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ABSTRACT
Researchers have reported that static analysis tools rarely achieve a false-positive rate that would make them attractive to developers. We overcome this problem by a technique that leads to reporting fewer bugs but also much fewer false positives. Our technique prunes the static call graph that sits at the core of many static analyses. Specifically, static call-graph construction proceeds as usual, after which a call-graph pruner removes many false-positive edges but few true edges. The challenge is to strike a balance between being aggressive in removing false-positive edges but not so aggressive that no true edges remain. We achieve this goal by automatically producing a call-graph pruner through an automatic, ahead-of-time learning process. We added such a call-graph pruner to a software tool for null-pointer analysis and found that the false-positive rate decreased from 73% to 23%. This improvement makes the tool more useful to developers.

CCS CONCEPTS
• Software and its engineering → Automated static analysis;
• Computing methodologies → Supervised learning by classification.

ACM Reference Format:

1 INTRODUCTION
The Problem. Christakis and Bird [14] interviewed developers about program analysis tools and they concluded:

Program analysis design should aim for a false-positive rate no higher than 15–20%.

Our Idea. Our approach stems from another conclusion by Christakis and Bird [14] who reported a preference of developers:

When forced to choose between more bugs or fewer false positives, they typically choose the latter.

This quote inspired our idea for how to improve the false-positive rate: we will report fewer bugs but also much fewer false positives. Indirect support for this idea comes from previous work that showed that practical static analyses aren’t totally sound [31, 43] and therefore may miss bugs. Thus, developers expect bug reports to be incomplete so reporting fewer bugs seems acceptable.

We want to reduce the false-positive rate in a modular way that leaves existing call-graph constructors unchanged. This brings us to our idea of a call-graph pruner that statically post-processes a
We end with a discussion of related work (Section 6) and our conclusion (Section 7).

Significance. Call-graph pruners improve static call-graphs significantly and thereby make client tools more useful to developers.

2 EXAMPLE

Now we give an example of a call-graph pruner, how it works on a example call graph, and how it affects a client analysis for warning about null-pointer problems. Our example program in Figure 2, shown in full in the Appendix, has three classes A, B, C, each of which has a method foo, and a main method that contains a method call x.foo(x.f). The call to C#object c = c.toString(); returns an object of type C, which is then assigned to the variable x. On the next line, the access x.f happens, but the field A.f may be uninitialized hence null. Thus the call x.foo(x.f) may pass null as an argument to C#object, which, in turn, at the call C#object.toString(), may throw a NullPointerExcepcion. The program has two additional methods, including getObjC, that we omitted from Figure 2.

Null-Pointer Warnings. As we mentioned in Section 1, we implemented a version of a static analysis for warning about null-pointer problems. This analysis finds null-pointer problems that stem from uninitialized fields, like the problem with c.toString() that is caused by the uninitialized field A.f. If we run this tool on the example program, we get three warnings, one for each call of toString in the foo methods. One of them is a true warning but the other two are false alarms. Let us investigate how that could happen and what a call-graph pruner can do about it.

Call Graph. The null-pointer tool uses a static call-graph constructor that built the call graph shown in Figure 2. In a call graph, each node is a method, and each edge is a directed edge from one method to another. Such an edge represents a call that may happen during the execution of the program.

The call-graph constructor uses a data-flow analysis to analyze the entire program, including the methods that we omitted from Figure 2. We skip the details of how this works and instead we focus on the constructed call graph. Specifically, in Figure 2 we focus on the four nodes for the main method, A.foo, B.foo, and C.foo. The call graph has an edge from the main method to each of A.foo, B.foo, and C.foo, as well as an edge some other method to B.foo and a couple of edges from some other methods to A/foo. The edge from main to C.foo is a true edge, while the edges from main to A.foo and from main to B.foo are false positives.

The false call-graph edges from main to each of A.foo and B.foo can arise from difficult-to-analyze methods, one of which is part of the full example program in the appendix.
We will use Program to denote the set of Java bytecode programs.

A call graph $G \in \text{CallGraph}$ is a multi-graph in which each node represents a method and each edge represents a potential transfer of control at a method call. Two nodes can have multiple edges between them because of multiple method calls. Each edge has a label that identifies the method call site.

