 at most for performance reasons). As before, we use JaCoCo [47] to instrument the subjects and recover coverage data.

In addition to removing methods with no variance, we also balance the dataset by sub-sampling the data, so that for every remaining method, the number of samples which reach the method is the same as the number of samples which do not reach the method, as recommended in [22]. We thus avoid the problem of learning trees that are heavily biased to either of the classes, as we want them to characterize the call conditions of a method as precisely as possible.

From here, we can train a decision tree for every trainable method using the features of the inputs. We set the maximum depth for the tree learner to be 5 as this value was successfully used in [51] to obtain good results. Also, we want to keep our trees *lean* to reduce the number of constraints CODEINE will have to solve when generating inputs.

5.4.2 Generative Power. One of the central questions in this work is whether we can successfully use the decision trees learned by CODEINE for generating inputs to cover a given method.

To answer this question, our experimental pipeline first proceeds to invoke the generation capabilities of CODEINE for each subject. As described in Section 5.3, we obtain a set of inputs for each decision tree. From those sets, we define two coverage metrics:

Relative coverage fraction is defined as the number of inputs that do cover the targeted method divided by the number of all inputs in the set.

Absolute coverage fraction is defined as the fraction of trees whose input set includes at least one input that covers its intended method. This expresses how many methods could be successfully covered at all.

However, there might be the possibility that covering the methods in question is easy, regardless of the nature of the inputs. To investigate this, we compare the results obtained from inputs generated with CODEINE to inputs generated randomly from the grammar by GRAMMARINATOR⁵. For a fair comparison, the pipeline generates for each decision tree as many random files as are generated by CODEINE. Table 9 reports the results of this comparison in the four columns labeled *Coverage Fraction*. The relative coverage ratio is measured individually per method, but due to space constraints, we report its median value across all methods for each subject. The absolute coverage ratio, however, is calculated per subject, and can thus be reported directly.

Looking at the relative coverage ratios, we see that given the same number of attempts, *CODEINE significantly outperforms random inputs*, which oftentimes fail to reach the targeted method at all. This observation is consistent across all subjects except for `jur1` and `url-detector`, where random inputs are roughly on par, or even outperform CODEINE, respectively. This indicates that the trees effectively reflect the input features which are relevant to a method being covered or not.

Inputs generated by CODEINE reach targeted methods better than grammar-random inputs.

The absolute coverage results tell us that for all but the three subjects of the URL family, inputs generated by CODEINE are indeed more likely to reach a given method than inputs generated randomly. In the aforementioned three cases, both approaches do equally well. This is due to the small size of the subjects and thus most methods being easily reachable regardless of input specifics.

Now, for the remaining subjects the difference might seem negligible, and the fact that *all* methods are indeed successfully reachable by randomly generated files might be surprising. However, this is given by the construction of our experiment: CODEINE forms decision trees from randomly generated inputs and can therefore only learn what is achievable by random inputs in the first place. Nonetheless, our approach does identify the conditions under which a method is reached, which is what explains why we observe a difference at all. We are convinced that given specially crafted, exotic inputs that cover hard-to-reach methods, this difference would be far more pronounced.

While it is not the main focus of the approach at hand, the inputs generated by CODEINE triggered between one and two orders of magnitude more exceptions with unique stack hashes than inputs generated by the random grammar-based approach across the seven subjects which have thrown exceptions.

5.4.3 Predictive Power. To address our next question of how well the decision trees can *predict* the code coverage of a given input, we can leverage classic evaluation methods from machine learning. Specifically, we can evaluate the precision, recall, and accuracy of the decision trees learned by CODEINE.

For this, our evaluation pipeline creates another, independent set of random inputs using the same algorithm we used to obtain our initial set but with a different random seed. This is our *test set*.

⁵Actually our own GRAMMARINATOR-like implementation, so that we can reuse the exact same grammar files.

Table 10. Subjects and association quality of CODEINE

| Subject | Association Quality | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|--------|
| | Accuracy | Precision | Recall |
| argo [18] | 0.983 | 0.959 | 0.971 |
| fastjson [17] | 0.984 | 0.966 | 0.976 |
| genson [31] | 0.986 | 0.964 | 0.969 |
| gson [19] | 0.987 | 0.964 | 0.962 |
| json-flattener [20] | 0.970 | 0.978 | 0.936 |
| json-java [56] | 0.982 | 0.944 | 0.937 |
| json-simple [2] | 0.997 | 0.988 | 0.994 |
| json-cliftonlabs [58] | 0.987 | 0.989 | 0.988 |
| minimal-json [71] | 0.974 | 0.946 | 0.928 |
| pojo [57] | 0.988 | 0.953 | 0.934 |
| autolink [72] | 0.946 | 0.948 | 0.952 |
| url [68] | 0.941 | 0.956 | 0.977 |
| url-detector [65] | 0.952 | 0.966 | 0.970 |
| rhino [21] | 0.954 | 0.846 | 0.825 |

We then run all subjects with these inputs and measure the real code coverage, which is our *ground truth*. Next, the decision trees in question are used to classify the inputs in the test set according to their features, which gives us a *prediction* for each method and each input.

