

CISPA Helmholtz-Zentrum i.G.

Inferring Input Grammars from Dynamic Control Flow

Rahul Gopinath, Björn Mathis, and Andreas Zeller

{rahul.gopinath, bjoern.mathis, zeller}@cispa.saarland
CISPA - Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Saarbrücken, Germany

arXiv:1912.05937v1 [cs.SE] 12 Dec 2019



CISPA
HELMHOLTZ-ZENTRUM I. G.

Inferring Input Grammars from Dynamic Control Flow

Rahul Gopinath, Björn Mathis, and Andreas Zeller

{rahul.gopinath, bjoern.mathis, zeller}@cispa.saarland

CISPA - Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Saarbrücken, Germany

(Dated December 13, 2019)

Abstract A program is characterized by its input model, and a formal input model can be of use in diverse areas including vulnerability analysis, reverse engineering, fuzzing and software testing, clone detection and refactoring. Unfortunately, input models for typical programs are often unavailable or out of date. While there exist algorithms that can mine the syntactical structure of program inputs, they either produce unwieldy and incomprehensible grammars, or require heuristics that target specific parsing patterns.

In this paper, we present a general algorithm that takes a program and a small set of sample inputs and automatically infers a readable context-free grammar capturing the input language of the program. We infer the syntactic input structure only by observing access of input characters at different locations of the input parser. This works on all program stack based recursive descent input parsers, including PEG and parser combinators, and can do entirely without program specific heuristics. Our *Mimid* prototype produced accurate and readable grammars for a variety of evaluation subjects, including expr, URLparse, and microJSON.

1 Introduction

One of the key properties of a program is its input model, and the availability of a formal input model can be critical in diverse fields. For example, an *accurate* input model of a suspect program can indicate the presence of hidden features. When programs with similar input models are found, it is often a hint that they may be clones and could be a target for refactoring (or may share similar origin in the case of plagiarism detection). The ability to generate valid or near valid inputs for a program is also much sought after in software testing, and especially fuzzing and vulnerability analysis [33]. Indeed, for fuzzing to reach deeper program states, one needs to be able to generate valid or near valid inputs [37]. Unfortunately, generating valid inputs is a non-trivial problem even when the source code is available [19]. In the vast majority of the cases, a formal input model may be unavailable, and in the cases where an input model is available, it may not be complete [5], or it may be obsolete, or inaccurate with respect to the program [43]. However, for testing complex inputs, a model for the input language is practically mandatory [24, 3, 19]. *Obtaining input models automatically* therefore bears great promise for test generation [19, 36], but also for reverse engineering protocols [7], program refactoring [23], and program comprehension [40, 13].

A small number of tools exist that learn aspects of the input structure in order to generate further inputs. *Learn&Fuzz* by Godefroid et al. [20] uses statistical models as the generative representation. *GLADE* and *REINAM* [5, 44] use internal structures that take the shape of a grammar. *GRIMOIRE* [6] learns partial grammars, generalizing over input fragments that cover the same code. All these tools are focused on fuzzing, and can infer some aspects of the input language, which is then used to generate inputs. But

none of them claims that the inferred *intermediate* models would be readable, editable or otherwise useful for humans in any way.

```

<START> ::= <json_raw>

<json_raw> ::= ' ' <json_string'> | '[' <json_list'> | '{'
             <json_dict'>
             | <json_number'> | 'true' | 'false' | 'null'

<json_number'> ::= <json_number>+
                 | <json_number>+ 'e' <json_number>+

<json_number> ::= '+' | '-' | '.' | [0-9] | 'E' | 'e'

<json_string'> ::= <json_string>* ' '

<json_list'> ::= '['
              | <json_raw> (',' <json_raw>)* ','
              | (',' <json_raw>)+ (',' <json_raw>)* ']'

<json_dict'> ::= '{'
              | (' ' <json_string'> ':' <json_raw> ',' )*
              | ' ' <json_string'> ':' <json_raw> '}'

<json_string> ::= ' ' | '!' | '#' | '$' | '%' | '&' | ''
              | '*' | '+' | '-' | ',' | '.' | '/' | ':' | ';'
              | '<' | '=' | '>' | '?' | '@' | '[' | ']' | '^' | '_' | ''
              | '{' | '|' | '}' | '~'
              | '[A-Za-z0-9]'
              | '\ ' <decode_escape>

<decode_escape> ::= ' ' | '/' | 'b' | 'f' | 'n' | 'r' | 't'

```

Figure 1: JSON grammar extracted from *microjson.py*.

The one approach so far that aims to produce human-

readable and maintainable descriptions of input structure is *Autogram* [26, 25] by Höschele et al. Given a program and a set of inputs, *Autogram* extracts a context-free grammar that approximates the program’s input language. It does so by tracking the *dynamic data flow* between *variables* at different locations in the parser: If a substring of the input flows into a variable called `protocol`, this substring forms a *protocol nonterminal* in the grammar.

While *Autogram* produces well-structured and readable grammars on a number of subjects, it also depends on a number of assumptions, the most important being that some data flow has to be there in the first place. If a program accepts a structured input where only part of the input is saved and used, *Autogram* has no data flow to learn from in the parts that were not saved. Second, one of the traditional parsing techniques is to attempt to parse a given string using a particular rule, and if the parse fail, attempt the next rule in the sequence. For example, a parser may attempt to parse a rule `if <body> then <body> else <body> end`, failing which, it may try and succeed in parsing `if <body> then <body> end`. This parsing strategy is also used by the PEG parsing technique. In such a case, *Autogram* [25] has multiple conflicting data flows in that it now has to deal with the data flow in the failing parse, but has no strategy to resolve the conflict.

Furthermore, *Autogram* requires special heuristics to work around common parsing patterns identified; the data flow induced by parser lookahead, for instance, has to be ignored as it would otherwise break the model [26]. Finally, common patterns such as passing the complete input as an array with an index indicating current parse status can break the subsumption model of *Autogram*. These limitations make the *Autogram* approach hard to generalize for a wide class of input processors.

In this paper, we describe a *general algorithm* to recover the *input grammar* from a program without any of these limitations. Rather than being based on *data flow*, it recovers the input grammar from *dynamic control flow* and how input characters are *accessed* from different locations in the parser. Our algorithm works regardless of whether and how the parsed data is stored, and requires no heuristics to identify parsing patterns. It works on all program stack based recursive descent parsers, including PEG and parser combinators; this parser class makes up 80% of the top programming language parsers on GitHub [38].

The resulting grammars are well-structured and very readable. As an example, consider the JSON grammar shown in Figure 1, which our *mimid* prototype extracted from *microjson.py*.¹ Each JSON element has its own production rule; $\langle json_number \rangle$, for instance, lists a number as a string of digits. Rules capture the recursive nature of the input: A $\langle json_list' \rangle$ contains $\langle json_raw \rangle$ elements, which in turn are other JSON values. All identifiers of nonterminals are derived from the names of the input functions that consume them. All this makes for very readable grammars that can be easily understood, adapted, and extended.


¹We removed rules pertaining to whitespace processing for clarity.

```

1 def digit(i):
2     return i in "0123456789"
3
4 def parse_num(s,i):
5     n = ''
6     while i != len(s) and digit(s[i]):
7         n += s[i]
8         i = i + 1
9     return i,n
10
11 def parse_paren(s, i):
12     assert s[i] == '('
13     i, v = parse_expr(s, i+1)
14     if i == len(s): raise Ex(s, i)
15     assert s[i] == ')'
16     return i+1, v
17
18 def parse_expr(s, i = 0):
19     expr, is_op = [], True
20     while i < len(s):
21         c = s[i]
22         if digit(c):
23             if not is_op: raise Ex(s,i)
24             i,num = parse_num(s,i)
25             expr.append(num)
26             is_op = False
27         elif c in ['+', '-', '*', '/']:
28             if is_op: raise Ex(s,i)
29             expr.append(c)
30             is_op, i = True, i + 1
31         elif c == '(':
32             if not is_op: raise Ex(s,i)
33             i, cexpr = parse_paren(s, i)
34             expr.append(cexpr)
35             is_op = False
36         elif c == ')': break
37         else: raise Ex(s,i)
38     if is_op: raise Ex(s,i)
39     return i, expr
40
41 def main(arg):
42     return parse_expr(arg)

```

(a) A Python parser for math expressions



(b) Derivation tree for 9+3/4.

```

<START> ::= (<parse_expr> [*+ - /])*<parse_expr>
<parse_expr> ::= <parse_num> | <parse_paren>
<parse_paren> ::= '(' <parse_expr> ')'
<parse_num> ::= <parse_digit>+
<digit> ::= '0' | '1' | '2' | '3' | '4' | '5' | '6' | '7' | '8' | '9'

```

(c) A grammar derived from the parser in Figure 2a

Figure 2: An expression parser, its parse tree, and the extracted grammar

1.1 Why should one care about readable grammars?

Grammars have a number of uses beyond simply fuzzing. These can be used for 1) reverse engineering, 2) clone detection, 3) program comprehension, 4) documentation, 4) refactoring, 5) parsing, 6) runtime verification, 7) data transformation, 8) reducing inputs, 9) feature location, 10) automatic repair, and a number of other uses in software engineering. Even if one focuses on fuzzing, readable grammars allow practitioners to edit and augment them to control what should be produced, for instance by providing probabilities or adding constraints such as allowing only previously defined variables.