The Recursive Decision Process begins in the root of the decision tree; if the answer to the question at the root is false, we move to the left subtree, while if the answer is true, we move to the right subtree. When we reach a leaf, we find the probability that the call-graph edge is a true-positive. The probabilities computed for each call-graph edge in this fashion are marked on the call graph.

Algorithm 1 shows how a call-graph pruner works. Intuitively, a call-graph pruner uses a classifier to determine the probability that an edge in a static call graph is a true-positive. If that probability is below a given threshold $T \in \text{Threshold}$, the call-graph pruner removes the edge.

The threshold parameter enables us to explore different levels of aggressiveness in removing edges. For our example in Figure 2, we discussed a threshold of 50% in Section 2, which led to the removal of two edges. We could also use a lower threshold of 20%, which would lead to the removal of a single edge, namely the one from main to $A\cdot\text{foo}$. The challenge is to strike a balance between removing many false-positive edges and keeping many true-positive edges. In

The threshold parameter enables us to explore different levels of aggressiveness in removing edges. For our example in Figure 2, we discussed a threshold of 50% in Section 2, which led to the removal of two edges. We could also use a lower threshold of 20%, which would lead to the removal of a single edge, namely the one from main to $A\cdot\text{foo}$. The challenge is to strike a balance between removing many false-positive edges and keeping many true-positive edges. In
Section 5 we will show results from an experimental investigation of how to choose a good threshold.

Notice that we use a static call graph constructor, a dynamic call graph constructor, and the training set of programs for the sole purpose of generating a classifier, while those items are no longer needed when we use the call-graph pruner.

### 3.2 Our Classifier Generator

We cast the edge-pruning problem as a classification problem for which learning a classifier can be done with machine learning. We proceed in three steps.

In the first step, we run existing static and dynamic call-graph constructor tools on every program in the training set (the dataset of programs is described in Section 4). The result is a set of pairs of call graphs: each pair consists of a static call graph and a dynamic call graph. We use the dynamic call graph as an approximation of the ground truth: if a static call-graph edge is also present in the call graph. We use the dynamic call graph as an approximation of a tool. Using these criteria, we arrived at the following algorithm or tool. Using these criteria, we arrived at the following.

In the second step, for each program, we construct a table in which each row represents a static-call-graph edge. Figure 3 illustrates this table. The last column in each row (titled Label in Figure 3) contains a label of 1 or 0, based on whether the edge exists in the dynamic call graph. The remaining columns (titled $f_1$ to $f_k$) represent the set of features of the static call-graph edge. The example in Figure 2 uses two features: dest-node-in-deg and src-node-out-deg; we will discuss other features below. We can view each row in the table as a vector of feature-values. Concatenating the tables of each individual program gives us a single large training dataset of call-graph edges with ground truth labels. This training dataset consists of a large number of pairs $(x_e, y_e)$, where $x_e$ is a vector of feature values corresponding to a static call-graph edge, and $y_e$ is a prediction of whether it is a false-positive or not. Our problem is now expressed in a format where it can be cast as a machine-learning classification problem [28].

In the third step we run an off-the-shelf machine-learning tool on the table constructed in second step. The result is a classifier that for any edge assigns a probability that it is a true-positive. We picked random forests [19] (ensembles of Decision Trees). One might try other approaches, which we leave to future work. Our goal with this step is to show that an off-the-shelf machine-learning tool is sufficient to get good results.

Our classifier generator can take any static call-graph constructor as input. For example, we have used the call-graph constructors WALA [47], Doop [9], and Petablox [33] as inputs and generated a call-graph pruner for each one.

The complexity of generating a classifier based on a training set with $n$ edges is $O(n \log n)$ [19].

#### 3.3 Our Feature set

Now we describe how we designed the feature set that both our classifier generator and our generated call-graph pruners use.

A feature is information about a static-call-graph edge that may help predict whether the edge is a true-positive. We would like our feature set to capture important context and semantic information about a call-graph edge. Encoding important semantic information as features is a common machine learning practice for incorporating domain knowledge into the learning process. For example, since dynamic dispatch is likely to affect the false-positive probability of a call-graph edge, we should add features that capture information about the targets of a method call. Using the context information of a graph edge has been useful for the related task of selective context and heap sensitivity in pointer-analysis [23], and we consider it a good criteria for picking features. Context information can be local by describing the neighborhood of the edge, or global by describing the call graph that the edge is a part of. In addition to capturing context and semantic features, we identify three criteria that we want our feature set to satisfy:

1. linear-time computation complexity,
2. interpretable and generalizable, and
3. black-box.