We can now compute the *accuracy* of the decision trees. We refer to our predictions as *true* or *false* depending on whether they are correct or not with respect to the ground truth, and as *positive* or *negative* depending on whether they predict that a method will or will not be covered, respectively. Based on those definitions, we can derive the following metrics:

Accuracy defined as $\frac{\text{true positives} + \text{true negatives}}{\text{number of samples}}$ is the fraction of correct predictions (covering or non-covering) over the number of samples.

Precision defined as $\frac{\text{true positives}}{\text{true positives} + \text{false positives}}$ denotes how many inputs reported to cover a method actually do so.

Recall defined as $\frac{\text{true positives}}{\text{true positives} + \text{false negatives}}$ denotes how many of the inputs covering a method are also classified as such.

All the above measures have values between zero and one, with one indicating the best results. Table 10 lists these metrics for all subjects in the columns *Accuracy*, *Precision*, and *Recall*, respectively.

From the results presented in Table 10, we can conclude that the decision trees as learned by CODEINE do indeed predict the code coverage very well.

CODEINE decision trees predict coverage with high accuracy.

First, the predictions made by the trees are accurate in more than 94% across all subjects. As observed earlier, the features are indeed relevant to a method being covered or not. This makes the trees valuable not only in conjunction with inputs which they can classify, but also on their own. A decision tree is very different from many other machine learning models in that its very structure gives information about the priorities with which individual features should be treated. In Section 5.2 we show how to translate our features into human-readable patterns, which can help in understanding the learned decision trees, making them useful even in the absence of inputs.

Second, while the accuracy is a measure of how often the tree is correct in its prediction, the precision concerns itself with how often a tree is correct in predicting the *interesting* case that a

Table 11. Method coverage for CODEINE (C) and grammar-random (R).
For each pair of comparable values, the larger one is printed in **bold**.

| Subject | Covered Methods | | | | # Calls | | Cohen's d | |
|---------|------------------|-----------|------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------|
| | Median | | Mean | | Mean | | | |
| | R | C | R | C | R | C | | |
| JSON | argo | 40 | 46 | 44.2 | 52.2 | 4.3 | 8.8 | 0.602 |
| | fastjson | 28 | 35 | 29.9 | 39.9 | 8.8 | 10.5 | 0.101 |
| | genson | 33 | 54 | 35.9 | 55.4 | 17.4 | 20.1 | 0.066 |
| | gson | 27 | 76 | 35.8 | 73.0 | 4.0 | 8.8 | 0.366 |
| | json-flattener | 17 | 27 | 17.9 | 25.5 | 464.6 | 464.1 | 0.000 |
| | json-java | 7 | 21 | 9.7 | 20.7 | 3.1 | 8.0 | 0.458 |
| | json-simple | 7 | 17 | 8.7 | 16.1 | 5.0 | 6.8 | 0.181 |
| | json-cliftonlabs | 12 | 12 | 12.5 | 13.1 | 73.3 | 35.2 | 0.447 |
| | minimal-json | 24 | 41 | 26.8 | 41.2 | 2.6 | 7.0 | 0.792 |
| | pojo | 17 | 48 | 19.2 | 49.6 | 1.0 | 5.2 | 0.425 |
| URL | autolink | 24 | 26 | 24.8 | 25.6 | 111.1 | 53.6 | 0.487 |
| | jur1 | 39 | 39 | 36.0 | 36.9 | 122.5 | 101.4 | 0.119 |
| | url-detector | 44 | 37 | 41.1 | 33.3 | 881.9 | 123.4 | 0.796 |
| JS | rhino | 264 | 343 | 270.4 | 334.8 | 3.8 | 181.0 | 0.082 |

method is covered. Upon inspecting our precision results, we can come to the conclusion that the trees are not only accurate because they simply predict non-coverage most of the time and just happen to be correct. Instead, the high precision indicates that the trees effectively characterize inputs that end up covering methods. The high recall further supports this interpretation: The trees identify almost all there is to identify in terms of method covering inputs.

5.4.4 Execution Extent. The next step in our study concerns itself with whether, in general, inputs generated from decision trees cover more methods as compared to random inputs because of their supposed deeper reach into the program. To find an answer, we base this experiment on the test set data obtained from the evaluation of predictive capabilities as described in Section 5.4.3, as well as on the cumulative results from the generative evaluation from Section 5.4.2. This effectively leaves us with two large sets of inputs, where for every input we know the number of methods it reaches. One set is composed of inputs generated randomly, and the other comprises inputs generated by CODEINE.

Table 11 gives in the first four columns the median and mean number of unique methods covered by each file for the two input sets, denoted by R and C for grammar-random and CODEINE, respectively.

Our results show for 11 out of the 14 subjects that the inputs generated by CODEINE reach more methods per input in general. This is consistent with our hypothesis that inputs generated by CODEINE for the purpose of covering a specific method usually cover more methods that are related to it. These tend to be methods that must be passed in order to reach the targeted method and also methods that are themselves called from the now reached target.

*Compared to grammar-random, for 11 out of 14 subjects,
inputs generated by CODEINE cover more methods.*

This behavior speaks of a higher diversity of the inputs generated by CODEINE, which also tend to be much smaller than randomly generated inputs. For instance, the inputs generated by CODEINE

have average sizes of 8.65, 12.06, and 22.09 bytes for the three grammars, while files generated by the random grammar-based approach are considerably larger averaging at 60.71, 80.75, and 60.92 bytes, respectively. In the context of testing, such inputs are favorable for covering more behavior in a single run of the system under test. Also, smaller inputs tend to reduce runtime and debugging effort.

