

Ultimate (Kojak) and the Abstraction of Bitwise Operations

Frank Schüssele¹ Manuel Bentele¹ Daniel Dietsch¹ Matthias Heizmann² Xinyu Jiang¹
Dominik Klumpp¹ Andreas Podelski¹

¹University of Freiburg, Germany

²University of Stuttgart, Germany

- KOJAK: Model checker based on interpolant splitting¹

¹Evren Ermis, Jochen Hoenicke, and Andreas Podelski. “**Splitting via Interpolants**”. In: *VMCAI 2012*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. 2012.

- KOJAK: Model checker based on interpolant splitting¹
- control flow graph using SMT-LIB formulas

¹Evren Ermiş, Jochen Hoenicke, and Andreas Podelski. “**Splitting via Interpolants**”. In: *VMCAI 2012*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. 2012.

- KOJAK: Model checker based on interpolant splitting¹
- control flow graph using SMT-LIB formulas
- shared translation with other ULTIMATE tools

¹Evren Ermis, Jochen Hoenicke, and Andreas Podelski. **“Splitting via Interpolants”**. In: *VMCAI 2012*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. 2012.

- KOJAK: Model checker based on interpolant splitting¹
- control flow graph using SMT-LIB formulas
- shared translation with other ULTIMATE tools
 - from C to Boogie

¹Evren Ermis, Jochen Hoenicke, and Andreas Podelski. “**Splitting via Interpolants**”. In: *VMCAI 2012*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. 2012.

- KOJAK: Model checker based on interpolant splitting¹
- control flow graph using SMT-LIB formulas
- shared translation with other ULTIMATE tools
 - from C to Boogie
 - from Boogie to control flow graph

¹Evren Ermiş, Jochen Hoenicke, and Andreas Podelski. “**Splitting via Interpolants**”. In: *VMCAI 2012*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. 2012.

Modeling C in SMT-LIB

```
int main() {  
    int x, y;  
    ...  
    int a = x + y;  
    int b = x | y;  
    ...  
}
```

Modeling C in SMT-LIB

```
int main() {
```

```
  int x, y;
```

```
  ...
```

```
  int a = x + y;
```

```
  int b = x | y;
```

```
  ...
```

```
}
```

integer: (= a (+ x y))



Modeling C in SMT-LIB

```
int main() {  
  int x, y;  
  ...  
  int a = x + y;  
  int b = x | y;  
  ...  
}
```

integer: (= a (+ x y))

bitvector: (= a (bvadd x y))

Modeling C in SMT-LIB

```
int main() {  
  int x, y;  
  ...  
  int a = x + y;  
  int b = x | y;  
  ...  
}
```

integer: (= a (+ x y))

bitvector: (= a (bvadd x y))

bitvector: (= b (bvor x y))

Modeling C in SMT-LIB

```
int main() {  
  int x, y;  
  ...  
  int a = x + y;  
  int b = x | y;  
  ...  
}
```

integer: (= a (+ x y))

bitvector: (= a (bvadd x y))

integer: ???

bitvector: (= b (bvor x y))

Modeling C in SMT-LIB

```
int main() {  
  int x, y;  
  ...  
  int a = x + y;  
  int b = x | y;  
  ...  
}
```

integer: (= a (+ x y))

bitvector: (= a (bvadd x y))

integer: true (overapproximation)

bitvector: (= b (bvor x y))

- based on earlier work², generalized in SV-COMP paper³

²Yuandong Cyrus Liu et al. “**Proving LTL Properties of Bitvector Programs and Decompiled Binaries**”. In: *PLDI 2021*. 2021.

³Frank Schüssele et al. “**Ultimate Automizer and the Abstraction of Bitwise Operations**”. In: *TACAS 2024*. 2024.