The time-complexity guideline is particularly important given that some of our benchmarks can have several hundred thousand call-graph edges. Interpretability gives us an understanding of which call-graph edges are being dropped, and generalizability ensures that what is learned for the training edges also applies to call-graph edges of unseen programs. The black-box criterion implies that the features should only be designed on the output call graph, and not on some internal state or representation of a tool. This allows us to post-process the results without being specific to a particular algorithm or tool. Using these criteria, we arrived at the following features for an edge.

Figure 4 presents our feature set for an edge in a static call graph $G$, where the edge is from a caller method $\text{callee}$ to a callee method $\text{caller}$. The node for the main method in $G$ is $\text{main}$. The first seven features describe local information while the last four describe global information. Note that the L-fanout of an edge is the number of outgoing edges at the call-site of that particular edge, whereas
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Figure 4: Our feature set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>src-node-in-deg</td>
<td>number of edges ending in caller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>src-node-out-deg</td>
<td>number of edges out of caller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dest-node-in-deg</td>
<td>number of edges ending in callee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dest-node-out-deg</td>
<td>number of edges out of callee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depth</td>
<td>length of shortest path from main to caller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repeated-edges</td>
<td>number of edges from caller to callee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-fanout</td>
<td>number of edges from the same call-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>node-count</td>
<td>number of nodes in G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edge-count</td>
<td>number of edges in G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avg-degree</td>
<td>average src-node-out-deg in G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avg-L-fanout</td>
<td>average L-fanout value in G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

src-node-out-deg is the number of outgoing edges from all the call-sites of an entire source method.

Our selection process started with a much longer list of features that all satisfy the three criteria listed above. We picked from that list the ones that helped the most with removing false-positives. Our process used the training set as case studies to find the main reasons why tools give false positives. The result was the eleven features in Figure 4.

4 IMPLEMENTATION AND DATASET

Static Call-Graph Constructors. We used the static call-graph constructors WALA [47], Doop [9], and Petablox [33]. In each case we used the default setting, which implements 0-CFA for methods that are estimated to be reachable from the main method and without any special handling of reflection. Those tools produce significantly different call graphs and so we generate a separate call-graph pruner for each tool.

Reflection. In preliminary experiments, we found that enabling special handling of reflection in the static call-graph constructors introduces many false-positive edges in the call graphs. Our generated classifiers tend to assign each of those edges a low probability of being a true-positive, and therefore our call-graph pruners will correctly remove most of them. Therefore, special handling of reflection presents no additional challenge for call-graph pruning and we decided to go with the default setting of each static call-graph constructor.

Dynamic Call-Graph Constructor. We used the open-source tool Wiretap [26] to instrument the Java bytecode and thereby enable dynamic call-graph construction. Next, we ran the instrumented bytecode and collected data about the run, particularly about the method calls.

Standard Library. The Java standard library is large and has the potential to dominate the measurements for every benchmark, which is counterproductive. So, when we do our measurements and training, we omit nodes from the standard library as well as edges between standard library nodes. We preserve aspects of the edges to and from the standard library in the following way. For every path of the form

\[ u \rightarrow \langle \ldots \text{standard library nodes} \ldots \rangle \rightarrow w \]

where \( u, w \) are nodes outside the standard library, we create a single edge from \( u \) to \( w \).

Random Forest Classifier. Our classifier generator uses the Random Forest algorithm [19] implemented with the Scikit-Learn [36] library (v0.21.3). The Random Forest algorithm works as follows: it trains several decision-trees using Bagging [10], and makes predictions by a “majority vote” across the decision trees. The training took 4 minutes. We tuned the hyper-parameters using Random Hyper-Parameter Search [5] with 4-fold cross-validation on the training set. We list the chosen hyper-parameters in the appendix.

Dataset. Our dataset consists of 141 programs from the NJR-1 benchmark suite [35], of which we used 100 programs for generating three call-graph pruners and the remaining 41 programs for our evaluation. We selected those 141 programs from the 293 NJR-1 programs according to the following criteria:

- consists at least 1,000 methods and at least 2,000 static call-graph edges according to Wala,
- executes at least 100 distinct methods at runtime, and
- has high coverage: executes a large percentage of the methods that are reachable from the main method according to Wala; for our benchmarks, the coverage is 68%, on average.