Readable grammars allow one to refine the grammar with specific inputs such as logins, passwords, or exploits. Given such a grammar, one can contract the grammar such that only specific subparts be generated if one is first able to understand what parts of the grammar correspond to the part that one is interested in. If even a partial human readable grammar is available, it can be expanded with human knowledge on features where the miner may not have sufficient inputs, or identify vulnerabilities through human inspection of the grammar (e.g. allowing special characters in usernames). Fuzzers can only allow for such control if the model is human-readable. Finally, we note that *Autogram* and *mimid* are the only tools available right now that can actually recover a context-free grammar from a given program. Other tools such as *GLADE*, *REINAM*, *GRIMOIRE* and others only recover a “grammar like structure” which are not translatable to a structure consumable by standard off the shelf tools such as fuzzers and parsers.

How does this work? We use lightweight instrumentation to track *dynamic control flow* and use *lightweight string wrappers* to identify in which control flow nodes, specific input characters are accessed. The character accesses as well as the corresponding control flow nodes are then logged. A *parse tree* of the input string is extracted from that trace using the following rules:

1. Names of methods that *process*² some part of the input is used as the *nonterminal* symbol for the input grammar for that part. As an example, consider [Figure 2a](#) showing a complete Python program to accept mathematical expressions. The method `parse_num()`, which parses numeric elements, becomes the *nonterminal* `parse_num` in the parse tree ([Figure 2b](#)), representing numeric elements in the input.
2. Parsers typically do not reparse their input if the last parse was successful. That is, the method that accesses a particular input character last, *consumes* that character. If `digit()` is the last to access the digit 3, then 3 is consumed by `digit()`.
3. Characters consumed in a method during each method call become alternative expansions for the

corresponding *nonterminal*. `parse_num()` will see several different sequences of digits ([Figure 2b](#)), all forming alternatives.

4. If some of the characters are processed further in methods called from the current method, we replace the portions of expansion that is processed by nested method calls by the *nonterminal* symbol corresponding to the nested method call. When, say, `parse_expr()` uses the result of `parse_num()`, this result will be referred to as the *parse_num nonterminal*.
5. Methods often have control structures such as if-conditions that selectively process parts of the input. Further, methods may also contain looping structures that process repetitive parts of the input. To handle these cases, we adapt *regular right hand sides* [29] for the grammar³. Input characters processed inside any if/else conditions are turned into *regular expression alternations*. Finally, inputs processed inside loops, after recovering the repetition order through active learning⁴, are turned into regular expression groups with *Kleene star*. If `parse_num()` uses a loop to read in digits, we will identify that `parse_num` consists of repeated digits, resulting in the regular expression `[0-9]+`.
6. Each method call becomes a named node with the method name. Each iteration becomes a node in the parse tree with the name derived from the method name, loop name and the location of the loop starting. Finally, each conditional becomes a node in the parse tree.

As an example, consider the recursive descent parser in [Figure 2a](#). Running it with an argument `9+3/4` yields the tentative parse tree shown in [Figure 2b](#). We extract such parse trees for a number of given inputs. Next, we traverse each tree and identify *loop* nodes that are similar as we detail in [Section 3.1](#). This results in parse trees where similar nodes have similar names. Finally, we construct the grammar by recursively traversing each parse tree, collecting the name and children types and names for each node. The node names become *nonterminal* symbols in the grammar, and each set of children becomes one possible expansion in the grammar being constructed. The child nodes that represent characters become terminal symbols in the constructed grammar.

The final result is the grammar in [Figure 2c](#), which exactly reflects the capabilities of the program in [Figure 2a](#). Again, the grammar is readable with near-textbook quality and well reflects the input structure. Using this grammar as a producer yields an arbitrary large number of syntactically valid input strings.

² In contrast to *Autogram* which assumes that the name of the method that *receives* a part of the input is the *nonterminal* symbol for that part.

³ A grammar with regular right hand sides is different from a typical context-free grammar in that it allows regular expressions in the rules. EBNF is a notable example.

⁴ The term *active learning* was first used by Dana Angluin [1] in the context of regular grammar learning.

In the remainder of this paper, we detail our contributions:

1. We provide a general algorithm for deriving the context-free approximation of input language from a recursive descent parser. Our approach relies on *tracking character access in the input buffer* (Section 2), which is easy to implement for a variety of languages that support string wrappers, or the source can be transformed to support such wrappers. From the tracked accesses, we then infer *parse trees* (Section 3), which we generalize by means of *active learning* before passing them to our grammar inference (Section 4). Our approach leverages structure of input processing and its identifiers to produce input grammars that are fit for human consumption out of the box.
2. We evaluate our approach, comparing it against the so far only approach for inference of human-readable grammars (*Autogram*). For the evaluation, we use producers (Section 5) to assess recall and precision (Section 6). Our approach is superior to *Autogram* in both aspects.
3. In our evaluation, we also show that our approach is applicable in contexts in which no usable data flow of input fragments to variables exists, as well as for advanced parsers such as *PEG* parsers and *parser combinators* which make the state of the art for writing secure parsers [8]. None of these is possible with *Autogram*, again extending the state of the art.

After discussing limitations (Section 7) and related work (Section 8), Section 9 closes with conclusion and future work. The complete source code of our approach and evaluation is available.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. We start by describing the individual steps of our technique. Section 2 details how we track the control flow and character accesses. Section 3 shows how to turn the resulting traces into parse trees. Section 4 details the algorithm for inferring the grammar from the parse trees. Section 5 finally sketches how to use these grammars for producing valid inputs. All this is then put to test in our evaluation (Section 6), pitching our *mimid* tool against the *Autogram* state of the art. After discussing limitations (Section 7) and the state of the art (Section 8), we close with conclusion and future work in Section 9.

2 Tracking Control Flow and Comparisons

Let us now start with describing the details of how we infer input grammars from dynamic control flow. We start with the *tracing* part—that is, acquiring dynamic control flow information from a program run.

For our experiments, we used the Python language, as Python makes it fairly easy to implement dynamic analysis techniques. Other than dynamic analysis, we do not make use of specific Python features, and implementing the techniques for other languages should be feasible with modest effort.

For tracking the control flow, we programmatically modify the parser source. We insert a tracker for both method entry and exit as well as trackers for control flow entry and exit for any conditions and loops. For the purposes of our approach, we consider these control structures as *pseudo methods*. Every such method call (both true and pseudo method calls) gets a unique identifier from a counter such that a child of the current method or a later method call gets a larger new method identifier than the current one. We note that this information — the execution tree — can be cheaply obtained from programs with simple coverage instrumentation.

For tracking the character accesses being made, we simply wrapped the input string in a proxy object that logged access to characters. We annotate each character accessed with the current method name.

During our analysis, we also check whether parser code guarded by conditionals can be skipped completely. That is, for cascading conditionals, we check whether the conditional ends in an *else* condition or not. Each method is also annotated with the current stack of pseudo methods until the most recent parent true method. Thus, each character access is associated with a specific method call, and each method call contains the information about the current stack of pseudo methods.

3 From Traces to Parse Trees

The instrumented program is provided with a *sample input* to collect the *character access* traces on associated control-flow nodes. Once we have the *character accesses* on the indexes on the origin string, we have to decide which method call should be associated with the particular character index. We follow a simple strategy:

The last method to access a particular character index consumes it.

Next, we need to eliminate overlaps between child nodes of the same node or between the parent and the child. That is, we want each child to own a single contiguous index range. To do that, we recursively scan the tree, and verify that the begin and end of none of the children of the same node overlap. If an overlap is found, the tie is decided in favor of the child that accessed the part last. The child that is in the overlap is recursively scanned, and any children that are contained in the overlap are removed.

Once the indexes are associated with method call identifiers, we generate a *call tree* with each method identifier arranged such that methods called from a given method are its children. The last accessed input indexes are added as the leaf nodes of the tree. As there is no overlap, such a tree can be considered as a *parse tree* for the given input string. The parse tree at this point is given in Figure 3a, which we call the *non-generalized* parse tree of the input string. In Figure 3a, each pseudo method has a list of values in parenthesis, in the following format. The last value in the parenthesis is the identifier for the control flow node taken. That is given a node name as `if (2:0, 3:1)`, the identifier is `3:1`. It indicates that the corresponding `if` statement was the third conditional in the program, and the

execution took the first (*if*) branch of the conditional. If the identifier was `3:2`, it would indicate that the execution took the *else* branch, and for larger values, it indicates the corresponding branch of a cascading *if* statement or a case statement. In the case of loops, there is only a single branch that has child nodes, and hence this is indicated by `0`. The values before the identifier corresponds to the identifiers of the pseudo-method parents of this node until the first method call. That is, the `if(2:0, 3:1)` has a parent node that is a loop, and it was the second loop in the program.

While we have produced a parse tree, it is not yet in a format from which we can recover the context-free grammar. To be able to do so, we need accurately labeled parse trees where any given node can be replaced by a node of similar kind without affecting the (parse) validity of the string. The problem here is that, not all iterations of loops are replaceable with each other. That is, loops can be influenced by the previous iterations. For example, consider the derivation tree in Figure 3a. If one considers each iteration of the loop to be one *alternate expansion* to the corresponding *nonterminal*, the rule recovered is:

$$\langle expr \rangle \rightarrow \text{num} | ++/$$

However, this is incorrect as a single free-standing operator such as `+` is not a valid value. The problem is that `is_op` encodes a link between different iterations. Hence, we annotate each individual iteration, and leave recovering the actual repeating structure for the next step. A similar problem occurs with method calls too. In the parse tree we produced, we assume that any given *nonterminal*—say `parse_num` can be replaced by another instance of `parse_num` without affecting the validity of the string. However, this assumption may not hold true in every case. The behavior of a method may be influenced by a number of factors including its parameters and the global environment. We fix this in the next step.