Compared to grammar-random, inputs generated by CODEINE are much smaller.

Note that this does not mean that CODEINE reaches *more* methods than a random generator. In our experiment, almost all methods were eventually reached with both approaches.

For a closer look, let us first consider the JSON parser `gson` as a subject that has the most prominent difference in the number of methods covered in favor of CODEINE. At its core, it has a central loop with a `switch` statement, which uses a lookahead to determine the type of the next structure and then delegates its parsing to specialized methods. For example, it has dedicated methods such as `peekNumber()` for looking up what kind of number should be read next, as well as `nextInt()` and `nextDouble()` for consuming JSON numbers as integers or double precision decimals. Due to the structure of the grammar, a random generator is very likely to generate a single, top-level value such as “true” or “null”. As such inputs lack the expected lookahead characters, no specialized methods are called when parsing them. Conversely, CODEINE is always guided by some non-trivial condition, leading it to generate specific, but more involved inputs that tend to cover more of those specialized methods.

On the other hand, we have `json-cliftonlabs` as a subject with no significant difference in the coverage extent. It, too, contains a single loop with a big `switch` statement as the centerpiece of its deserialization routine. For serialization, it sports an `if-else` cascade of an equally impressive size. All processing happens in these two locations, confined to two methods from which no other notable methods are called. And almost regardless of the inputs, the parser always takes the same methods to reach these central places, which explains why there cannot be a significant difference in the number of methods reached, regardless of the approach to input generation.

Finally, there is the `url-detector` subject, which is the only case where random inputs cover more methods per input file. It works similarly to `gson` by delegating a lot of its work to individual methods from a central loop. Most notably contributing to the difference in coverage, there are numerous methods that are executed only in the presence of specific characters. One such example is the `readQueryString()` method that is entered when a “?” is encountered, which is something that is only generated by CODEINE when it specifically tries to reach a method that is involved in the processing of the so-called *query* part of a URL and not on other occasions. The random generator creates inputs containing a “?” much more frequently because it derives aimlessly.

5.4.5 Execution Frequency. One could expect that inputs generated from decision trees, which describe the precise conditions under which a method is called, would, in general, exercise those methods more often than random inputs. With this experiment, we want to know whether this is the case. To answer this, our pipeline leverages the same inputs as in Section 5.4.2, which gives us for every method a set of inputs generated by CODEINE and a set of the same size generated randomly. Our experimental pipeline instruments the subjects so that not only the method coverage, but also the method execution counts are reported. We compare how often each method was executed by inputs generated specifically for it by CODEINE to how often it was executed by a set of random inputs of the same size. We use the Wilcoxon signed-rank test [78] to determine if the differences are statistically significant, and Cohen’s *d* [33] to calculate the effect size.

While the differences are indeed statistically significant in favor of CODEINE with a p -value < 0.001 for all but the three URL subjects, they are very limited in their size. The three rightmost columns of Table 11 show the average number of invocations of the methods targeted by their respective decision trees for the input sets generated randomly and by CODEINE, as R and C, respectively. The rightmost column shows the value of Cohen’s d calculated on the pairwise differences. Most values are below 0.5, which can be interpreted as small to medium effect sizes [66].

CODEINE aims at reaching methods once, not often.

This observation, however, is consistent with the way CODEINE is training its decision trees: It uses the input features to learn a binary classification whether a method is covered or not without taking the number of its executions into account. Therefore, it generates samples which simply cover the targeted method, as opposed to samples which cover the targeted method as often as possible.

6 THREATS TO VALIDITY

The experimental evaluations in this paper are all empirical in nature, especially because GRAMMARINATOR, decision trees, and the k -path algorithm come with inherent randomness. Hence, all observations naturally face threats to validity.

6.1 External Validity

When it comes to *external validity*, we have examined a number of subjects and input languages, covering a variety of input and implementation features. While our observations are consistent, we cannot claim generality of the results across all programs and inputs.

All our subjects are written in the Java programming language, which might come with some constraints on the represented code architecture and control structure paradigms. Additionally, we have opted to use the most easily accessible sources of grammars for our subject formats. However, variations in the formulation of derivation rules of a grammar might affect the behavior of a fuzzing algorithm. At present, there is no systematic research into the nature and extent of such effects.

As the subjects are all *libraries*, the control flow must originate from client code, which in turn means that we had to write test drivers ourselves. We ensured that the test drivers exercised as much of the advertised functionality to the best of our ability by accessing all documented public methods, but it may be that some code was missed leading to underreporting of code coverage.

While we were careful in writing the drivers, and studied the documentation of all libraries thoroughly, we can not rule out wrong API usage within our drivers, and effects on coverage or number of errors found. However, if those effects were present, they affected GRAMMARINATOR and CODEINE likewise, and therefore do not invalidate the comparison of those tools.

This also has consequences for the learning of k -path features, as we can only learn from what we can observe. Therefore, the extent of the methods to which CODEINE can be applied hinges on the amount of the training data we can obtain. In practice, we can usually expect to profit from existing regression test suites or readily available collections of test inputs found on the Internet.

