



Tankut Akgul and Vincent J. Mooney

School of Electrical and Computer Engineering Georgia Institute of Technology

November 2002



Background



Debugging is a repetitive process!



Motivation

- State constructed during forward execution
- At least one (typically more than one) re-execution required for locating a bug in a program
- Re-executions localized around erroneous program points by reverse execution
- Time saved by preventing reexecutions starting from the beginning of the program
- Assembly-level reverse execution as a first step





Motivation

| iuff1.etf | | | | | | | 🕷 Rei | eister | View | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------|---|-------|------|------|-----------|--------|-------|-----|----------|-----|----------|-----|----------|
| x00100004: x00100008: x0010000c: | addi lis subi | r13 r9, | r13,r13,0x1d40 r9,0x0011 r9,r9,0x2068 | | | | Set Clear | | | | | | | | Close |
| x00100010: x00100014: | rlwinm subi | r9, | r9,0, r9,0) | 0xfff | 8111 | | RO | 000 | 00000 | R8 | 00000000 | R16 | 00000000 | R24 | 00000000 |
| x00100018: | li | r0, | 0x00 | 000 | | | RI | 000 | 00000 | R9 | 00000000 | R17 | 0000000 | R25 | 00000000 |
| x0010001c: | stw | r0, | 0x00 | 00(r1 |) | | R2 | 000 | 00000 | R10 | 00000000 | R18 | 00000000 | R26 | 00000000 |
| x00100020: | DI | DI 0000100080 | | | | | R3 | 000 | 00000 | R11 | 00000000 | R19 | 00000000 | R27 | 00000000 |
| x00100028: | sa Menior | Mamory View | | | | | R4 | 000 | 00000 | R12 | 00000000 | R20 | 0000000 | R28 | 00000000 |
| x0010002c: | Set | Set | | Clear | | Go t | R5 | 000 | 00000 | R13 | 00000000 | R21 | 00000000 | R29 | 00000000 |
| x00100034: | Adda | ess | +0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | R6 | 000 | 00000 | R14 | 0000000 | R22 | 0000000 | R30 | 00000000 |
| 00100038: | 0010 | df30 | ee | cc | ee | cc | - | _ | _ | | | - | | | _ |
| 0010003c: | 0010 | df38 | cc | cc | cc | cc | R7 | 000 | 00000 | R15 | 00000000 | R23 | 00000000 | R31 | 00000000 |
| 00100040 | 0010 | df 40 | cc | cc | cc | cc | | | | | | | | | |
| 00100044: | 0010 | df 48 | cc | cc | cc | cc | | | | | | | | | |
| 00100044. | 0010 | df50 | cc | cc | cc | cc | | | | | | | _ | | |
| 00100048: | 0010 | df58 | cc | cc | cc | cc | cc | cc | cc | cc | | | | | |
| 0010004c: | 0010 | df60 | cc | cc | cc | cc | cc | cc | cc | ce | | | | | |
| 00100050: | 0010 | df68 | cc | cc | cc | cc | cc | cc | cc | cc | | | | | |
| 0100054: | 0010 | 4678 | cc | cc | CC | cc | cc | cc | cc | ce | | | | | |
| 0100058: | 0010 | 4580 | | CC | | 00 | 00 | CC | 00 | ce | | | | | |
| 010005c: | 0010 | df88 | cc | CC | CC | cc | CC. | cc | 66 | CC | | | | | |
| 0100060 | 0010 | df90 | cc | CC | CC | CC | cc | cc | cc | cc | | | | | |
| 0100064: | 0010 | df98 | cc | cc | cc | cc | cc | cc | cc | cc | | | | | |
| 00100068: | 0010 | dfa0 | cc | cc | cc | cc | cc | cc | ee | ce | | | | | |



Previous Work

- Periodic state saving
 - Save whole processor state periodically
- o Incremental state saving
 - Save modified processor state
- Program animation
 - Construct a virtual machine with reversible instructions which are usually stack operations
- Source transformation
 - Transform the source code to a reversible source code version
 - Apply state saving for destructive statements

All above methods use state saving heavily!