3.1 Active Learning of Labeling

The parse tree thus derived is accurate but not very useful to construct a grammar. The problem is the unique labeling of nodes. We do not yet know the dependencies between each iteration. Nor do we know if the behavior of any method is influenced by its parameters or its environment. To determine the precise labeling, we simply traverse all parse trees we have, and collect every single node, and separate them by the name of the node. That is, all `parse_num` nodes go together, so does all `if(1:0, 1:1)`.

We now want to identify whether each node that is grouped under a node name is replaceable (or compatible) with another with the same name. Unfortunately, compatibility is not *transitive* if one is looking at parse validity. For example, say, there are three *words* in a language — `a`, `b`, and `ac`. Each *word* is composed of individual *letters*. In the case of `a`, and `b`, the corresponding letter, and for `ac`, the letters `a`, and `c`.

$\langle START \rangle ::= \langle word1 \rangle | \langle word2 \rangle | \langle word3 \rangle$

$\langle word1 \rangle ::= \langle letter_a \rangle$

$\langle word2 \rangle ::= \langle letter_b \rangle$

$\langle word3 \rangle ::= \langle letter_a \rangle \langle letter_c \rangle$

$\langle letter_a \rangle ::= 'a'$

$\langle letter_b \rangle ::= 'b'$

$\langle letter_c \rangle ::= 'c'$

Now, consider the parse trees of `a`, `b`, and `ac`.

```
1 (START (word1 (letter_a "a")))
2 (START (word2 (letter_b "b")))
3 (START (word3 (letter_a "a") (letter_c "c")))
```

We consider a node as compatible with another if the string produced from a parse tree where the first node is replaced by the second is parsed correctly — that is, the generated string parses without any errors, and the parse tree generated from the new parse has the *same structure* as the tree generated by replacing the node.

Here, the nodes `letter_a` across parse trees are compatible because the generated strings are exactly the same. Next, the `letter_a` under `word1` is compatible with `letter_b` under `word2`. The generated strings are `a` and `b`. So, is the node `letter_b` under `word2` compatible with `letter_a` under `word3`? Unfortunately not, as the string generated from

```
1 (START (word3 (letter_b b) (letter_c c)))
```


is `bc` which is not in the language.

This means that for accurate identification of compatible nodes, each node has to be compared with all other nodes with the same name, which gives us a complexity of $O(n^2)$ in the worst case in terms of the number of nodes. However, we found that the assumption of *transitivity* rarely breaks, and even then, the inaccuracy induced, affects less than 10% of inputs generated from the grammar (See the evaluation of `mathexpr.py`). Since the assumption of *transitivity* allows us to reduce the computational effort, our evaluation is implemented assuming *transitivity* of compatibility.⁵

Once we have identified the compatibility buckets, we can update the nodes in them with unique suffixes corresponding to each bucket, and update the node name of each with the suffix. In the case of loop nodes, we also update the stack name of this node in all the child and grand child elements of this node — all grand children up to the next non-pseudo method call. The idea here is that, if there are two unique loop iterations that are incompatible with each other, then any other control flow nodes inside that loops such as conditionals should also be considered incompatible even if the same alternative path is taken in the conditional during the execution of both iterations.

Once the process is complete, all the nodes in all the parse trees will be labeled with consistent and correct identifiers. These can then be extracted to produce the correct grammar. The generalized counterpart to Figure 2b is given in Figure 3b.

⁵ We note that one does not need to rely on this assumption. One can choose to do the complete $O(n^2)$ verification, or can choose anything in between that and the faster but approximate version.



(a) Non-generalized parse tree. The number before colon indicates the identifier of the particular control flow pseudo-method, and after number after the colon identifies the alternative if any. That is, `if(... 5:2)` indicates the fifth `if` whose `else` branch was taken. The pseudo method stack is in the parenthesis. (b) Generalized parse tree. The number in suffix after colon indicates the generalized identifier after validating replacements. As before, the pseudo method stack is contained in the parenthesis, which is also updated when the parent is updated during generalization.

Figure 3: Parse trees for $9+3/4$. The prefix before colon indicates the static identifier of the control structure in the method. That is, the first `if` gets the prefix `1:`. The suffix is explained above.

3.2 Active Learning of Nullability

For conditional nodes, whether an `if` node can be skipped can be determined statically without active learning, by simply checking for the presence of an `else` branch.

However, unlike conditionals, we do not have a simple way to statically determine if a loop can be skipped entirely or at least one iteration is required. One alternative is to wait for sufficient number of samples, and see if there are examples where the loops are absent. A second alternative is to use *active learning*.

The idea is to replace all *consecutive* `loop` nodes that are the children of a given node in a given parse tree. Then check the validity of the string produced from that tree. If the parse structure of the new string is correct, and this can be done on all parse trees and at all points where this is possible, the loop is marked as nullable.

Similar to loops, `if` conditionals may also be labeled incorrectly. For example, consider the set of statements below.

```
1 if g_validate:
2   validate_header(header)
```

The problem here is that, while the `if` does not have an `else` branch, we do now know whether the body of the conditional can be skipped or not. In particular, the `g_validate` may be a global configuration option which may mean that it is always enabled or always disabled for specific kinds of parse trees. While we have not found such conditionals in our subjects, if additional accuracy is desired, the optional parts of conditionals may also be verified using active learning.

With this, our trees are accurately labeled and ready for inferring grammars from them.

4 Grammar Inference

The basic idea of constructing a grammar out of a labeled parse tree is simple. We traverse each parse tree starting from the top, descending into each children, and each node we see, if it is not a character node, is marked as a *nonterminal*

in the grammar. The children are placed as the rule for expansion of the *nonterminal* in the grammar. If the child is a non-character node, the token in the expansion will be a reference to the corresponding *nonterminal* in the grammar. There may be multiple alternate expansions to the same *nonterminal* even from the same tree as the same method call may be made recursively. This is detailed in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Extracting the basic grammar

```
function EXTRACT_GRAMMAR(node, grammar)
  name, uid, children, stack  $\leftarrow$  node
  a_name  $\leftarrow$  name + uid + stack
  rule  $\leftarrow$  []
  if a_name  $\notin$  grammar then
    grammar[a_name]  $\leftarrow$  {rule}
  else
    grammar[a_name].add(rule)
  if children =  $\emptyset$  then
    return T, a_name
  else
    for child  $\leftarrow$  children do
      kind, cname  $\leftarrow$  extract_grammar(child)
      if kind = T then
        rule + = to_terminal(cname)
      else
        rule + = to_nonterminal(cname)
  return NT, a_name
```

A complication in grammar inference is that our rules may look as below (method stack details are skipped).

```
 $\langle expr \rangle \rightarrow$  while:1
 $\langle expr \rangle \rightarrow$  while:1 while:2 while:1 while:2 while:1
 $\langle expr \rangle \rightarrow$  while:1 while:2 while:1
 $\langle while:1 \rangle \rightarrow$  if:1
```

$\langle if:1 \rangle \rightarrow \text{num}$

$\langle while:2 \rangle \rightarrow +$

There may be even more complex repeating patterns. The problem is that we want to merge and abstract these rules because they represent possible infinite repetitions. We see next how they can be handled.

4.1 Identifying Repeating Patterns

An additional challenge comes from identifying repeating patterns. We essentially want to identify the repeating patterns even if they are a few levels deep, and we want to identify the best repeating patterns here. Fortunately, this problem has various solutions [16]. We chose a modification of the *prefix tree acceptor* algorithm⁶. Once we run the modified *PTA* algorithm, the previous grammar is transformed to:

$\langle expr \rangle \rightarrow \text{while}:1$

$\langle expr \rangle \rightarrow (\text{while}:1 \text{ while}:2)^+ \text{ while}:1$

$\langle while:1 \rangle \rightarrow \text{if}:1$

$\langle if:1 \rangle \rightarrow \text{num}$

$\langle while:2 \rangle \rightarrow +$

The `while:<n>` can be replaced by the regular expression summaries of the corresponding rules recursively. Here, this gives us the regular expression:

$\langle expr \rangle \rightarrow \text{num} | (\text{num} [+])^+ \text{num}$

While generalizing, we can replace any `+` with `*` provided all the items inside the group are nullable. Similarly, when merging regular expressions corresponding to conditionals, one can add `(...|)` i.e. an ϵ alternative, provided the corresponding if condition was nullable. These steps generate the right hand side regular expressions in Figure 2c for a simple program given in Figure 2a. For details on learning regular expressions from samples, see Higuera [12]. The grammar derived from *microjson.py* after removing differences due to *white space* is given in Figure 1.

4.2 Producing a Compact Grammar

At this point, the mined grammar readable but verbose. There are a number of transformations that one can take to reduce its verbosity without changing the language defined by the grammar. These are as follows:

1. If there is any key that is defined by a single rule with a single token, delete the key from the grammar, and replace all references to that key with the token instead.
2. If there are multiple keys with the same rule set, choose one, delete the rest, and update the references to other keys with the chosen one.

3. If there are duplicate rules under the same key, remove the redundant rules.
4. Remove any rule that is same as key it defines.
5. If there is any key that is referred to on a single rule on a single token, and the key is defined by just one rule, delete the key from the grammar, and replace the reference to the key by the rule.