In addition to the observability problem, for some methods, it may be undecidable whether they can ever be reached and how the conditions could ever be characterized other than through the program itself. As such, this presents a threat to our assessment of whether the trained models have sufficient expressive power.

6.2 Internal Validity

In terms of *internal validity*, we have taken great care in validating our findings, notably by using well-established tools for computing code coverage, statistical significance, and validating grammar coverage during construction. We repeated the experiment with different initial seeds to offset the effects of randomness that is an essential element in both algorithms, and we used established techniques to compute statistical significance of the observations. To ensure fidelity of results we use the same initial conditions for both approaches in terms of the number of input files. In addition, the entire tool chain from experiment configuration to collected data is fully automated and tested, greatly mitigating the risk of human error; all data and tools are available for external replication and validation.

Further, we do not account for the fact that some of our features may syntactically depend on other features, thus leading to feature correlation. For example, consider k -paths that are included in other k -paths by construction, in which case it would not be advantageous to include both of them in the same decision tree. In a similar vein, our models can only express coverage conditions over *basic* features of input elements. As actual coverage conditions are undecidable in general, our models can only approximate coverage conditions by construction.

Grammar ambiguity possibly deserves its own place in this list, as it is a major source of trouble for the ALHAZEN tool when it comes to handling features of inputs. In ambiguous grammars, there exist different derivation trees for the same input, and so we must use an expensive Earley parser [35] to be able to find all such interpretations. From here, we consider that an input has a feature if it is contained in *any* of the possible derivation trees. This by itself already presents an over-approximation and thus a threat to generalizability, as different subjects may interpret the same input differently, and so the presence of a feature may or may not be factual.

Nevertheless, when it comes to the technical realization of the experiments, to avoid technical errors on our part, we use proven implementations of well-researched statistical methods throughout the experimental pipeline.

7 RELATED WORK

In this section, we take the opportunity to explore some relevant fuzzing approaches related to grammar-based and machine-learning-based techniques.

7.1 Blackbox Fuzzing

TRIBBLE is a language-based test generator (“fuzzer”), relying on a *language specification* to produce syntactically valid inputs that are set to cover as many program behaviors as possible. The usage of language models as *producers* was introduced in 1970 by Hanford in his *syntax machine* [43]. Now as then, such producers are mainly used for testing compilers and interpreters: CSmith [79] produces syntactically correct C programs, and LANGFUZZ [48] uses a JavaScript grammar to parse, recombine, and mutate existing inputs while maintaining syntactic validity. Like TRIBBLE and GRAMMARINATOR, they can be used in *blackbox* settings without requiring feedback from the program.

7.2 Whitebox Fuzzing

Several fuzzers exploit information from program code and executions to guide test generation. Grammar-based whitebox fuzzing [37], combining grammar-based fuzzing with symbolic testing, has saved Microsoft millions of dollars in testing. Sireer et al. [69] as well as Coppit et al. [34] present attractive domain specific languages and associated input generators for easy grammar-based testing. Instead, Beyene et al. [29], Kifetew et al. [52], Veggalam et al. [75], Pham et al. [63],

Aschermann et al. [26], and also Wang et al. [77] opt to apply metaheuristic optimization guided by code coverage to the task of input generation.

None of the above approaches aim for grammar coverage. Our results, however, indicate that any of these approaches could be extended with k -path coverage at low cost, providing additional guidance for test generation.

7.3 Mutational Fuzzing

In place of a grammar, one can also have a fuzzer work on a population of inputs, which are then *evolved* through basic lexical mutations towards a particular goal such as coverage. This approach has been implemented in the highly popular AFL [80] and libFuzzer [67] tools and their many derivatives.

Mutational fuzzers are generally *format-agnostic*, meaning that they assume no knowledge about the input format when producing or mutating inputs. This makes them easy to set up and deploy. However, they also require that

- a collection of diverse input files to be mutated be available,
- instrumentation and feedback from the program under test is available, and
- the cost of producing myriads of invalid inputs is bearable.

None of these restrictions apply for grammar-based fuzzers, which by construction cover the entire syntax of inputs—but require a grammar to operate.

7.4 Grammar Coverage and Production

The concept of grammar coverage was invented in 1972 with Purdom’s *sentence generator* [64], which improved over Hanson’s syntax machine by systematically covering all production rules. In 2001, Lämmel introduced context-dependent rule coverage for grammars [54]. Given a set of words, this “non-trivial coverage notion” (Lämmel) determines for a rule whether a set of words covers all contexts the rule can occur in. The *Geno* tool by Lämmel and Schulte [55] also gave developers control over which rules should be exhaustively recombined, and to which depth. Our k -path approach generalizes over such context notions and recombinations by introducing context depth as a single parameter.

7.5 Model-Based Testing

The idea of *systematically covering combinations* is prevalent in testing techniques. On code, its closest equivalent is the LCSAJ metric, covering all sequences of branches up to a given length [45], whereas *condition coverage* or *MC/DC coverage* define criteria for covering combinations of basic conditions in decisions.

In *model-based testing* [74], *transition coverage* and *path coverage* measure how many combinations of subsequent states in a finite-state machine are covered. As an example, consider the finite state machine in Figure 11, modeling possible command sequences for some (hypothetical) program. A good test suite for this program would at least cover all states, better all transitions, and possibly also combinations of transitions.

