

Critical Code Guided Directed Greybox Fuzzing for Commits

Yi Xiang, Xuhong Zhang, Peiyu Liu, Shouling Ji, Xiao Xiao, Hong Liang, Jiacheng Xu, Wenhai Wang

Hangzhou, China

Commit Testing is Important

- Nearly 4/5 bug reports in OSSFuzz are regression bugs [1]
- Regression is initiated when a programmer fixes any bug or adds a new code for new functionality to the system [2]

Regression: "when you fix one bug, you introduce several newer bugs."

[1] Zhu, Xiaogang, and Marcel Böhme. "Regression greybox fuzzing." Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security. 2021 ₂ [2] https://www.softwaretestinghelp.com/regression-testing-tools-and-methods/.

Commit Testing is Important

Regression: "when you fix one bug, you introduce several newer bugs."

• Higher likelihood of newly added code introducing vulnerabilities

• Growing program scale but Limited availability of resources

It is crucial to *prioritize* fuzzing commit modified code

 Manually identified the bug-inducing commit (BIC) of 30 real-world bugs, we observe that

- Manually identified the bug-inducing commit (BIC) of 30 real-world bugs, we observe that
	- the crash site often **differ from** the commit change site

- Manually identified the bug-inducing commit (BIC) of 30 real-world bugs, we observe that
	- the crash site often **differ from** the commit change sit
	- the BIC often contains **multiple** change sites

C

C

Total

 \equiv

[3] Böhme, Marcel, et al. "Directed greybox fuzzing." Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security. 2017. [4] Huang, Heqing, et al. "Beacon: Directed grey-box fuzzing with provable path pruning." 2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP). IEEE, 2022.

- The crash site often **differ from** the commit change site
- Focusing on reaching the target (change site) quickly, but neglecting **thorough testing** of affected code

- The crash site often **differ from** the commit change site
- Focusing on reaching the target (change site) quickly, but neglecting **thorough testing** of affected code
- **Failure** to detect newly introduced vulnerabilities

- The crash site often **differ from** the commit change site
- Focusing on reaching the target (change site) quickly, but neglecting **thorough testing** of affected code
- **Failure** to detect newly introduced vulnerabilities

- The BIC often contains **multiple** change sites
	- **Struggle** to effectively address the multi-targets issue

- The crash site often **differ from** the commit change site
- Focusing on reaching the target (change site) quickly, but neglecting **thorough testing** of affected code
- **Failure** to detect newly introduced vulnerabilities

- The BIC often contains **multiple** change sites
	- **Struggle** to effectively address the multi-targets issue
		- Degrading to coverage-based fuzzing, **lacking guidance**
		- Disregarding connections between change sites, **less efficient**

Challenges

 \bullet How to quickly and thoroughly test the affected code?

How to handle multiple site changes in a smart and lightweight manner?

Challenges

- How to quickly and thoroughly test the affected code?
	- **•** first efficiently **reach** the change site (target)
	- **maintain** the reachability, and then generate **diverse inputs** to explore different program states of the affected code
- How to handle multiple site changes in a smart and lightweight manner?
	- guarantee the directness of **each grouped target**

Methodology

A critical code guided directed fuzzer for commit.

- \checkmark Group targets and calculate distance
- \checkmark Identify critical code and guide input generation strategy

Figure 2: Architecture of WAFLGO.

A critical code guided directed fuzzer for commit.

- Identify Critical Code
	- Path-prefix code: a, b, e, and f
	- Data-suffix code: i and k

A critical code guided directed fuzzer for commit.

- Identify Critical Code
	- Path-prefix code: a, b, e, and f
	- Data-suffix code: i and k

A critical code guided directed fuzzer for commit.

- Identify Critical Code
	- Path-prefix code: a, b, e, and f
	- Data-suffix code: i and k (only consider written variable x)

A critical code guided directed fuzzer for commit.

- Path-prefix code: a, b, e, and f
- Data-suffix code: i and k (only consider written variable x)

Static Value-Flow Analysis Framework

A critical code guided directed fuzzer for commit.

- Identify Critical Code
	- Path-prefix code: a, b, e, and f
	- Data-suffix code: i and k (only consider written variable x)
- Input Generation Strategy
	- \checkmark Key insight: preserving the execution of the critical code, while generating diverse testcases

A critical code guided directed fuzzer for commit.

- Identify Critical Code
	- Path-prefix code: a, b, e, and f
	- Data-suffix code: i and k (only consider written variable x)
- Input Generation Strategy
	- \checkmark Key insight: preserving the execution of the critical code, while generating diverse testcases
	- Select target edge based on execution status seed A: $a \rightarrow b \rightarrow e \rightarrow f \rightarrow m$, target edge: e_{ef} , e_{be} , e_{ab}

A critical code guided directed fuzzer for commit.

