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Other publicly available tools

- Related tool: Thrille for UPC (Unified Parallel C)
  - [http://upc.lbl.gov/thrille](http://upc.lbl.gov/thrille)

- Threader
  - [http://www.model.in.tum.de/~popeea/research/threader.html](http://www.model.in.tum.de/~popeea/research/threader.html)

- Model Checking: Java PathFinder
  - [http://ti.arc.nasa.gov/tech/rse/vandv/jpf/](http://ti.arc.nasa.gov/tech/rse/vandv/jpf/)

- Systematic testing: CHESS

- Static Analysis: Chord
  - [http://paq.gatech.edu/chord](http://paq.gatech.edu/chord)

- Dynamic Analysis: RoadRunner
  - [http://dept.cs.williams.edu/~freund/rr/](http://dept.cs.williams.edu/~freund/rr/)

- Intel Thread Checker
Thanks

- Prof. Koushik Sen (UC Berkeley)
- Pallavi Joshi (UC Berkeley, now at NEC Labs)
- Chang-Seo Park (UC Berkeley, now at Google)

Highlights

- Incorporates many techniques we discussed
  - Static/dynamic analysis: to find “potential violation”
  - Testing: to find real violation, based on above
- Extensible – add your own analysis and checker!
Getting started …

- Download CalFuzzer 2.0
  
  [Link: http://srl.cs.berkeley.edu/~ksen/calfuzzer/]

- Build using ant
  
  ```sh
tar zxvf calfuzzer2.tar.gz
cd calfuzzer
ant
ant -f run.xml racefuzzer
ant -f run.xml deadlockfuzzer
  ```

- Small examples in: test/benchmarks/testcases

- To build and run an individual example (already included in run.xml)
  
  ```sh
  ant -f run.xml test_race1
  ```

- To try a new example, add build commands to run.xml (similar to above)
  
  - See example from Gidon Ernst (ConcurrentStack.java, on SSFT13 website)
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Goal

• Build a tool to test and debug concurrent programs
  - More Practical: That works for large programs
  - Efficient
  - No false alarms
  - Finds many bugs quickly
  - Reproducible
Related Work: Concurrent Program Analysis

- Static program analysis (e.g., Engler et al.; Naik et al.)
  - Examines all possible program behavior
  - Often reports many false positives
- Type systems (e.g., Boyapati et al., Flanagan and Qadeer)
  - Annotation burden often significant
- Model checking (e.g., SPIN, Verisoft, Java Pathfinder)
  - Does not currently scale beyond few KLOC
  - Not “directed” towards finding bugs
- Dynamic program analysis (e.g. Eraser, Atomizer)
  - Usually reports lesser false positives
  - Has false negatives
- Testing
  - Scales to large programs and no false positives
  - False negatives and poor coverage
Observation

• Static and dynamic program analyses have false positives
• Testing is simple
  - No false positives
  - But, may miss subtle thread schedules that result in concurrency bugs
Observation

• Static and dynamic program analyses have false positives

• Testing is simple
  – No false positives
  – But, may miss subtle thread schedules that result in concurrency bugs

• Can we leverage program analysis to make testing quickly find real concurrency bugs?
Our Approach

• **Active Testing**

• **Phase 1**: Use imprecise static or dynamic program analysis to find “abstract” states where a potential concurrency bug can happen

• **Phase 2**: “Direct” testing (or model checking) based on the “abstract” states obtained from phase 1
Active Testing Cartoon: Phase I

Potential Collision
Active Testing Cartoon: Phase II
Abstract Buggy States

- A predicate on the program state
- **Race:** $\exists$ threads $t_1, t_2$ s.t. $t_1$ and $t_2$ are about to execute statements $s_1$ and $s_2$, respectively, and access the same memory location and one of the accesses is a write
- **Deadlock:** $\exists t_1, t_2$ s.t. $t_1$ holds lock $L_1$ and about to acquire lock $L_2$ at statement $s_1$ and $t_2$ holds lock $L_2$ and about to acquire lock $L_1$ at statement $s_2$
- **Atomicity:** $\exists t_1, t_2$ s.t. $t_1$ is inside an atomic block at $s_1$ and $t_2$ is about to access the same memory location at $s_2$
- **Extensible:** Define your abstract buggy state and implement custom active tester
Abstract Buggy State and Active Testing