Each program consists of 560,000 lines of code, on average (not counting the standard library). In more detail, each program consists of the main application, which is 8,000 lines of code, on average, in addition to third-party libraries which account for an estimated 552,000 lines of code, on average.

The total number of static-call-graph edges (not counting the standard library) that are reachable from the main methods of the 141 programs is 1.3 million. For our classifier generator, each edge from 100 of those programs is a data point, which is 860,000 edges. Note that manual creation of ground truth about those 860,000 edges infeasible.

Large Benchmarks. The histogram in Figure 5 gives the distribution of the edge counts in the training programs. The X-axis is plotted on a logarithmic scale due to the skew in the distribution. Among the 100 training programs, 7 of them have a very large number of call-graph edges (~20,000). This gives them the potential to dominate how the classifiers work. To overcome this, we randomly sample 20,000 edges from the edge-sets of these 7 programs. Notice that this sampling is done only during generation of call-graph

![Histogram of Edge-counts in the 100 Training Programs.](image)
pruners, while we use all the edges from the 41 programs that we use for evaluation.

Analysis Time. Running the three static call-graph constructors and the dynamic call-graph constructor on all the programs takes four days of compute time.

Precision and Recall. We estimate the quality of a static call graph using the standard notions of precision and recall. In our setting, if $S$ is the edge set produced by a static call-graph constructor, and $W$ is the edge set produced by Wiretap, then:

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{|S \cap W|}{|S|} \quad \text{Recall} = \frac{|S \cap W|}{|W|}$$

The rate of false-positives is $1 - \text{Precision}$. We compute the average precision and recall values for the entire test-set by taking the arithmetic mean over the precision and recall values of individual programs.

Figure 6 shows a histogram of the original precision and recall scores for WALA on the 41 individual programs of the test set. Note that the precision values vary significantly, but almost all programs get below 40% precision. Hence, there is a lot of scope for improving the precision. The recall is close to 100% for most programs, but get below 40% precision. Hence, there is a lot of scope for improving the rate of false-positives.

5 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In this section, we discuss our experimental results that validate the following claims.

1. Our generated call-graph pruners for WALA, Doop, and Petablox produce call graphs with balanced 66% precision and 66% recall.
2. For precision-sensitive clients, our generated call-graph pruners are significantly better at boosting precision than context-sensitive analyses, and have a much smaller overhead.
3. The precision improvement is consistent across the test set.
4. The call-graph pruner enables a monomorphic call-site client to balance its skewed 52% precision and 93% recall to a more balanced 68% precision and 68% recall.
5. The call-graph pruner enables a null-pointer analysis to reduce its average warning count from 223 to 20, while increasing precision from 27% to 77%.

All experiments are run on a separate test set of 41 programs which were not used during training. The experiments were carried out on a machine with 24 Intel(R) Xeon(R) Silver 4116 CPU cores at 2.10GHz and 188 Gb RAM. A minimum RAM size of 32Gb is essential for ensuring that the static analyses run in reasonable time. The artifact for the paper is available here [46] and the NJR-1 dataset can be downloaded from [45].

5.1 Main Result

Figure 8 gives the main result of the paper: a call-graph pruner can be successfully used to boost precision and to balance the goals of precision and recall for the CFA call-graph analysis of WALA, Doop and Petablox. The plot is used to represent the precision and recall values of various tools, wherein all precision and recall values are reported as averages over the test-set programs. The black triangle marks the WALA 0-CFA analysis (23.8% Precision, 95.3% Recall), the green triangle marks the Doop 0-CFA analysis (23.1% Precision, 92.6% Recall) and the blue triangle marks the Petablox 0-CFA analysis (29.8% Precision, 88.8% Recall). They all have close to perfect recall, but poor precision. The red plus sign marks the WALA 1-CFA analysis (29.6%, 95.4%). The black curve represents the precision-recall trade-off points obtained when a call-graph pruner is applied to the WALA 0-CFA output. The original WALA-0-CFA output is a single point on the precision-recall graph, but the call-graph pruner gives a curve instead. This is because the call-graph pruner gives a probability score for each edge being in the ground-truth call-graph, and by setting different thresholds (i.e. cutoffs below which an edge is removed), we can obtain different points on the precision-recall curve. Joining all these different points gives us the black curve in the figure. Setting a low-probability threshold for accepting an edge, gives us points near the left end of the black curve, because we accept a large percentage of edges, thereby giving us higher recall but lower precision. Setting a high-probability threshold gives us points near the right end of the curve because we accept only very few edges which are very likely to be in the ground-truth call-graph, and this gives us high-precision and low recall. The green and blue curves represent the precision-recall trade-off obtained by applying the call-graph pruner to the Doop and Petablox call-graph respectively, and the case is very similar to the black WALA curve.