Abstraction of Bitwise Operations

- based on earlier work², generalized in SV-COMP paper³
- two techniques to improve overapproximation for bitwise operators
&, |, ^, ~, <<, >>

²Yuangdong Cyrus Liu et al. “**Proving LTL Properties of Bitvector Programs and Decompiled Binaries**”. In: *PLDI 2021*. 2021.

³Frank Schüssele et al. “**Ultimate Automizer and the Abstraction of Bitwise Operations**”. In: *TACAS 2024*. 2024.

General rules

$$6 \mid 12 \rightsquigarrow 14$$

General rules

$$6 \mid 12 \rightsquigarrow 14$$

$$\sim x \rightsquigarrow -1 - x$$

General rules

$$6 \mid 12 \rightsquigarrow 14$$

$$\sim x \rightsquigarrow -1 - x$$

$$x \ll 3 \rightsquigarrow x * 8$$

$$x \gg 4 \rightsquigarrow x / 16$$

General rules

$6 \mid 12 \rightsquigarrow 14$

$\sim x \rightsquigarrow -1 - x$

$x \ll 3 \rightsquigarrow x * 8$

$x \gg 4 \rightsquigarrow x / 16$

Rules based on bitpattern

$(1\dots 1) \quad x^{-1} \rightsquigarrow -1 - x$

General rules

$6 \mid 12 \rightsquigarrow 14$

$\sim x \rightsquigarrow -1 - x$

$x \ll 3 \rightsquigarrow x * 8$

$x \gg 4 \rightsquigarrow x / 16$

Rules based on bitpattern

$(1\dots 1) \quad x \hat{-} 1 \rightsquigarrow -1 - x$

$(0\dots 0) \quad 0 \mid x \rightsquigarrow x$

General rules

$6 \mid 12 \rightsquigarrow 14$

$\sim x \rightsquigarrow -1 - x$

$x \ll 3 \rightsquigarrow x * 8$

$x \gg 4 \rightsquigarrow x / 16$

Rules based on bitpattern

$(1\dots 1) \quad x \hat{-} 1 \rightsquigarrow -1 - x$

$(0\dots 0) \quad 0 \mid x \rightsquigarrow x$

$(0\dots 01\dots 1) \quad x \& 255 \rightsquigarrow x \% 256$

Constrained Overapproximation

```
procedure and(a: int, b: int) {  
    if (a == 0 || b == 0) return 0;  
    if (a == b) return a;  
  
    var r: int;  
    assume (a >= 0 || b < 0) ==> r <= a;  
    assume (a < 0 || b >= 0) ==> r <= b;  
    assume (a >= 0 || b >= 0) ==> r >= 0;  
    assume (a < 0 || b < 0) ==> r > a + b;  
    return r;  
}
```

Table 1: Comparison for U**AUTOMIZER** on ReachSafety

| | Bitvector | | | Integer (optimized) | | | Integer (old) | | |
|----------------|-----------|-----|-------|---------------------|-----|-------|---------------|-----|-------|
| | time | | mem | time | | mem | time | | mem |
| | # | (h) | (GB) | # | (h) | (GB) | # | (h) | (GB) |
| total (10 205) | 1 958 | 65 | 1 862 | 2 076 | 37 | 2 600 | 2 051 | 36 | 2 550 |
| safe (7 557) | 1 183 | 41 | 1 030 | 1 350 | 22 | 1 510 | 1 324 | 21 | 1 440 |
| unsafe (2 648) | 775 | 24 | 832 | 726 | 15 | 1 090 | 727 | 15 | 1 110 |

Table 2: Comparison for UAutomizer on Termination-BitVectors

| | Integer (optimized) | | | Integer (old) | | |
|-------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|
| | # | time (s) | mem (GB) | # | time (s) | mem (GB) |
| total (37) | 31 | 410 | 12.1 | 12 | 122 | 4.2 |
| safe (23) | 23 | 325 | 9.2 | 7 | 73 | 2.5 |
| unsafe (14) | 8 | 85 | 2.9 | 5 | 49 | 1.7 |