If we embed the finite state machine into an equivalent grammar (Figure 12), turning states into nonterminals, then k -path coverage in the grammar maps all paths of length k in the finite state machine: 1-path grammar coverage is equivalent to state coverage, 2-path coverage is equivalent to transition coverage (= covering all pairs of states), and covering all 3-paths in the grammar is equivalent to covering all sequences of states of length 3. All our algorithms for determining coverage and producing covering inputs equally apply; modeling the system as a grammar has the extra advantage that command arguments and their syntax can also be detailed.




Fig. 11. A finite state model

```

start := q1;
q1 := "ping" q1 | "auth" q2;
q2 := "auth" q2 | "connect" q3 | "";
q3 := "cmd" q3 | "quit" q2;
  
```

Fig. 12. Grammar for the finite state model in Figure 11

7.6 Combinatorial Testing

For configurable systems, *combinatorial testing* [61] also mandates that certain combinations of configuration variables be covered. As an example, the grammar in Figure 13 models various configurations of operating system, processor, and browser—for instance, "windows-intel-edge" or "macos-arm-safari".

```

start := config;
config := os;
os := "windows-"processor | "linux-"processor | "macos-"processor;
processor := "arm-"browser | "intel-"browser;
browser := "chrome" | "edge" | "firefox" | "safari";
  
```

Fig. 13. A configuration grammar

In this example, applying 1-path coverage ensures that each value of each configuration variable be tested at least once; applying 3-path coverage would cover all possible combinations of operating system, processor, and browser. While k -paths and grammars are no substitute for the complex constraints in combinatorial testing, both build on similar concepts of exploring combinations.

7.7 Probabilistic Input Generation

The *Skyfire* approach by Wang et al. [76] attempts to learn and then generatively reproduce *input distributions* using a probabilistic, context-sensitive grammar. Upon closer inspection, their notion of context is limited to considering 3-paths and the first sibling of an element. In the context of systematic test generation, attempting to achieve such coverage fully is likely to be equivalent to full two-way combinatorial testing, and so possibly infeasible. However, such contexts might be adequate to serve as input features for the task of coverage prediction as in CODEINE.

7.8 Suppression Patterns

Groce et al. [42] explore the relationship between controllable and observable aspects of testing—notably, input features and code coverage—and point out that it may also be necessary to express

which features should *not* be produced during testing. In our setting, such a negation can be addressed by applying an *exclusion* pattern [40] on the grammar before going for k -path coverage.

7.9 Coverage Prediction

Several works use machine learning as an oracle for code coverage in the context of test execution. Grano et al. use features of generated tests to predict coarse-grained code coverage [41]. Zhang et al. predict mutation score [81]. These works are only tangentially related to ours as they do not leverage grammars, and focus on *predicting* only.

Appelt et al. [24, 25] use decision trees to predict whether a firewall will let through a SQL injection attack. They use a grammar to obtain parse trees of the inputs, and use the subtrees of those as features. They employ the learned model in a feedback loop with a genetic algorithm that synthesizes attack inputs, which are, in turn, used to iteratively refine the model. In contrast to their work, our approach produces human-readable explanations of the features that are most relevant for reaching a given method as we show in Section 5.2.

7.10 Grammarware: Past and Future

Despite their versatility both as parsers and producers of program inputs, grammars play only a minor role in software testing. In 2005, Klint et al. [53] noted a lack of best practices for “grammarware”, that is, grammars and grammar-dependent software, as well as a lack of metrics and other quality notions for testing. In the context of test generation, we find that a multitude of input languages can be easily described using grammars, and that grammar-based testing reaches well into domains not traditionally associated with formal grammars—file formats, network protocols, command languages, and more. Recent advances in grammar inference [28, 38, 39, 49] suggest that grammars may be inferred from programs or sample inputs, promising to make grammar-based fuzzing easier than ever.

8 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

As a formalism for describing the languages of programs and data, grammars have shown their usefulness again and again. This paper introduces the concept of k -paths, which allow to capture the *coverage of input elements* and their combinations. This leads to substantial improvements in the context of grammar-based testing:

- k -paths introduce a *grammar coverage metric* that is easy to measure and hence allows for simple assessment of the quality of test cases. Even more importantly, k -path coverage is easy to achieve.

Our TRIBBLE prototype implements the metric and coverage-driven generation algorithm. In its evaluation, both our metric and algorithm improve the state of the art in test generation. As *k -path input coverage positively correlates with code coverage*, k -paths make a useful objective for systematic generation of diverse inputs.

- We show how k -paths can be used as input features to learn *associations between input and code coverage*. These associations are *explicit* and *user-facing* and can thus be immediately used to *generate* inputs that effectively target specific methods, while treating the program under test as a black box. The learned associations can be used to predict coverage for given inputs, thus assisting in test selection.

Our CODEINE prototype implements this advanced use case of k -paths. We show that CODEINE is effective in generating inputs that target methods in real-world programs with complex inputs, and accurate in predicting the method coverage for given inputs.

Besides applying our TRIBBLE and CODEINE frameworks in further domains, our future work will focus on the following topics:

***k*-Paths for debugging.** As *k*-paths emerge as good predictors for coverage, they might also turn out to be good predictors for *failures*; also, associations between input features, the coverage they cause, and failures might make great diagnoses for debugging.