We repeat these steps as long as the number of rules in the grammar decreases in each cycle. This produces a smaller grammar that defines the same language.

5 Generating Inputs from Grammars

$$5 \cdot (8 + (2 - ((338 + 50409)/56))) \cdot ((8/1) - 7 - 8 - 7 - ((9) + 9 - 3/25) \cdot 5/((6 - (88233/60)))) \cdot 4 * (8 - ((99/((1 + 3))) - 31200/(8 + (308)))) \cdot (((2/0)) + (39 + (4 * 2 * 70))) \cdot ((9 * (1 * 3)) * ((0 * (0))/(5 - (9 + 8)))) + (2) \cdot (802 + 3)/(1 + (5758 * (74506 + (((77) + 902369) + 2))) \cdot (854 * 1 + (3) - ((37 * (2))/7 - (((8 - (((084/((((9/5))/(((0 - (((9) + 97966) - (1 - 81))) * 33) + (((982 + 7) - 20932) - 66)) - 659)/2) + 26) - 681) - 519 + 76) + 225)/489)/15))) * ((9 - (0)) - (7))) * 08))))$$

Figure 4: Inputs produced from the grammar in Figure 2c

Once a grammar is extracted, it can immediately be turned into a *producer*, which starting from the start symbol, will apply one expansion after the other to produce inputs. For our calculator example from Figure 2a, the extracted grammar in Figure 2c yields arithmetic expressions such as the ones shown in Figure 4. State of the art tools like *FI* [21] implement several optimizations to prevent out-of-bound growth. In our experiments, we make use of the Python *GrammarCoverageFuzzer* [47], which additionally aims for systematically covering all input elements.

It does not take a grammar for fuzzing, though. As our seed inputs are all decomposed into parse trees, one can also mutate and recombine these parse trees to obtain large sets of test samples [24]. This alternative is especially valuable when applying our approach on parsers that do not produce named *nonterminals* (e.g. PEG parsers and parser combinators).

6 Evaluation

For evaluation, we used the following subjects:

Calculator (*calc.py*) – a simple recursive descent program written in textbook style from the Codeproject⁷, simplified and converted to Python. It also forms the running example in the paper. We used self generated expressions to mine the grammar and evaluate.

Mathexpr (*mathexpr.py*) – a more advanced expression evaluator from the Codeproject⁸. It includes pre-defined constants, method calls, and the ability to

⁶ Unlike the original *PTA*, which considers only repeating patterns single character long, we first scan for, and identify repeating patterns of any block size. We next scan the inputs for any instances of the identified repeating patterns. These are then chunked, and considered as the alphabets as in the original *PTA* algorithm.

⁷<https://www.codeproject.com/Articles/88435/Simple-Guide-to-Mathematical-Expression-Parsing>

⁸<https://github.com/louisfisch/mathematical-expressions-parser>

define variables. As in the case with Calculator, we used self generated expressions and test cases to mine the grammar and evaluate.

CGIDecode (*cgidecode.py*) – the *CGIDecode* program originally from the Pezze et al. [39], with the Python implementation from the chapter on *Code Coverage* [45] from Zeller et al. This is an example of a parser that is a simple state machine. It is not recursive, and hence does not use the stack. For *CGIDecode*, we used self generated expressions to mine the grammar and evaluate.

URLParse (*urlparse.py*) – the URL parser part of the Python *urllib* library⁹. An example of ad hoc parsing with little ordering between how the parts are parsed. For initial mining and evaluation, we used the URLs generated from passing tests using the *test_urllib.py* in the Python distribution. We also used a handwritten grammar to generate inputs as we detail later.

NetRC (*netrc.py*) – the *netrc* library from the Python distribution¹⁰ which is used to parse the *.netrc* files that contain login information. This parser uses a separate lexing stage with the *shlex* lexer from the Python distribution. The *lexing* stage can stop the grammar recovery completely because we stop tracking the character access as soon as it is transformed from a character stream to a token. Hence, for NetRC, we modified the *shlex* to transmit proxy strings that allow one to track character accesses similar to object based tainting [10, 50]. For *NetRC*, few samples were available in *test_netrc.py*. Hence, we searched for samples of *.netrc* online and found ten samples. These were used as a template for writing a grammar for the *NetRC* format, which was used to generate inputs.

MicroJSON (*microjson.py*) – a minimal JSON parser from Github¹¹. We fixed a few bugs in this project during the course of extracting its grammar (merged upstream). For mining, we chose ten simple samples that explored all codepaths in the parser. For our evaluation, we used 100 samples of JSON generated from the following JSON API end points: *api.duckduckgo.com*, *developer.github.com*, *api.github.com*, *dictionaryapi.com*, *wordsapi.com*, *tech.yandex.com*. We also added sample JSON files obtained from *json.org*, *json-schema.org*, *jsonlint*, *www.w3schools.com*, and *opensource.adobe.com*.

Are our subjects too few or small? We note that our focus is on recovering input grammar from parsers written in various recursive descent parsing styles. It would be obvious to parser implementers that there is little difference between a small and a large parser in terms of its implementation other than the scale. To buttress the point, if one

has an off the shell parser, there is little difference between a large grammar or a small grammar. Similarly, for a particular style of parsing, showing that one can recover the grammar from a small program is no different from showing that one can recover the input grammar from a larger one. Hence, our focus was to identify parsers that deploy diverse strategies for parsing (while still being recursive descent).

Indeed, the subjects for our evaluation have diverse strategies for parsing. For example, the *cgidecode.py* is an automata, and recognizes a regular language. *urlparse.py* also recognizes a regular language, but is written in an ad hoc style with parts being parsed in a different order than it appears in the input. The *calc.py* is an example of a text book style procedure based approach to parsing, and uses an input buffer and an index to specify the current parsing location. It recognizes a context free language for arithmetic expressions. The *mathexpr.py* is more complex. It has an object oriented structure, and the input being parsed is encapsulated within the object. It recognizes a context free language for arithmetic expressions with variables and functions. *microjson.py* recognizes JSON, which is a real world context-free format, and contains complex parsing rules. Finally, *netrc.py* also recognizes a context-free language, but in addition, sports a *lexing* stage.

6.1 Methodology

For comparing our approach with *Autogram*, we used the Python implementation in the chapter on *Mining Input Grammars* [48] from Zeller et al. *GrammarMiner* is a Python implementation of *Autogram* with important differences. The first is that, unlike the original approach, the *GrammarMiner* is written in Python and is used for analysis of Python programs. It is a technology demonstrator used for illustrating the concept of grammar mining. Hence, our comparisons may not apply directly to the original *Autogram* implementation. However, our focus is on the *conceptual* differences between *Autogram* and *Mimid*, especially whether there are programs that can not be easily analyzed by the *Autogram* approach of using data flow to recover the program input grammar. For all differences in results, we thus investigate how much they are due to *conceptual* differences.

We note that the Python implementation of *Autogram* does not implement generalization of character sets to regular expressions unlike the original *Autogram*. For a fair comparison, we have disabled *Mimid* generalization of character sets to larger regular expressions during comparisons.

Our research questions are as follows:

RQ 1. How accurate are the derived grammars as *producers*?

RQ 2. How accurate are the derived grammars as *parsers*?

RQ 3. Can one apply *Mimid* to parsers without data flow?

⁹<https://github.com/python/cpython/blob/3.6/Lib/urllib/parse.py>

¹⁰<https://github.com/python/cpython/blob/3.6/Lib/netrc.py>

¹¹<https://github.com/phensley/microjson>

RQ 4. Can one apply *Mimid* to non-traditional parsers such as PEG and Parser combinators?

6.2 RQ 1. Grammar Accuracy as Producers

As we explained previously, we collected a set of detailed samples for each of the programs for grammar mining. Next, we used both *Autogram* and *Mimid* on the *same* set of samples and generated a grammar from each approach for each program. This grammar was then used to generate inputs to fuzz the program using the *GrammarFuzzer* [46]. The number of inputs that were accepted by the subject program is given in Table 1.

Table 1: Inputs generated by inferred grammars that were accepted by the program (1,000 inputs each)

	<i>Autogram</i>	<i>Mimid</i>
<i>calc.py</i>	36.5%	100.0%
<i>mathexpr.py</i>	30.3%	87.5%
<i>cgidecode.py</i>	47.8%	100.0%
<i>urlparse.py</i>	100.0%	100.0%
<i>netrc.py</i>	0.0%	100.0%
<i>microjson.py</i>	53.8%	98.7%

Grammars inferred by Mimid produce many more correct inputs than Autogram.

To assess and understand the differences in results, we manually examined the grammars from both *Autogram* and *Mimid*.

6.2.1 *calc.py*

A snippet of the grammar from *Autogram* for *calc.py* is below.

```

<START> ::= <init@884:self>
<init@884:self> ::= <expr@26:c>00
  | <expr@26:c>3<expr@26:c><expr@29:num>
  | <expr@26:c>*<expr@29:num>*4
  | <expr@26:c>1<expr@26:c><expr@26:c>0<expr@26:c>2
  | <expr@26:c>100) ...

```

The grammar from our approach for the same program, using same mining sample is given in Figure 2c. An examination shows that the rules derived by *Autogram* were not as general as *Mimid*. That is, the grammar generated by *Autogram* is enumerative at the expense of generality. Why does this happen? The reason is that the `parse_expr` and other functions in *calc.py* accept a *buffer* of input characters, with an index specifying the current parse location. *Autogram* relies on fragmented values being passed in to method calls for successful extraction of parts, and hence the derivation of tree structure. Here, the first call creates a linear tree with each nested method claiming the entirety of the buffer, and this defeats the *Autogram* algorithm.