These curves which trade-off recall for precision show that the classifier has assigned probabilities meaningfully. In contrast, a tool that randomly assigns probabilities to edges would result in a curve that goes straight down to zero recall without improving any precision. This is because it results in a random removal of edges, which keeps the ratio of true-positives (i.e. precision) the same. Boosting precision requires the ratio of false-positive edges in the removed edge set to be higher than the rest of the edges.

There are 2 particularly interesting points on the black (WALA) curve in Figure 8. The first is the one marked by the black (WALA) square (66.0% Precision, 66.0% Recall), which represents the point with balanced precision and recall. Such a point will be useful to a precision-sensitive client analysis. As compared to the original WALA 0-CFA (black-triangle), this point has over 72% of the edges from the original call-graph removed, and out of the removed edges, less than 10% are true positives. This point is at a 0.45 probability threshold. Similar points for Doop and Petablox, marked by a green square (hidden behind the black square) and blue square (also hidden behind the black square) respectively, are at (66.2% Precision, 66.2% Recall) and (66.4% Precision, 66.4% Recall) respectively. A second interesting point is the right-most point on the curve after which recall starts dropping faster, represented by a black circle (50% Precision, 92% Recall). Such a point would be useful for a client analysis that needs to increase a little precision, without losing much recall. Similar points for Doop and Petablox are marked by the green circle (50% Precision, 88% Recall) and blue circle (50% Precision, 87% Recall) respectively.

Both these points give larger precision boosts than the 1-CFA analysis. However, in general, the best precision-recall trade-off point is decided by the needs of the client of the call graph. Precision-sensitive clients would benefit more from our call-graph pruner.
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Figure 6: Precision and recall for 41 test programs.

Figure 7: Precision and recall after call-graph pruning.

Our call-graph pruner adds an overhead of 18% to the WALA 0-CFA analysis, whereas moving to a 1-CFA analysis adds 292% overhead. Prior research also finds that context-sensitivity increases analysis time by many folds [30].

For completeness, we also ran this experiment for WALA’s RTA implementation and it gets similar results (that we show in the supplementary material). Since the three tools show similar characteristics, we only present numbers for the WALA 0-CFA call graph in the rest of this section. The corresponding graphs for Doop and Petablox are available in the supplementary material.

Picking a Cutoff value. We picked the balanced precision-recall point because it gave good results for a null-pointer analysis client, but different precision-recall trade-off points may be suitable for different client analyses. Figure 9 helps a user pick the right trade-off point for their client. It plots the probability cutoff values on the X-axis, and the Precision, Recall and F-score on the Y-axis. The graph shows what values each of these metrics takes at every probability cutoff value, as well as what the expected cutoff would be for a given target Precision, Recall or F-score. For example, by looking at the figure, we can say that to obtain an expected Precision of 60%, we can set a cutoff value of 0.4. At this point we would get a Recall of approximately 75% and F-score of around 65%. This graph also shows that the balanced precision-recall point is also very close to the point with maximum F-score.

Feature Importance. Figure 10 gives the impurity-based importance [42] for each feature used in the random-forest in descending order. The L-fanout and dest-node-in-deg are the most important features and the four global features are the least important. Dropping
the four global features decreases the area under the precision-recall curve from Figure 8 by 6%.