Associating *k*-paths with data flow. We are investigating to which extent input features relevant for a particular path can be *mined* from the state of program at hand, using combinations of dynamic and symbolic analysis. This requires establishing *mappings* between input elements and the state of internal variables.

Feedback loops. Features that are relevant for a particular program behavior can be systematically refined and refuted using a feedback loop triggering additional test cases as is done in our previous work [51]. In the setting of targeted input generation, one can gather coverage information for *all* methods with a single run, so we are experimenting with approaches to generate inputs that refine multiple coverage hypotheses at once.

***k*-Path features.** While we already have established that on average, CODEINE-generated inputs are smaller than randomly generated ones (Section 4.4), an interesting question would be whether they also achieve a higher depth, a higher breadth, a higher variety, or fare different on other structural metrics—features that would help further understanding what makes generated inputs most efficient.

Program comprehension. As sketched in Section 5.2, *k*-paths offer a way to express the *conditions* under which a particular code location is executed. But how helpful (and how complex) would these patterns be to developers? We are currently running a *user study* to understand how input patterns and features can help developers for debugging and program comprehension.

All our tools and experiments are available as open source at

<https://github.com/havrikov/tribble>

<https://github.com/havrikov/codeine>

Acknowledgments. We thank the anonymous reviewers of TOSEM and ASE 2019 for their detailed and productive comments. Andreas Zeller’s team at CISPA provided helpful feedback on earlier versions of this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] 2012. jcsv. <https://code.google.com/archive/p/jcsv>. Version 1.4.0.
- [2] 2014. json-simple. <https://github.com/fangyidong/json-simple>. Version 1.1.1.
- [3] 2015. ECMAScript 2015 Standard ECMA-262 6th Edition. <https://www.ecma-international.org/ecma-262/6.0/>.
- [4] 2016. Markdown4J. <https://github.com/jdcasey/markdown4j>. Version 2.2-cj-1.1.
- [5] 2016. super-csv. <https://github.com/super-csv/super-csv>. Version 2.4.0.
- [6] 2017. Atlassian Commonmark. <https://github.com/atlassian/commonmark-java>. Version 0.11.0.
- [7] 2017. Txtmark. <https://github.com/rjeschke/txtmark>. Version 0.13.
- [8] 2018. <https://commons.apache.org/proper/commons-csv/>. Version 1.6.
- [9] 2018. CSV Grammar. <https://github.com/antlr/grammars-v4/tree/master/csv>.
- [10] 2018. galimatias. <https://github.com/smola/galimatias>. Version 0.2.1.
- [11] 2018. Jackson-Databind. <https://github.com/FasterXML/jackson-databind>. Version 2.9.8.
- [12] 2018. Jackson Dataformat CSV. <https://github.com/FasterXML/jackson-dataformats-text/tree/master/csv>. Version 2.9.8.
- [13] 2018. Simple Flat Mapper. <https://github.com/arnaudroger/SimpleFlatMapper>. Version 6.1.1.
- [14] 2018. simplecsv. <https://github.com/quux00/simplecsv>. Version 2.1.
- [15] 2018. URL Grammar. <https://github.com/antlr/grammars-v4/blob/master/url/url.g4>.
- [16] 2019. Fuzzinator Configs. <https://github.com/renatahodovan/fuzzinator-configs>.