This is not a matter of better implementation. The original *Autogram* relies on parameters to the method calls to contain only parts of the input. While an *Autogram* derived

algorithm may choose to ignore the method parameters, any use of a similar buffer inside the method will cause the algorithm to fail unless it is able to identify such spurious variables.

6.2.2 *mathexpr.py*

For *mathexpr.py*, the situation was again similar. *Autogram* was unable to abstract any rules. The *mathexpr.py* program uses a variation of the strategy used by *calc.py* for parsing. It stores the input in an internal buffer in the class and stores the index to the buffer as the location being currently parsed. For similar reasons as before, *Autogram* fails to extract the parts of the buffer. *Mimid* on the other hand produced an almost correct grammar, correctly identifying constants and external variables. The single mistake found (which was cause of multiple invalid outputs) was instructive. The *mathexpr.py* program pre-defines letters from a to z as constants. Further, it also defines functions such as `exp()`. The function names are checked in the same place as the constants are parsed. *Mimid* found that the function names are composed of *letters*, and some of the letters in the function names are compatible with the single letter variables — in that, they can be exchanged and still produce correct values. Since we assumed *transitivity*, *Mimid* assumed that all letters in function names are compatible with single letter constants. This assumption produced function names such as `eep()`, which failed the input validation.

6.2.3 *microjson.py*

The inferred *microjson.py* with *Autogram* produces more than 50%, valid inputs when compared to 98.2% from *Mimid*. Further, we note that the 50% valid inputs from *Autogram* paints a more robust picture than the actual situation. That is, the grammar recovered by *Autogram* for *microjson.py* is mostly an enumeration of the values seen during mining. The reason is that *microjson.py* uses a data structure `JStream` which internally contains a `StringIO` buffer of data. This data structure is passed around as method parameters for all method calls, e.g. `_from_json_string(stm)`. Hence, every call to the data structure gets the complete buffer with no chance of breaking it apart. We note that it is possible to work around this problem by essentially ignoring method parameters and focusing more on return values. The problem with the data structure can also be worked around by modifying the data structure to hold only the remaining data to be parsed. This however, requires some specific knowledge of the program being analyzed. *Mimid* on the other hand is not affected by the problem of buffers at all and recovers a complete grammar.

6.2.4 *urlparse.py*

For *urlparse.py* we initially noticed that *Autogram* and *mimid* did not perform well (the inferred grammar could recognize less than 10% of the samples) due to the inability to generalize strings. Since we were interested in comparing the capabilities of both algorithms in detecting structure, we restricted our mining sample to only contain a specific set of strings. In particular, we noticed that the *urlparse.py*

program split the given input to `<scheme>`, `<netloc>`, `<query>`, and `<fragment>` based on delimiters. In particular, the internal structure of `<netloc>` and `<query>` were ignored.

Hence, we wrote a grammar for `urlparse.py` which contained a list of specific strings for each part. Next, we generated 100 inputs each using the Grammar Fuzzer and validated each by checking the string with the program. We then used these strings as mining set. With this mining set, the grammar from both *Mimid* and *Autogram* could produce 100% correct inputs.

6.2.5 `netrc.py`

For `netrc.py`, similar to `urlparse.py` we noticed that *Autogram* and *mimid* did not perform well due to the inability to generalize strings. Since we were interested in comparing the capabilities of both algorithms in detecting structure, we restricted our mining sample to only contain a specific set of strings including fixed spaces. Next, we generated 100 inputs each using the Grammar Fuzzer and validated each by checking the string with the program. We then used these strings as mining set. With this mining set, the grammar mined using *Mimid* was able to recognize 100% of the input. Unfortunately, *Autogram* was unable to produce valid inputs. The problem is that, `netrc.py` employs `shlex`, a lexical stage before parsing. The *lexing* stage seems to have confused *Autogram*, especially for the first token, where all characters in the token are assigned to the same *nonterminal* symbol. This essentially leads to incorrect inputs even though only the first token is incorrect in a large number of inputs.

If one fixes this by hand in the inputs, *Autogram* produces 69.2% valid inputs, which was still lesser than *mimid*.

6.3 RQ 2. Grammar Accuracy as Parsers

For our second question, we want to assess whether correct inputs would also be accepted by our inferred grammars. In order to obtain correct inputs, we used various approaches as available for different grammars. For `calc.py` and `mathexpr.py`, we wrote a grammar by hand. Next, we used this grammar to generate a set of inputs that were then run through the subject programs to check whether the inputs were valid. We collected 1,000 such inputs for both programs. Next, these inputs were fed into parsers using grammars produced by *Mimid* and *Autogram*. We used the *Iterative Earley Parser* from [49] for verifying that the inputs were parsed by the given grammar.

For `netrc.py` and `urlparse.py`, we used the same grammar for parsing that we already had used to generate mining inputs. We again collected a set of valid inputs and verified that the inferred grammar is able to parse these inputs. For `microjson.py`, we used the collected JSON documents as described above. The largest document was 2,840 lines long. We then verified whether the grammar inferred by each algorithm was able to parse these inputs. Our results are given in Table 2.

¹² A recognizer recognizes the structure but does not return a parse tree.

Table 2: Inputs generated by golden grammar that were accepted by the inferred grammar parser (1,000 inputs each except `microjson.py` which used 100 external inputs)

	<i>Autogram</i>	<i>Mimid</i>
<code>calc.py</code>	0.0%	100.0%
<code>mathexpr.py</code>	0.0%	92.7%
<code>cgidecode.py</code>	35.1%	100.0%
<code>urlparse.py</code>	100.0%	96.4%
<code>netrc.py</code>	34.6%	41.3%
<code>microjson.py</code>	0.0%	93.0%

As one would expect, *Autogram* is unable to parse the expressions from `calc.py` and `mathexpr.py` grammars. For `cgidecode.py`, *Autogram* performed poorly, while *Mimid* achieved 100% accuracy. For `netrc.py`, both *Autogram* and *mimid* performed poorly. However, *Mimid* performed slightly better than *Autogram*. On analysis, we found that the *lexing* stage introduced a large amount of noise in the inferred parse tree, as the character access from the *lexing* stage was indistinguishable from the *parsing* stage. We will focus on this as our future work. As we expected, *mimid* performed better for `microjson.py` too with more than 90% of the input samples recognized by the inferred grammar.

Grammars inferred by Mimid accept many more correct inputs than Autogram.

The outlier is `urlparse.py`, for which *Autogram* performed achieved 100% while *Mimid* performed slightly worse (but still more than 90% input strings recognized by the inferred grammar). An inspection of the source code of the subject program reveals that it violated one of the assumptions of *mimid*. Namely, `urlparse.py` searches for character strings in the entirety of its input rather than restricting searches to unparsed parts of the program. For example, it searches for URL fragments (delimited by #) starting from the first location in the input. When this happens, *mimid* has no way to tell these spurious accesses apart from the true parsing.

6.4 RQ 3. Parsers without Data Flow to variables

To investigate whether *Mimid* would also work on parsers that do not rely on data flow of input fragments to variables, we create a variant of the program in Figure 2a. It is a simple recognizer¹² for calculator expressions, and is given in Figure 5.

```

1  def is_digit(i):
2      return i in "0123456789"
3
4  def parse_num(s,i):
5      while i != len(s) and is_digit(s[i]):
6          i = i + 1
7      return i
8
9  def parse_paren(s, i):
10     assert s[i] == '('
11     i = parse_expr(s, i+1)
12     if i == len(s):
13         raise (s, i)
14     assert s[i] == ')'
15     return i+1
16
17 def parse_expr(s, i = 0):
18     is_op = True
19     while i < len(s):
20         c = s[i]
21         if is_digit(c):
22             if not is_op: raise (s,i)
23             i = parse_num(s,i)
24             is_op = False
25         elif c in ['+', '-', '*', '/']:
26             if is_op: raise (s,i)
27             is_op = True
28             i = i + 1
29         elif c == '(':
30             if not is_op: raise (s,i)
31             i = parse_paren(s, i)
32             is_op = False
33         elif c == ')':
34             break
35         else:
36             raise (s,i)
37     if is_op:
38         raise (s,i)
39     return i
40
41 def main(arg):
42     parse_expr(arg)
43

```

Figure 5: A recognizer for mathematical expressions.

Now, the parser no longer stores parsed information in any data structure. There are no substrings being stored in any variable, and hence no taints to look for. *Mimid* can still recover the grammar from this program, and the parse tree is exactly the same as the one given in Figure 2b. However, *Autogram* is unable to track the data flow because there is no data flow anymore. This means that *Mimid* is able to recover grammars from a larger class of programs than *Autogram*. (While complex programs such as recognizers can be written without data flow, it is impossible to write complex programs such as parsers without some control flow.) Why is this important? Not all parts of an input may be equally valid. One may have to parse the header to identify where the body starts even if one is not interested in the information contained in the header. One may also wish to skip parts of the input to get to the next interesting chunk. None of these require explicit data flow.