**Human-Interpretable Explanation of the Classifiers.** We can give a human-interpretable explanation of the main aspects of the Random Forest classifiers that were learned in the experiment. In each case, the top-level decisions center around the following generic classifier:

if \((L\text{-fanout} > m) \land (\text{dest-node-in-deg} > n)\) then 0 else 1

The above expression says that if an edge has \(L\text{-fanout}\) greater than \(m\) and \(\text{dest-node-in-deg}\) greater than \(n\), then the probability that it is a true edge is 0, and otherwise 1. For each of the static call-graph constructors, we can identify the constants \(m\) and \(n\):

- **WALA:**
  \[
  \text{if } ((L\text{-fanout} > 3.5) \land (\text{dest-node-in-deg} > 9.5)) \text{ then 0 else 1}
  \]

- **Doop:**
  \[
  \text{if } ((L\text{-fanout} > 3.5) \land (\text{dest-node-in-deg} > 16.5)) \text{ then 0 else 1}
  \]

- **Petablox:**
  \[
  \text{if } ((L\text{-fanout} > 3.5) \land (\text{dest-node-in-deg} > 20.5)) \text{ then 0 else 1}
  \]

The orange cross (49% precision, 92% recall) in Figure 8 gives the precision-recall trade-off when using the generic classifier for WALA. This generic classifier has a slightly worse trade-off and is much less tunable than the black line (WALA with call-graph pruner). However, its pruning rules are also much simpler and easily understandable. The use of \(L\text{-fanout}\) and \(\text{dest-node-in-deg}\) in the generic classifier aligns with the fact that these are the most important features according to Figure 10.

### 5.2 Distribution of Precision and Recall for individual programs

Figure 7 gives a histogram of the precision and recall scores of individual programs when a call-graph pruner is used to prune the WALA call graph at the balanced precision-recall point (marked by the black square in Figure 8). Most of the programs get at least 50% precision, and a several even reach the 70% precision goal. Contrast this to the precision in Figure 6 where almost all programs fail to cross the 40% precision point.

As expected, the recall scores from Figure 7 dropped as compared to Figure 6. However, most programs still get at least 50% recall, implying that they retain a good portion of their true edges. Note that it is impossible to improve recall using a call-graph pruner since it cannot find new edges that WALA did not find.

The histogram from Figure 11 illustrates the percentage improvement in precision scores. The X-axis is plotted on a logarithmic scale. By using a call-graph pruner, 30 out of the 41 programs have their precision score boosted by at least 2 times their original precision score. All but 2 programs have their precision score boosted by at least 20%. No benchmark gets a worse precision. Thus, a significant majority of the individual programs consistently get a large precision improvement without loosing too much recall, and achieve a better precision-recall balance. The Doop and Petablox graphs have similar characteristics and are shown in the supplementary material.
This in turn implies that whenever we incur the overhead of inlining implies that more of the call-sites declared monomorphic by the static analysis actually turn out monomorphic in the ground-truth. Figure 12 give the precision and recall of a monomorphic call-sites client.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WALA 0-CFA</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALA 0-CFA + call-graph pruner</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12: Impact of improved call-graph precision on a monomorphic call-sites client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Warnings Before</th>
<th>Warnings After</th>
<th>True-Positives Before</th>
<th>True-Positives After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13: Total warning counts and a manual classification of a sample of 10 warnings for the null-pointer analysis before and after applying a call-graph pruner

5.3 Effect on Client Analyses

Next, we look at the effect of improved call-graph precision on the monomorphic call-site detection and null-pointer analysis clients.

Monomorphic call-site client. This client is based on the WALA-generated 0-CFA call graph, and it uses the dynamic analysis as the ground-truth. Figure 12 give the precision and recall of a monomorphic call-site client with and without the call-graph pruner. The call-graph pruner helps the client boost precision from 52% to 68% and balance its goals of precision and recall.

Applications of the monomorphic call-sites client include devirtualization and inlining. Since the call-graph analysis is never sound in practice [31], these applications require some safety checks, resulting in overheads. For example, if devirtualization is used for optimization, run-time checks need to be inserted to ensure correctness [22]. Higher precision for the monomorphic call-sites implies that more of the call-sites declared monomorphic by the static analysis actually turn out monomorphic in the ground-truth. This in turn implies that whenever we incur the overhead of inlining or devirtualization, we are also more likely to realize its benefits.

Null pointer analysis. This analysis is based on the paper by Hubert et al. [21]. It is implemented in WALA, and is used to find null-pointer errors originating from uninitialized instance fields. The analysis is context-insensitive, field-insensitive and flow-sensitive. It only reports potential null-pointer dereferences in application code, and not for the standard library.

The original WALA call graph gives us, on average, 223 null pointer warnings per program. The high volume of warnings makes it cumbersome for developers to manually inspect and in practice this results in developers ignoring the tool output entirely [6, 25]. Using the call graphs produced after pruning gives us much fewer (on average 20 per program) warnings.