- [17] 2020. Alibaba fastjson. <https://github.com/alibaba/fastjson>. Version 1.2.75.
- [18] 2020. Argo. <https://sourceforge.net/projects/argo/>. Version 5.16.
- [19] 2020. gson. <https://github.com/google/gson>. Version 2.8.6.
- [20] 2020. json-flattener. <https://github.com/wnameless/json-flattener>. Version 0.12.0.
- [21] 2020. Mozilla Rhino. <https://github.com/mozilla/rhino>. Version 1.7.13.
- [22] 2020. Scikit-learn Guide on Decision Trees. <https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/tree.html>.
- [23] Alfred V. Aho, Ravi Sethi, and Jeffrey D. Ullman. 1986. *Compilers: Principles, Techniques, and Tools*. Addison-Wesley. <https://www.worldcat.org/oclc/12285707>
- [24] Dennis Appelt, Cu D Nguyen, and Lionel Briand. 2015. Behind an Application Firewall, are we Safe From SQL Injection Attacks?. In *2015 IEEE 8th international conference on software testing, verification and validation (ICST)*. IEEE, 1–10.
- [25] Dennis Appelt, Cu D Nguyen, Annibale Panichella, and Lionel C Briand. 2018. A Machine-Learning-Driven Evolutionary Approach for Testing Web Application Firewalls. *IEEE Transactions on Reliability* 67, 3 (2018), 733–757.
- [26] Cornelius Aschermann, Tommaso Frassetto, Thorsten Holz, Patrick Jauernig, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, and Daniel Teuchert. 2019. NAUTILUS: FiShing for Deep Bugs With Grammars. In *NDSS*. <https://www.ndss-symposium.org/ndss-paper/nautilus-fishing-for-deep-bugs-with-grammars/>
- [27] The Luigi Authors. 2020. Luigi. <https://github.com/spotify/luigi>.
- [28] Osbert Bastani, Rahul Sharma, Alex Aiken, and Percy Liang. 2017. Synthesizing Program Input Grammars. In *Proceedings of the 38th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (Barcelona, Spain) (PLDI 2017)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 95–110. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3062341.3062349>
- [29] Michael Beyene and James H Andrews. 2012. Generating String Test Data for Code Coverage. In *2012 IEEE Fifth International Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation*. IEEE, 270–279.
- [30] T. Bray. 2017. *The JavaScript Object Notation (JSON) Data Interchange Format*. STD 90. RFC Editor.
- [31] Eugen Cepoi. 2020. Genson. <https://github.com/owlike/genson>. Version 1.6.
- [32] N. Chomsky. 1956. Three models for the description of language. *IRE Transactions on Information Theory* 2, 3 (1956), 113–124. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.1956.1056813>
- [33] Jacob Cohen. 2013. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Academic press.
- [34] David Coppit and Jixin Lian. 2005. Yagg: an Easy-to-use Generator for Structured Test Inputs. In *Proceedings of the 20th IEEE/ACM international Conference on Automated software engineering*. 356–359.
- [35] Jay Earley. 1970. An Efficient Context-Free Parsing Algorithm. *Commun. ACM* 13, 2 (1970), 94–102.
- [36] GitHub. 2012. Community Grammars Written for ANTLR v4. <https://github.com/antlr/grammars-v4/>. Accessed 2018.
- [37] Patrice Godefroid, Adam Kiezun, and Michael Y. Levin. 2008. Grammar-Based Whitebox Fuzzing. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (Tucson, AZ, USA) (PLDI '08)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 206–215. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1375581.1375607>
- [38] Patrice Godefroid, Hila Peleg, and Rishabh Singh. 2017. Learn&Fuzz: Machine Learning for Input Fuzzing. In *Proceedings of the 32nd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (Urbana-Champaign, IL, USA) (ASE 2017)*. IEEE Press, Piscataway, NJ, USA, 50–59. <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=3155562.3155573>
- [39] Rahul Gopinath, Björn Mathis, and Andreas Zeller. 2020. Mining Input Grammars from Dynamic Control Flow. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (Virtual Event, USA) (ESEC/FSE 2020)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 172–183. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3368089.3409679>
- [40] Rahul Gopinath, Hamed Nemati, and Andreas Zeller. 2021. Input Algebras. In *2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. 699–710. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE43902.2021.00070>
- [41] Giovanni Grano, Timofey V Titov, Sebastiano Panichella, and Harald C Gall. 2018. How High Will it be? Using Machine Learning Models to Predict Branch Coverage in Automated Testing. In *2018 IEEE Workshop on Machine Learning Techniques for Software Quality Evaluation (MaLT&SQuE)*. IEEE, 19–24.
- [42] Alex Groce, Chaoqiang Zhang, Mohammad Amin Alipour, Eric Eide, Yang Chen, and John Regehr. 2013. Help, help, I'm being suppressed! The significance of suppressors in software testing. In *2013 IEEE 24th International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering (ISSRE)*. 390–399. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISSRE.2013.6698892>
- [43] Kenneth V. Hanford. 1970. Automatic Generation of Test Cases. *IBM Syst. J.* 9, 4 (1970), 242–257. <https://doi.org/10.1147/sj.94.0242>
- [44] Nikolas Havrikov and Andreas Zeller. 2019. Systematically Covering Input Structure. In *34th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2019, San Diego, CA, USA, November 11-15, 2019*. IEEE, 189–199. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE.2019.00027>
- [45] Michael A. Hennell, Martin R. Woodward, and David Hedley. 1976. On Program Analysis. *Inform. Process. Lett.* 5, 5 (1976), 136–140.
- [46] Renáta Hodován, Ákos Kiss, and Tibor Gyimóthy. 2018. Grammarinator: A Grammar-Based Open Source Fuzzer. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGSOFT International Workshop on Automating TEST Case Design, Selection, and Evaluation*.

ACM, 45–48.