- Identify Critical Code
	- Path-prefix code: a, b, e, and f
	- Data-suffix code: i and k (only consider written variable x)
- Input Generation Strategy
	- \checkmark Key insight: preserving the execution of the critical code, while generating diverse testcases
	- Select target edge based on execution status seed A: $a \rightarrow b \rightarrow e \rightarrow f \rightarrow m$, target edge: e_{ef} , e_{be} , e_{ab}

A critical code guided directed fuzzer for commit.

- **Identify Critical Code**
	- Path-prefix code: a, b, e, and f
	- Data-suffix code: i and k (only consider written variable x)
- Input Generation Strategy
	- \checkmark Key insight: preserving the execution of the critical code, while generating diverse testcases
	- Select target edge based on execution status seed B: $a \rightarrow b \rightarrow e \rightarrow g \rightarrow i \rightarrow j \rightarrow l$, target edge: e_{eq} , e_{be} , e_{ab} , e_{qi} seed A: $a \rightarrow b \rightarrow e \rightarrow f \rightarrow m$, target edge: e_{ef} , e_{be} , e_{ab}

A critical code guided directed fuzzer for commit.

- **Identify Critical Code**
	- Path-prefix code: a, b, e, and f
	- Data-suffix code: i and k (only consider written variable x)
- Input Generation Strategy
	- \checkmark Key insight: preserving the execution of the critical code, while generating diverse testcases
	- Select target edge based on execution status seed B: $a \rightarrow b \rightarrow e \rightarrow g \rightarrow i \rightarrow j \rightarrow l$, target edge: e_{eq} , e_{be} , e_{ab} , e_{qi} seed A: $a \rightarrow b \rightarrow e \rightarrow f \rightarrow m$, target edge: e_{ef} , e_{be} , e_{ab}

A critical code guided directed fuzzer for commit.

- Identify Critical Code
	- Path-prefix code: a, b, e, and f
	- Data-suffix code: i and k (only consider written variable x)
- Input Generation Strategy
	- \times Key insight: preserving the execution of the critical code, while generating diverse testcases
	- Select target edge based on execution status seed B: $a \rightarrow b \rightarrow e \rightarrow g \rightarrow i \rightarrow j \rightarrow l$, target edge: e_{eq} , e_{be} , e_{ab} , e_{qi} seed A: $a \rightarrow b \rightarrow e \rightarrow f \rightarrow m$, target edge: e_{ef} , e_{be} , e_{ab}
	- Use mutation masks to sustain target edge execution

Commit Fuzzer

A critical code guided directed fuzzer for commit.

Group targets based on the same preconditions (within the same function)

Figure 2: Architecture of WAFLGO.

Commit Fuzzer

A critical code guided directed fuzzer for commit.

- Group targets based on the same preconditions (within the same function)
- Calculate input distance for the **rarest** executed target (similar with AFLGo)

 $d_{s}(s, T_b) = \frac{\sum_{m \in \xi(s) d_b(m, T_b)} |S(s)|}{|\xi(s)|}$

$$
\xi(s) = \{ m \mid m \in \delta(s) \text{ and } d_b(m, T_b) \neq \text{NaN} \}
$$

Figure 2: Architecture of WAFLGO.

Effectiveness of Bug Reproducing

How effective is WAFLGO in discovering bugs introduced by commits?

- \checkmark WAFLGo effectively reproduces 21/30, achieving the highest success rate among all the fuzzers
- \checkmark WAFLGO achieves an average speedup of 10.3 \times compared to others in reproducing bug time

Coverage Improvement

Does the guidance toward critical code improve the efficiency of fuzzing?

 \checkmark WAFLGO demonstrates an average 11.7% increase in edge coverage and nearly 2 \times (181.5%) more path discoveries compared to AFLGo after 24 hours.

Multi-target Case

Does the multi-target optimizations improve the efficiency of fuzzing?

 \checkmark Case study:

For issue #1289, AFLGo overlooks target 0, while the seed distribution in FishFuzz^[4] is similar to that of WAFLGO.

Real-world Vulnerabilities

Can WAFLGO detect new vulnerabilities in real-world programs?

- \checkmark WAFLGO discover seven new bugs, including four CVEs.
- \checkmark Case study:

The CVE-2023-34631 is introduced by the fixing commit (6678ad8) for the CVE-2023-34630.

Table 4: New vulnerabilities detected by WAFLGO

Critical Code Guided Directed Greybox Fuzzing for Commits

Real World Dataset

- Crash site often **differ from** the commit change site
- BIC often contains **multiple** change sites

Summary of WAFLGo

Fuzzing framework for program commit

Experimental Result

- Highest bug reproduction success rate
- Average speedup of 10.3x
- Seven new bugs, 4 CVEs

Email Address: xiangyi0406@zju.edu.cn