*Mimid infers grammars from parsers
without data flow from input to variables.*

¹³ In the words of a commenter <https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=18400717> “getting a reasonable error message out of YACC style parser generators is as fun as poking yourself in the eye with a sharp stick”. GCC http://gcc.gnu.org/wiki/New_C_Parser, and CLANG <http://clang.llvm.org/features.html#unifiedparser> uses handwritten parsers for the same reason. Python is also shifting to a PEG parser https://medium.com/@gvanrossum_83706/peg-parsers-7ed72462f97c.

¹⁴ <https://pypi.org/project/pyparsec/>

6.5 RQ 4. Advanced Parsers

While a large number of parsers are written by hand [38] in the traditional recursive descent approach, a few other parsing techniques in the program stack based recursive descent family have become popular recently: Parser combinators and PEG parsers. In fact, parser combinators [8] and PEG parsers [30] are recommended over parser generators due to the various inflexibilities such as handling ambiguities, context-sensitive features [32], and bad error messages [28]¹³ when using parser generators. Our technique can recover parse trees for both kinds of parsers, which can be used to recover grammar as we detailed previously. For example, Figure 6 shows the parse tree obtained from a simple parser written using *PyParsec*¹⁴ given below.

```

1 import pyparsec
2 alphap = pyparsec.char('a')
3 eqp = pyparsec.char('=')
4 digitp = pyparsec.digits
5 abcparser = alphap >> eqp >> digitp

```

(we use the PEG parser from the Parser [49] chapter from Zeller et al.). Using the following grammar:

$\langle main \rangle ::= \langle assignment \rangle$

$\langle assignment \rangle ::= \langle alpha \rangle '=' \langle digit \rangle$

$\langle alpha \rangle ::= 'a' | 'b' | 'c' | 'd' | 'e' | 'f' | 'g' | 'h' | 'i'$

$\langle digit \rangle ::= '0' | '1' | '2' | '3' | '4' | '5' | '6' | '7' | '8' | '9'$

with PEG parser, Figure 7 details the recovered parse tree for the input: a=0




Figure 6: Recovered (unprocessed) parse tree from *PyParsec* for a simple language with top level rule: `abcparser := alphap >> eqp >> digitp` the * indicates where a long chain was shortened




Figure 7: Recovered (unprocessed) parse trees from PEG parser for a simple assignment language with top level rule: `assignment := alpha '=' digit` on parsing `a=0`

Due to limitations that Python imposes, the parser combinator library needs to be slightly modified to recover the node names. In particular, the function names themselves do not have any relation with the parsing behavior. Rather, chains of parser objects are assigned to specific variables, and the names of these variables (such as `alphap`, `eqp` and `digitp`) capture the parse information¹⁵. For the parser combinator library, we capture the variable names as *nonterminal* symbols in the grammar.

We can also recover the parse trees, and hence the grammar from a PEG parser, with similar results as that of the parser combinator. For details, refer to the Jupyter notebook submitted along with the paper.

Mimid can infer the context-free grammar from PEG and combinator parsers.

7 Limitations

Our work is subject to the following important limitations.

Approximation. Any approach trying to recover an input language as a context-free grammar can only produce an *approximation* of the actual input language. (A fully accurate description would have to be Turing-complete just as the accepting program—i.e. an unrestricted grammar or a program accepting the input). When using grammars for understanding programs and input formats, this limitation is well-known, as

¹⁵ Given that variables are involved, would *Autogram* perform better with parser combinators? The problem here is that the variables do not hold parsed fragments of strings. Rather, they are functions in disguise, and the result of parsing is not stored anywhere. Hence, *Autogram* has no usable dataflow to extract.

grammars for, say, programming languages always only have covered syntactic aspects only. For the purpose of test generation, this inaccuracy results in unnecessary (semantically) invalid inputs being generated; but as these would be quickly rejected by the program under test, the risk is limited to excess resource usage.

Parser Combinators. For parser combinators, the method names themselves do not hold any meaning. The *nonterminal* symbols have to be extracted from the variable names, which may require library specific tagging or processing. Same issue exists for the PEG parser. While the particular PEG parser we used stores the name of the *nonterminal* symbol in the argument to the parsing procedure, this may not always be the case. Hence, library specific processing may be required to identify human readable *nonterminal* names.

Table-driven parsers. To identify the input structure, *mimid* makes use of control flow and call stack during execution. In *table-driven* parsers, control flow and stack are not explicitly encoded into the program, but an implicit part of the parser state, which *mimid* could recover. However, table-driven parsers are typically generated from a given grammar, which one could simply use in the first place.

Sample inputs. The features of grammars produced by *mimid* reflect the features of the inputs it learns from: If a feature is not present in the input set, it will not be present in the resulting grammar either. This problem of incompleteness, which is shared with all current grammar induction techniques, can be alleviated by learning from a large and varied set of inputs. New test generators specifically targeting input processors [38] could be able to create such input sets automatically.

Reparsing. Since *mimid* tracks only the *last* access of a character, it can get challenged if an ad hoc parser reparses a previously parsed input. This problem can be addressed by exploring multiple candidates for consumption and assessing the resulting grammars for their structure.

8 Related Work

Learning the input language of a given program is not a new line of research. However, the recent rapidly rising interest in automated test generation and fuzzing has fueled an increase of interest in this field.

8.1 Grammar Inference with Membership Queries

The first class of approaches treats the program as an oracle which can be asked whether it will accept a given string or not, and assumes little else.

We note that the seminal paper “*When Won’t Membership Queries Help?*” by Angluin and Kharitonov [2] shows that a pure black-box approach is doomed to failure as **there cannot be a polynomial time algorithm** in terms of the number of queries needed for recovering a context-free grammar from membership queries alone. That is, as the grammar length increases, the number of membership queries needed to infer the grammar grows exponentially.

In the class of query-based approaches, *GLADE* [5] is a pure *black-box* approach that produces grammatical structures. *GLADE* takes a program and a set of inputs and then constructs a series of increasingly general languages by using generalization steps, which add repetition, alternation, and recursive constructs to the language. Each generalization is tested by sending synthesized inputs to the program under test; if all inputs are accepted, the generalization is valid. The advantage of *GLADE* over white-box approaches is that no complex analysis is necessary or even possible; and the authors apply *GLADE* to complex programs such as PDF processors. The disadvantage is that the *GLADE* grammars cannot make use of the program structure or its identifiers. Indeed, *GLADE* makes no claim as to recovering a readable grammar. An inspection of the *GLADE* source [18] shows that the mined grammar is in the form of an internal data structure, which is not easily translatable to a context-free grammar form. Indeed, new programs have to be incorporated separately by implementing program specific drivers. Consequently, the grammar can’t be consumed by any external tool that accepts a context-free grammar such as parsers or grammar fuzzers, which makes it hard to evaluate whether the “grammar” it produces is reasonable.

Bastani et al. shows that a Dyck language can be inferred by the *GLADE* algorithm in $O(n^4)$ time in terms of the seed length. However, we note that Dyck languages are a small subset of context-free languages, and one needs to be careful to generalize this result to the general class.

REINAM [44] starts with the *GLADE* approach, but improves on two counts. First, it uses *PEX*[~][42] for generating the initial seed inputs. Next, it improves on the generalization algorithm of *GLADE*. However, the grammar it produces is the same form as that of *GLADE*, and has the same drawbacks. Second, the symbolic execution engine *PEX* is only used for the initial seed generation. Hence as with *GLADE*, it ignores the internal structure of the program, which leaves it open to the same limit pointed out by Angluin et al. [2].

GRIMOIRE by Blazytko et al. [6] is an end-to-end grey-box fuzzer that uses the new coverage obtained by inputs to synthesize a *grammar like structure* while fuzzing. There are two major shortcomings with the grammar like structures generated by *GRIMOIRE*. First, according to authors [6, Section 3, last paragraph], the grammar like structure contains a flat hierarchy, and contains a single *nonterminal* denoted by \square . This *nonterminal* can be expanded to any of the “production rules” which are input fragments with the same *nonterminal* \square inserted in them, producing gaps that can be filled in. The problem is that, real world applications often have multiple nestings, where

only a particular kind of can be inserted — e.g numbers, strings, etc. These kinds of structures cannot be represented by the grammar like structure without loss of accuracy. Second, as the grammar structure derived by *GRIMOIRE* is essentially a long list of templates, the grammar is likely to be uninterpretable by humans.

Learn&Fuzz by Godefroid et al. [20] automates the generation of an input grammar using sample inputs and neural-network-based statistical machine-learning techniques. This approach uses thousands of inputs (63,000 PDF objects) to learn from, and uses queries not only to determine membership, but also to maximize code coverage. Similarly to the tools above, the resulting grammars are not meant for human consumption, but show considerable improvements for test generation of complex inputs. Another model inference tool is *PULSAR* [17] which recovers a Markov model and state machine representation of the input. Another notable mentions include *Neural byte sieve* [41], and *NEUZZ* [14].

It should be noted that neither *GLADE*, *REINAM*, *GRIMOIRE*, or Learn&Fuzz provide examples of inferred grammars or grammar-like structures in their publications; all these are strictly meant as intermediate representations to be passed to a fuzzer without assuming a human could make use of these. Their usefulness for fuzzing without humans in the loop, however, is clearly demonstrated.

8.2 Using Program Analysis for Grammar Mining

Given the limitations of a black-box approach toward learning input languages — any general algorithm will have exponential time behavior — an obvious choice is to recover information about the structure of the input language from the parser in question.