Two of the authors manually inspected a random sample of 10 null-pointer warnings from 10 of the 41 test programs when used with and without the call-graph pruner. The 10 programs were chosen with the criteria that they had at least 10 warnings both with and without the call-graph pruner, and the ratio of warnings with and without the call-graph pruner was close to (20/223). Figure 13 gives the total warning counts as well as the true-positive counts (from a sample of 10 warnings) for each of these 10 programs. The use of a call-graph pruner helped the null-pointer analysis improve its precision from 27% to 77%

The criteria for marking a warning as a true-positive was that the author could trace the backward slice of a dereference to an instance field which was uninitialized by the end of a constructor. Warnings that either could not be verified in 10 minutes, ran into another exception before triggering the null exception, or otherwise unverifiable by the authors, were considered as false-positives. Reachability from the main method was not considered because it is hard to verify manually.

We leave to future work to try other clients, including other approaches to null-pointer analysis such as NullAway [4].

5.4 Threats to Validity

The first threat is a threat to the use of a dynamic analysis as a proxy for the call-graph ground truth. It assumes good coverage of the true ground-truth call-graph and affects the precision-recall calculations. If the dynamic analysis had higher coverage, more of the static analysis edges would be in the dynamic call-graph. As a consequence, both the baseline precision scores as well as the pruned-call-graph precision scores would be higher. In contrast, we expect the recall scores to remain similar. However, improving dynamic analysis coverage is a non-trivial and orthogonal problem and any techniques improving coverage will automatically improve our technique and evaluation.

Symbolic execution [27] is one option to improve coverage, but it doesn’t scale to the size of our programs. Instead, we use a subset of the NJR-1 benchmark set which gets good coverage. Note that this threat does not affect the evaluation of the null-pointer analysis.

The second threat is the manual inspection of the null-pointer warnings, which are vulnerable to human errors. The authors inspecting the errors have a limited familiarity with the code-bases of the examined program. This could lead to misclassification of both true and false errors, and affect the precision score accordingly. Further, the precision scores are reported for a sample of 10 programs.

The third threat to validity is the generalizability of the results to programs outside the NJR dataset. Our assumption is that our learning and evaluation results generalize to other programs outside the dataset.

The fourth threat to validity is that programs in the training set and evaluation set share some third-party libraries. On average (geometric mean), 3.6 percent of the methods of a program in the evaluation set also occur in some training program. We believe that this overlap is low enough to not significantly affect the conclusions of our evaluation.
6 RELATED WORK

Our technique is the first to apply machine learning to boost call-graph precision. In our discussion of related work, we focus on three areas: combining static and dynamic analyses, applying machine learning to remove static-analysis false-positives, and improving the precision of call-graph construction.

Combining static and dynamic analysis. Prior research has used a dynamic analysis to improve the precision of a static analysis. Grech et al. [16] generate dynamic heap information and use this as a drop-in replacement for the heap modeling part in an existing static analysis tool to improve its precision. Artzi et al. [3] use a dynamic analysis to confirm the mutability information computed by a static analysis. Chen et al. [13] use the information from test-executions to prioritize the alarms given by a static analysis. The main drawback that these tools face is that they need the dynamic analysis to be run every single time the tool is run. In contrast, our technique needs the dynamic analysis only for generating a call-graph pruner. After that, a call-graph pruner is purely a static tool, and hence does not suffer from the usual drawbacks of a dynamic analysis like long execution times or finding good inputs.

Applying machine learning to improve static-analysis by removing false-positives. The technique of filtering static-analysis false-positives by casting it to a classification problem with hand-picked features has been used for static bug-analysis tools [15, 18, 39, 44, 49]. Each of these works follows the same workflow: collect static analysis error-reports, get a programmer to label them as true or false-positives, design a feature-set for the error reports, and then train a classifier on these labeled error-reports to identify false-positives. However, they have minor differences among themselves in terms of the feature-set chosen, the bug-reporting tool used and the benchmarks used for the training data. Ruthuff et al. [39] use the FindBugs [20] bug-reporting tool and the set of Java programs at Google as their dataset. Heckman and Williams [18] also use FindBugs reported bugs on 2 open-source Java projects. Yuksel and Sozer [49] classify bug-alerts for a digital TV software. Flynn et al. [15] combine the bug-alerts from multiple tools, in addition to using the hand-picked features. Tripp et al. [44] work with a JavaScript security checker’s warnings from popular Web sites as its dataset.