- [47] Marc R. Hoffmann. 2018. JaCoCo, version 0.8.2. <https://github.com/jacoco/jacoco>.
- [48] Christian Holler, Kim Herzig, and Andreas Zeller. 2012. Fuzzing with Code Fragments. In *USENIX Conference on Security Symposium*. 445–458. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity12/technical-sessions/presentation/holler>
- [49] Matthias Hörschele and Andreas Zeller. 2016. Mining Input Grammars from Dynamic Taints. In *Proceedings of the 31st IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (Singapore, Singapore) (ASE 2016)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 720–725. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2970276.2970321>
- [50] Eric Jones, Travis Oliphant, and Pearu Peterson. 2014. SciPy: Open Source Scientific Tools for Python. (2014).
- [51] Alexander Kampmann, Nikolas Havrikov, Ezekiel O. Soremekun, and Andreas Zeller. 2020. When Does my Program do This? Learning Circumstances of Software Behavior. In *ESEC/FSE '20: 28th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, Virtual Event, USA, November 8-13, 2020*. ACM, 1228–1239. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3368089.3409687>
- [52] Fitsum Meshesha Kifetew, Roberto Tiella, and Paolo Tonella. 2014. Combining Stochastic Grammars and Genetic Programming for Coverage Testing at the System Level. In *International Symposium on Search Based Software Engineering*. Springer, 138–152. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-09940-8_10
- [53] Paul Klint, Ralf Lämmel, and Chris Verhoef. 2005. Toward an Engineering Discipline for GRAMMARWARE. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM)* 14, 3 (2005), 331–380.
- [54] Ralf Lämmel. 2001. Grammar Testing. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Fundamental Approaches to Software Engineering (FASE '01)*. Springer-Verlag, London, UK, UK, 201–216. <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=645369.651271>
- [55] Ralf Lämmel and Wolfram Schulte. 2006. Controllable Combinatorial Coverage in Grammar-Based Testing. In *Testing of Communicating Systems*, M. Ümit Uyar, Ali Y. Duale, and Mariusz A. Fecko (Eds.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 19–38.
- [56] Sean Leary. 2020. JSON-java. <https://github.com/stleary/JSON-java>. Version 20201115.
- [57] Joe Littlejohn. 2020. jsonschema2pojo. <https://github.com/joelittlejohn/jsonschema2pojo>. Version 1.0.2.
- [58] Davin Loegering. 2020. json-simple by Cliftonlabs. <https://github.com/cliftonlabs/json-simple>. Version 3.1.1.
- [59] John MacFarlane. 2013. Markdown PEG-Grammar. https://github.com/jgm/peg-markdown/blob/master/markdown_parser.leg.
- [60] H. B. Mann and D. R. Whitney. 1947. On a Test of Whether one of Two Random Variables is Stochastically Larger than the Other. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 18, 1 (1947), 50–60. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2236101>
- [61] Changhai Nie and Hareton Leung. 2011. A Survey of Combinatorial Testing. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 43, 2, Article 11 (feb 2011), 29 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1883612.1883618>
- [62] Terence J. Parr and Russell W. Quong. 1995. ANTLR: A Predicated-LL(k) Parser Generator. *Software: Practice and Experience* 25, 7 (1995), 789–810.
- [63] Van-Thuan Pham, Marcel Böhme, Andrew Edward Santosa, Alexandru Razvan Caciulescu, and Abhik Roychoudhury. 2019. Smart greynbox fuzzing. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* (2019).
- [64] Paul Purdom. 1972. A Sentence Generator for Testing Parsers. *BIT Numerical Mathematics* 12, 3 (1972), 366–375.
- [65] Kanishk Rastogi. 2018. URL-Detector. <https://github.com/linkedin/URL-Detector>. Version 0.1.17.
- [66] Shlomo S Sawilowsky. 2009. New Effect Size Rules of Thumb. *Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods* 8, 2 (2009), 26.
- [67] Kosta Serebryany. 2016. Continuous fuzzing with libfuzzer and addresssanitizer. In *2016 IEEE Cybersecurity Development (SecDev)*. IEEE, 157–157.
- [68] Anthony N. Simon. 2019. jurl. <https://github.com/anthonynsimon/jurl>. Version v0.4.2.
- [69] Emin Gün Sirer and Brian N Bershad. 1999. Using Production Grammars in Software Testing. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices* 35, 1 (1999), 1–13.
- [70] C. Spearman. 1904. The Proof and Measurement of Association between Two Things. *The American Journal of Psychology* 15, 1 (1904), 72–101. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1412159>
- [71] Ralf Sternberg. 2017. minimal-json. <https://github.com/ralfstx/minimal-json>. Version 0.9.5.
- [72] Robin Stocker. 2020. autolink-java. <https://github.com/robinst/autolink-java>. Version 0.10.0.
- [73] Philip H Swain and Hans Hauska. 1977. The Decision Tree Classifier: Design and Potential. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience Electronics* 15, 3 (1977), 142–147.
- [74] Mark Utting and Bruno Legeard. 2010. *Practical Model-Based Testing: A Tools Approach*. Elsevier.
- [75] Spandan Veggalam, Sanjay Rawat, Istvan Haller, and Herbert Bos. 2016. Ifuzzer: An Evolutionary Interpreter Fuzzer Using Genetic Programming. In *European Symposium on Research in Computer Security*. Springer, 581–601.
- [76] Junjie Wang, Bihuan Chen, Lei Wei, and Yang Liu. 2017. Skyfire: Data-Driven Seed Generation for Fuzzing. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 579–594.

- [77] Junjie Wang, Bihuan Chen, Lei Wei, and Yang Liu. 2019. Superion: GrAMmar-Aware Greybox Fuzzing. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 724–735.
- [78] Frank Wilcoxon. 1945. Individual Comparisons by Ranking Methods. *Biometrics Bulletin* 1, 6 (1945), 80–83. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3001968>
- [79] Xuejun Yang, Yang Chen, Eric Eide, and John Regehr. 2011. Finding and Understanding Bugs in C Compilers. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGPLAN conference on Programming language design and implementation*. 283–294.
- [80] Michal Zalewski. [n.d.]. American Fuzzy Lop. <http://lcamtuf.coredump.cx/afl>. Accessed October 1, 2016.
- [81] Jie Zhang, Lingming Zhang, Mark Harman, Dan Hao, Yue Jia, and Lu Zhang. 2018. Predictive Mutation Testing. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 45, 9 (2018), 898–918.