Autogram [26] (and later Pygmalion [22]) is the approach closest to ours. *Autogram* uses the program code in a *dynamic, white-box* fashion. Given a program and a set of inputs, *Autogram* uses *dynamic taints* to identify the *data flow* from the input to string fragments found during execution. These entities are associated with corresponding method calls in the call tree, and each entity is assigned an *input interval* that specifies start and end indices of the string found in that entity during execution. Using a subsumption relation, these intervals are collated into a parse tree; the grammar for that parse tree can be recovered by recursively descending into the tree. While *Autogram* can produce very readable and usable grammars, its success depends on having data flow to track. If parts of the input are *not* stored in some variable, there is no data flow to learn from. If the parser skips parts of the input (say, to scan over a comment), this will not result in data flow. Conversely, data can flow into *multiple variables*, causing another set of problems. If a parser uses multiple functions, whose parameters are a buffer pointer and an index into the buffer, then each of these functions gets the entire buffer as data flow. Such programming idioms may be less frequent in Java (the language *Autogram* aims at), but in general would require expensive and difficult disambiguation.

In contrast, our approach tracks *all* accesses of indi-

vidual characters, no matter whether they would be stored. Our assumption that the last function accessing a character is the *consumer* of this character (and hence parsing a *nonterminal*) still produces very readable and accurate grammars.

8.3 Recovering Parse Trees

Lin et al. [34, 35] show how to recover parse trees from inputs using a combination of static and dynamic analysis. They observe that the structure of input is induced by the way its parts are used during execution, and provide two approaches for recovering bottom-up and top-down parse trees. Similar to our approach, they construct a call tree which contains the method calls, and crucially, the conditionals and individual loop iterations. Next, they identify which nodes in the call tree consumes which characters in the input string.

Their key idea is *parsing point* which is the point at which they consider a particular character to have been consumed, and they define the parsing point of a character as the last point that the character was *used* before the parsing point of its successor. In particular, a character is used when a value *derived from it* is accessed — that is, the input labels are propagated through variable assignments much like taints (the labels are propagated except during binary operations on two input related variables).

A problem with this approach is that, this approach *only* considers well written parsers in the text book style, that consumes characters one by one before the next character is parsed. Unfortunately, a large number of real world parsers are written in an ad hoc style where we cannot have such a firm guarantee on the order of consumption. For example, the Python URL parser first checks if a given URL contains any fragment (indicated by the delimiter #), and if there is, the fragment is split from the URL. Next, in the remaining *prefix*, the query string is checked, which is indicated by the delimiter ?, which is then separated out from the path. Finally, the parameters that are encoded in the path using ; are parsed from the path left over from the above steps. This kind of processing is by no means rare. A common pattern is to split the input string into fields using delimiters such as commas, and then parse the individual fields. Some programs may also parse the outer structure such as the XML wrapper first before separately parsing the wrapped data. All this means that the parsing points as determined by the algorithm by Lin et al. will occur much before the actual parse. Lin et al. notes that one can't simply use the *last use* of a label as its parsing point because the values derived from it may be accessed after the parsing phase.

Mimid uses the same *last use* strategy, but gets around this problem by only tracking access to the original input buffer. That is, *mimid* stops tracking as soon as the input is transformed, which makes the *mimid* instrumentation lightweight, and its mined grammars accurate.

Finally, Lin et al. stop at parse trees and do not proceed further. While they show how the function names can form the *nonterminal* symbols, their approach stops at identifying control flow nodes, and makes no attempt to

either identify compatible nodes or the iteration order, or to recover a grammar which needs something similar to the *prefix tree acceptor* algorithm to generalize over multiple trees, each of which is needed to *accurately label* the parse tree.

If one has an *accurately labeled* parse tree, grammar recovery is possible as demonstrated by Kraft et al. [31] and Duffy et al. [15] who hack the *GCC* to output the parse tree after parsing, and use it to derive the grammar of C. Zhao et al. [51] recovers a graph grammar from the call trace, but without any further generalization.

8.4 Learning Finite State Models

The idea of using dynamic traces for inferring models of the underlying software goes back to [27], learning a finite state model representation of a program; Walkingshaw et al. [43] later refined this approach using queries. Such models represent legal sequences of (input) *events* and thus correspond to the input language of the program. While our approach could also be applied to event sequences rather than character sequences, it focuses on recovering syntactic (context-free) input structures.

8.5 Domain-Specific Approaches

Some domains have seen related language recovery techniques. Polyglot [7] by Caballero et al. and Prospex [9] from Comparetti et al. reverse engineer network protocols. They track how the program under test accesses its input data, recovering fixed-length fields, direction fields, and separators. Tupni [11] from Cui et al. uses similar techniques to reverse engineer binary file formats; for instance, element sequences are identified from loops that process an unbounded sequence of elements. AuthScan [4] from Bai et al. uses source code analysis to extract web authentication protocols from implementations. None of these approaches generalizes to recursive input structures (and hence grammars), as *mimid* does; in our context, these techniques could be useful to extract input grammars for programs processing binary inputs.

8.6 Summary

Of all the grammar induction and mining methods discussed, very few have actually managed to recover an actual *context-free grammar* rather than a *grammar like structure* that is opaque to practitioners. We note that only *Autogram* and *mimid* are the only methods available today that can recover a full and accurate context-free grammar.

9 Conclusion and Future Work

A formal input model for a program can be of use in diverse fields. However, formal input models are often unavailable, and in cases when it is available, the model can be incomplete, obsolete, or inaccurate with respect to the program in the vast majority of cases. Inferring input grammars from dynamic control flow produces readable grammars that accurately describe input syntax. Improving over the state of the art, which uses data flow to identify grammars, our approach can infer grammars even in the absence of data flow, does not require heuristics for common parsing

patterns, and is applicable to a wide range of parsers. As the evaluation shows, it is superior to the state of the art both in precision and recall.

Having an algorithm that reliably produces input grammars offers several research opportunities. Besides addressing limitations (Section 7), our future work will have following focus:

Other languages. Right now, our approach is implemented in Python and works on Python files; this has the advantage of it being entirely self-contained, easy to assess and reproduce. Having established its effectiveness, we are currently porting *mimid* to binary executables. This is not too hard, as both dynamic tracking of input characters and dynamic control flow is available on binary level too. In particular, tools such as Ghidra¹⁶ can easily recover the control structure of a binary program, while tools such as Pin¹⁷ can dynamically insert probes into binaries without recompilation. Hence, while we have utilized the availability of source code in this paper, there is nothing that prevents the same approach from being implemented on (non-obfuscated) binaries.

Tokenization. For efficiency, input processors often consist of a *scanning* phase, composing characters into *tokens*, and an actual *parsing* phase, composing tokens into syntactical structures. We are working on automatic identification of scanners in existing programs, applying our approach first to the scanner, and by identifying the relationship between input elements and tokens, express grammars by means of tokens rather than characters.

The complete code of our approach, including the subjects and experimental data, is available as a self-contained Jupyter notebook, which can be applied to arbitrary Python programs. For details, go to the site

<https://github.com/vrthra/axiv-mimid/blob/1.0/PymimidBook.ipynb>

References

- [1] Dana Angluin. “Learning Regular Sets from Queries and Counterexamples”. In: *Inf. Comput.* 75.2 (Nov. 1987), pp. 87–106. ISSN: 0890-5401. DOI: [10.1016/0890-5401\(87\)90052-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401(87)90052-6). URL: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401\(87\)90052-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401(87)90052-6).
- [2] Dana Angluin and Michael Kharitonov. “When Won’t Membership Queries Help?” In: *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 50.2 (1995), pp. 336–355.
- [3] Cornelius Aschermann et al. “NAUTILUS: Fishing for Deep Bugs with Grammars”. In: *The Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*. 2019.
- [4] Guangdong Bai et al. “AUTHSCAN: Automatic Extraction of Web Authentication Protocols from Implementations”. In: *The Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*. The Internet Society, 2013.
- [5] Osbert Bastani et al. “Synthesizing Program Input Grammars”. In: *ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. Barcelona, Spain: ACM, 2017, pp. 95–110. ISBN: 978-1-4503-4988-8.
- [6] Tim Blazytko et al. “GRIMOIRE: Synthesizing Structure while Fuzzing”. In: *28th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 19)*. Aug. 2019, pp. 1985–2002. URL: <https://www.syssec.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/media/emma/veroeffentlichungen/2019/06/03/grimoire.pdf>.
- [7] Juan Caballero et al. “Polyglot: Automatic Extraction of Protocol Message Format Using Dynamic Binary Analysis”. In: *ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. Alexandria, Virginia, USA: ACM, 2007, pp. 317–329. ISBN: 978-1-59593-703-2. DOI: [10.1145/1315245.1315286](https://doi.org/10.1145/1315245.1315286). URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1315245.1315286>.
- [8] Pierre Chifflier and Geoffroy Couprie. “Writing parsers like it is 2017”. In: *2017 IEEE Security and Privacy Workshops (SPW)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 80–92.
- [9] Paolo Milani Comparetti et al. “Prospex: Protocol Specification Extraction”. In: *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*. Washington, DC, USA: IEEE Computer Society, 2009, pp. 110–125. ISBN: 978-0-7695-3633-0. DOI: [10.1109/SP.2009.14](https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2009.14).
- [10] Juan José Conti and Alejandro Russo. “A taint mode for Python via a library”. In: *Nordic Conference on Secure IT Systems*. Springer, 2010, pp. 210–222.
- [11] Weidong Cui et al. “Tupni: Automatic Reverse Engineering of Input Formats”. In: *ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. Alexandria, Virginia, USA: ACM, 2008, pp. 391–402. ISBN: 978-1-59593-810-7.
- [12] Colin De la Higuera. *Grammatical inference: learning automata and grammars*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [13] Jean-Christophe Deprez and Arun Lakhotia. “A Formalism to Automate Mapping from Program Features to Code.” In: *IWPC*. 2000, pp. 69–78.
- [14] Kexin Pei Dongdong Shi. “NEUZZ: Efficient Fuzzing with Neural Program Smoothing”. In: *IEEE security and privacy* (Jan. 2019). URL: <http://par.nsf.gov/biblio/10097303>.