• A predicate on the program state
  - User defined
• Active Testing: Use your favorite model checker
  - But whenever a thread satisfies the abstract state predicate “partly”
    • Non-deterministically decide either to pause the thread or continue
  - We use a randomized model checker
    • But one can use Java Pathfinder or CHESS
• Summary: Add extra intelligence to your favorite model checker so that bugs get created quickly
Why it works? Simplified explanation

- Consider 2 threads each with n instructions
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- Consider 2 threads each with n instructions
- 1-context switch bounded model checking explores 2n paths
  - Worst case probability of reaching bad state is 1/(2n): still low
- Active testing with abstraction of potential bug explores 1 schedule
  - Directed by the bug
Extensible Tool

- **CALFUZZER for Java Programs**
  - Effective random testing [ASE 07]
  - Race Directed Active Testing [PLDI 08]
  - Atomicity Violation Directed Active Testing [FSE 08]
  - Deadlock Directed Active Testing [PLDI 09]
  - User-specified pre-emption points [CAV 09]
  - Application to checking determinism [FSE 09]

- Applied to real-world programs
- Easy to implement dynamic analyses
  - Eraser, Atomizer, vector clock library, lockset, etc.
- Coming soon: THRILLE for C/C++
Summary of Bugs Found

• Races, deadlocks, atomicity violations in
  - Java Collections Framework

• Data Races found in
  - Jigsaw web server
  - weblech, hedc, Java Grande Forum Benchmark Suite (HPC)

• Deadlocks found and reproduced in
  - Jigsaw web server
  - Java Swing GUI framework
  - Java Database Connectivity (JDBC)

• Atomicity violations in
  - Apache Commons Collections
CalFuzzer in Action
Tool for Java available for download [CAV 09]

- http://srl.cs.berkeley.edu/~ksen/calfuzzer/

CalFuzzer: An Extensible Active Testing Framework for Concurrent Programs

Introduction

Active testing has recently been introduced to effectively test concurrent programs. Active testing can quickly discover real data races, deadlocks, and atomicity violations. Active testing works in two phases. It first uses imprecise off-the-shelf static or dynamic program analyses to identify potential concurrency bugs, such as data races, deadlocks, and atomicity violations. In the second phase, active testing uses the reports from these imprecise analyses to explicitly control the underlying scheduler of the concurrent program to accurately and quickly discover real concurrency bugs, if any, with very high probability and little overhead. CalFuzzer implements an extensible framework for active testing of Java programs.

Download

Follow this link to download CalFuzzer.

System Requirements

Windows or Linux or Mac OS X. You need pre-installed Sun’s JDK 1.5 for Windows or Linux, or Apple’s latest JDK for Mac OS X. You also need Apache’s ANT (http://ant.apache.org/) for building and running your code.

Installation

Download CalFuzzer from http://srl.cs.berkeley.edu/~ksen/calfuzzer/calfuzzer.tar.gz. Make sure that java, javac, and ant are in your PATH. Invoke the following commands to install CalFuzzer:

```bash
tar xzf calfuzzer.tar.gz
```
Teaching Module based on CALFUZZER

- http://sp09.pbworks.com/RaceFuzzer-Homework

RaceFuzzer Homework

Introduction

Active testing has recently been introduced to effectively test concurrent programs. Active testing works in two phases. It first uses imprecise off-the-shelf static or dynamic program analyses to identify potential concurrency bugs, such as data races, deadlocks, and atomicity violations. In the second phase, active testing uses the reports from these imprecise analyses to explicitly control the underlying scheduler of the concurrent program to accurately and quickly discover real concurrency bugs, if any, with very high probability and little overhead. In this homework, you will be implementing the RaceFuzzer algorithm described in the following paper:


Requirements

Windows or Linux or Mac OS X. You need pre-installed Sun's JDK 1.5 or Windows or Linux, or Apple's latest JDK for Mac OS X. You also need Apache ANT (http://ant.apache.org) for building and running your code.
Conclusion

• Parallel computing will become wide-spread
  - Need testing and debugging tools
  - Because testing is what real developers use to find bugs and improve quality

• Trick is to make testing “directed” using imprecise program analyses
  - And not to make it exhaustive

• Active Testing makes concurrency testing directed
  - Confirms real bugs
  - Reproducibility is easy
  - Efficient
  - Scales really well
  - Effective