State saving = **time** and **memory** overheads introduced during forward execution



Methodology

We define the state of a processor as follows:

- S = (PC, M, R)
- PC : program counter
- M : memory values
- R : register values

In order to reverse execute a program do the following:

- Construct a reverse program T' for an input program T
- Recover *M* and *R* by executing *T*' in place of *T*
- Recover the program counter value with the help of the debugger tool



Program Execution Model



Execution 1:

Execution 2:

 $I_{1} = (\alpha_{1}, \beta_{2}, \alpha_{3}, \beta_{4}, \alpha_{5})$ $I_{2} = (\alpha_{1}, \beta_{2}, \alpha_{6})$

 β_4, α_5) α : a non-branch instruction β : a branch instruction



Reverse Execution

Take a specific execution of T

Execution 1:
$$(S_0 \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} (S_1 \xrightarrow{\beta_2} (S_2 \xrightarrow{\alpha_3} (S_3 \xrightarrow{\beta_4} (S_4 \xrightarrow{\alpha_5} (S_5 \xrightarrow{\beta_5} (S_$$

Generate a set of one or more reverse instructions, a *reverse instruction group (RIG)*, for every non-branch instruction such that RIG_x reverses the effect of α_x

 $(\alpha_1, \alpha_3, \alpha_5) \rightarrow (\mathsf{RIG}_1, \mathsf{RIG}_3, \mathsf{RIG}_5)$

Execute RIGs in the order **opposite to the completion order** of the instructions during forward execution and have the debugger tool recover the rest of the state

Reverse Execution:

ion:
$$S_0 \stackrel{\mathsf{RIG}_1}{\longleftarrow} S_1 \stackrel{\mathsf{debugger}}{\longleftarrow} S_2 \stackrel{\mathsf{RIG}_3}{\longleftarrow} S_3 \stackrel{\mathsf{debugger}}{\longleftarrow} S_4 \stackrel{\mathsf{RIG}_5}{\longleftarrow} S_5$$



Reverse Execution (Continued)

Problem:

Dynamic control flow of *T* may change!

Solution:

- Find out a condition set C (predicate expressions) which determines control flow of T
- Combine the RIGs in such a way that the execution order of the RIGs is bound to C



Reverse Execution (Continued)



- Instructions in a basic block (BB) complete in lexical order
- Confluence points are the only decision points on the path to follow during reverse execution



Reverse Code Generation (RCG) Algorithm

- Step 1: Constructs a *control flow graph* (*CFG*) for every procedure/function (intra-procedural analysis) and labels the CFG edges for Step2
- Step 2: Determines the predicate expressions (condition set *C*) at the confluence points in the CFG of each procedure/function
- Step 3: Constructs the RIGs
- Step 4: Combines the RIGs via conditional branch instructions with the determined predicates at the confluence points to generate the reverse of each procedure/function
- Step 5: Combines the reverse procedures/functions

Georgia Tech

Step 1: CFG Construction and Labeling



 $L_{i,i}^{\text{In}}$: jth incoming forward edge of BB_i $L_{i,i}^{out}$: jth outgoing forward edge of BB_i $L_{1,1}^{out} = [0,255]$ $\forall BB_i \in CFG - \{exit \land start\}, do \{$ InFwdEdges(BB_i) $L^{\text{temp}} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{n} [x_k, y_k] = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} L^{in}_{i,j}$ for k = 1 to $n \in \{$ $if(|OutFwdEdges(BB_i)| == 2)$ { $L_{i,1}^{out} = L_{i,1}^{out} \cup [x_k, (x_k + y_k + 1)/2 - 1],$ $L_{i,2}^{out} = L_{i,2}^{out} \cup [(x_k + y_k + 1)/2, y_k]$ } elseif |OutFwdEdges(BB_i)|==1) $L_{i,1}^{out} = L_{i,1}^{out} \cup [x_k, y_k]$ }



Step 2: Predicate Expression Determination





Step 3: Construction of the RIGs



 $r_3^{(}$

 $r_1 = r_2$

 $r_1 = r_2 + r_3$



Step 3: Construction of the RIGs (Example)





Step 4: Combination of the RIGs





Step 5: Combination of Reverse Procedures/functions





- Push addresses on the dynamically taken edges into stack
- Pop the addresses from stack during reverse execution and branch to popped addresses



Recovering the Program Counter





RTC, four 16-bit timers, watchdog



Experimental Results



ISS: Incremental State Saving, ISSDI: Incremental State Saving for Destructive Instructions

FNG: Fibonacci Number Generator, SS: Selection Sort, MM: Matrix Multiply, RNG: Random Number Generator



Experimental Results (Cont.)



ISS: Incremental State Saving, ISSDI: Incremental State Saving for Destructive Instructions

FNG: Fibonacci Number Generator, SS: Selection Sort, MM: Matrix Multiply, RNG: Random Number Generator



Reverse Debugger





Conclusion

- Reduced debugging time with localized re-executions
- Very low time and memory overheads in forward execution by using reverse code
- Reverse execution up to an assembly instruction level granularity

T. Akgul and V. J. Mooney. Instruction-level reverse execution for debugging. Technical Report GIT-CC-02-49, Georgia Institute of Technology, September 2002. http://www.cc.gatech.edu/tech_reports/index.02.html