¹⁶<https://github.com/NationalSecurityAgency/ghidra>

¹⁷<https://software.intel.com/en-us/articles/pin-a-dynamic-binary-instrumentation-tool>

- [15] Edward B Duffy and Brian A Malloy. “An automated approach to grammar recovery for a dialect of the C++ language”. In: *14th Working Conference on Reverse Engineering (WCRE 2007)*. IEEE, 2007, pp. 11–20.
- [16] Henning Fernau. “Algorithms for learning regular expressions from positive data”. In: *Information and Computation* 207.4 (2009), pp. 521–541.
- [17] Hugo Gascon et al. “Pulsar: Stateful black-box fuzzing of proprietary network protocols”. In: *International Conference on Security and Privacy in Communication Systems*. Springer, 2015, pp. 330–347.
- [18] *GLADE Implementation and experiments*. <https://github.com/obastani/glade-full>.
- [19] Patrice Godefroid, Adam Kiezun, and Michael Y. Levin. “Grammar-based Whitebox Fuzzing”. In: *ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. Tucson, AZ, USA: ACM, 2008, pp. 206–215. ISBN: 978-1-59593-860-2.
- [20] Patrice Godefroid, Hila Peleg, and Rishabh Singh. “Learn&Fuzz: Machine Learning for Input Fuzzing”. In: *Proceedings of the 32nd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. ASE 2017. Urbana-Champaign, IL, USA: IEEE Press, 2017, pp. 50–59. ISBN: 978-1-5386-2684-9. URL: <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=3155562.3155573>.
- [21] Rahul Gopinath and Andreas Zeller. “Building Fast Fuzzers”. In: *CoRR* (2019). arXiv: [1911.07707](https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.07707) [cs.SE]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.07707>.
- [22] Rahul Gopinath et al. “Sample-Free Learning of Input Grammars for Comprehensive Software Fuzzing”. In: *CoRR* abs/1810.08289 (2018). arXiv: [1810.08289](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.08289). URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.08289>.
- [23] Benedikt Hauptmann, Elmar Juergens, and Volkmar Woinke. “Generating refactoring proposals to remove clones from automated system tests”. In: *Proceedings of the 2015 IEEE 23rd International Conference on Program Comprehension*. IEEE Press, 2015, pp. 115–124.
- [24] Christian Holler, Kim Herzig, and Andreas Zeller. “Fuzzing with Code Fragments”. In: *Proceedings of the 21st USENIX Conference on Security Symposium*. Security’12. Bellevue, WA: USENIX Association, 2012, pp. 38–38. URL: <https://www.usenix.org/system/files/conference/usenixsecurity12/sec12-final173.pdf>.
- [25] Matthias Höschle, Alexander Kampmann, and Andreas Zeller. “Active Learning of Input Grammars”. In: *CoRR* abs/1708.08731 (2017).
- [26] Matthias Höschle and Andreas Zeller. “Mining Input Grammars from Dynamic Taints”. In: *IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. Singapore, Singapore: ACM, 2016, pp. 720–725.
- [27] H. Hungar, T. Margaria, and B. Steffen. “Test-based model generation for legacy systems”. In: *International Test Conference, 2003. Proceedings. ITC 2003*. Vol. 2. Sept. 2003, 150–159 Vol.2. DOI: [10.1109/TEST.2003.1271205](https://doi.org/10.1109/TEST.2003.1271205).
- [28] Clinton L Jeffery. “Generating LR syntax error messages from examples”. In: *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems (TOPLAS)* 25.5 (2003), pp. 631–640.
- [29] Trevor Jim and Yitzhak Mandelbaum. “Efficient Earley parsing with regular right-hand sides”. In: *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* 253.7 (2010), pp. 135–148.
- [30] Adam Koprowski and Henri Binszok. “TRX: A formally verified parser interpreter”. In: *European Symposium on Programming*. Springer, 2010, pp. 345–365.
- [31] Nicholas A Kraft, Edward B Duffy, and Brian A Malloy. “Grammar recovery from parse trees and metrics-guided grammar refactoring”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 35.6 (2009), pp. 780–794.
- [32] Nicolas Laurent and Kim Mens. “Taming context-sensitive languages with principled stateful parsing”. In: *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Software Language Engineering*. ACM, 2016, pp. 15–27.
- [33] Jun Li, Bodong Zhao, and Chao Zhang. “Fuzzing: a survey”. In: *Cybersecurity* 1.1 (2018), p. 6.
- [34] Zhiqiang Lin and Xiangyu Zhang. “Deriving Input Syntactic Structure from Execution”. In: *ACM SIGSOFT Symposium on The Foundations of Software Engineering*. Atlanta, Georgia: ACM, 2008, pp. 83–93. ISBN: 978-1-59593-995-1.
- [35] Zhiqiang Lin, Xiangyu Zhang, and Dongyan Xu. “Reverse Engineering Input Syntactic Structure from Program Execution and Its Applications”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 36.5 (Sept. 2010), pp. 688–703. ISSN: 0098-5589. DOI: [10.1109/TSE.2009.54](https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2009.54). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2009.54>.
- [36] Rupak Majumdar and Ru-Gang Xu. “Directed Test Generation Using Symbolic Grammars”. In: *IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. Atlanta, Georgia, USA: ACM, 2007, pp. 134–143. ISBN: 978-1-59593-882-4. DOI: [10.1145/1321631.1321653](https://doi.org/10.1145/1321631.1321653).
- [37] Valentin J. M. Manès et al. “Fuzzing: Art, Science, and Engineering”. In: *CoRR* abs/1812.00140 (2018).

- [38] Björn Mathis et al. “Parser Directed Fuzzing”. In: *ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2019.
- [39] Mauro Pezzè and Michal Young. *Software testing and analysis: process, principles, and techniques*. John Wiley & Sons, 2008.
- [40] Václav Rajlich and Norman Wilde. “The role of concepts in program comprehension”. In: *Proceedings 10th International Workshop on Program Comprehension*. IEEE. 2002, pp. 271–278.
- [41] Mohit Rajpal, William Blum, and Rishabh Singh. “Not all bytes are equal: Neural byte sieve for fuzzing”. In: *CoRR abs/1711.04596* (2017). arXiv: 1711.04596. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1711.04596>.
- [42] Nikolai Tillmann and Jonathan De Halleux. “Pex—white box test generation for .net”. In: *International conference on tests and proofs*. Springer. 2008, pp. 134–153.
- [43] Neil Walkinshaw et al. “Reverse Engineering State Machines by Interactive Grammar Inference”. In: *Working Conference on Reverse Engineering*. Washington, DC, USA: IEEE Computer Society, 2007, pp. 209–218. ISBN: 0-7695-3034-6. DOI: [10.1109/WCRE.2007.45](https://doi.org/10.1109/WCRE.2007.45).
- [44] Zhengkai Wu et al. “REINAM: reinforcement learning for input-grammar inference”. In: *ACM SIGSOFT Symposium on The Foundations of Software Engineering*. Aug. 2019, pp. 488–498. ISBN: 978-1-4503-5572-8. DOI: [10.1145/3338906.3338958](https://doi.org/10.1145/3338906.3338958).
- [45] Andreas Zeller et al. “Code Coverage”. In: *Generating Software Tests*. Retrieved 2019-05-10. Saarland University, 2019. URL: <https://www.fuzzingbook.org/html/Coverage.html> (visited on 05/10/2019).
- [46] Andreas Zeller et al. “Efficient Grammar Fuzzing”. In: *Generating Software Tests*. Retrieved 2019-05-10. Saarland University, 2019. URL: <https://www.fuzzingbook.org/html/GrammarFuzzer.html> (visited on 05/10/2019).
- [47] Andreas Zeller et al. “Grammar Coverage”. In: *Generating Software Tests*. Retrieved 2019-05-10. Saarland University, 2019. URL: <https://www.fuzzingbook.org/html/GrammarCoverageFuzzer.html> (visited on 05/10/2019).
- [48] Andreas Zeller et al. “Mining Input Grammars”. In: *Generating Software Tests*. Retrieved 2019-05-10. Saarland University, 2019. URL: <https://www.fuzzingbook.org/html/GrammarFuzzer.html> (visited on 05/10/2019).
- [49] Andreas Zeller et al. “Parsing Inputs”. In: *Generating Software Tests*. Retrieved 2019-05-10. Saarland University, 2019. URL: <https://www.fuzzingbook.org/html/GrammarFuzzer.html>.
- [50] Andreas Zeller et al. “Tracking Information Flow”. In: *Generating Software Tests*. Retrieved 2019-05-03. Saarland University, 2019. URL: <https://www.fuzzingbook.org/html/InformationFlow.html> (visited on 05/03/2019).
- [51] Chunying Zhao, Jun Kong, and Kang Zhang. “Program behavior discovery and verification: A graph grammar approach”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 36.3 (2010), pp. 431–448.