Our work differs in three ways: it uses an estimate of ground-truth produced by dynamic analysis, it has a generalizable approach to picking a feature set, and it has a tunable precision-recall trade-off, as we discuss next.

The key bottleneck faced by each of these prior works was that they relied on the collection of human-labeled ground-truth, which does not scale. This restricted their dataset to a handful of projects and a couple of thousand data-points (bug reports) at best. In fact, for each type of error, there is typically less than a few hundred bugs in each of the datasets. In contrast, our technique uses an estimate of ground-truth produced by dynamic analysis, which allows it to scale to a much larger number of programs with a million data points (call-graph edges).

The second major difference is in the choice of the feature-set. This is partly a consequence of the fact that the previous work focuses on static-analysis error report data, which is different from the graph output generated by call-graph construction tools. Hence some of the common features used in these works are the bug-priority level, file-modification-frequency, coding-style metrics, and lexical features (like method or package names). These features, though appropriate, violate generalizability and black-box guiding principles listed in Section 3.3. Non-black-box features like bug-priority level will not generalize across different tools or algorithms, and non-generalizable features like lexical features are unlikely to generalize to programs outside the dataset. In contrast, we use a systematic approach to selecting features, as described in Section 3.3, and as a consequence, our approach generalizes easily across multiple programs and multiple call-graph construction tools.

The third difference is that these prior works, except for [44], provide a single precision-recall point. [44] provide eight different precision-recall points, by varying the classifier used. Instead, our approach has a tunable precision-recall trade-off by predicting edge-probabilities and pruning edges with probability lower than a threshold. Further, we only use a single classifier (Random Forests) since it achieves superior precision-recall trade-offs than the classifiers used in [44].

Another area that uses machine learning for filtering false positives is the work by Raghothaman et al. [37]. They predict the probabilities of static-analysis alarms using Bayesian inference and update these as the user resolves alarms as true or false positives. This paradigm of online learning, where the model is learned and improved as the user gives feedback, is quite different from our fully-automated offline learning paradigm, where we do a one-time training on a large dataset of static and dynamic analysis outputs and require no user input.

Recently data-driven techniques have also been used to selectively apply context- and flow-sensitivity [12, 24] to methods that will benefit it the most. These techniques can potentially provide the precision improvement of a 1-CFA at a lower overhead, but as seen in Figure 8, this improvement is still much lower than what is achieved by our call-graph pruner.

Improving the precision of call-graph construction. Lhotak [29] designed an interactive tool to qualitatively understand the root cause of differences between different static and dynamic analysis tools. This is then used in a case study to understand the main cause of imprecision in a static analysis tool as compared to its corresponding dynamic analysis output. In contrast, our classifier generator is fully automated, using machine learning, and doesn’t require a skilled programmer to use an interactive tool to figure out the cause of the imprecision.

Sawin and Rountev [41] propose certain heuristics to deal with dynamic features like reflection, dynamic class loading and native method-calls in Java, which helps to improve call-graph precision of the CHA algorithm without sacrificing much recall. Similarly, a call-graph pruner trades of a little recall for a large boost in precision, but it achieves this through automated machine learning on a dataset of call graphs instead, and is able to boost precision by a much larger amount. Additionally, we work with a 0-CFA baseline (with no handling of dynamic features like reflection), which already has a large precision gain over a CHA algorithm with reflection handling.
While their technique calls for a new static analysis, our call-graph pruner works as a black-box post-processor for existing call-graph construction tools. A second future direction could be to replace dynamic-analysis results with developer-labeling for call-graph edges. This work was supported by the U.S. NSF Award 1823360, and the ONR Award N00014-18-1-2037. We thank Aishwarya Sivaraman, Aaron Berdy and Ashwin Dharne for many helpful discussions. We also thank the ICSE’22 reviewers for their constructive comments that helped improve the paper.

APPENDIX

The example in Figure 2 is an excerpt of the program from the paper that Figure 14 shows in full. Our classifier generator uses the Random Forest algorithm [19] implemented with the Scikit-Learn [36] library (v0.21.3). We tuned the hyper-parameters using Random Hyper-Parameter Search [5]. The score for which we optimized was the area under the precision-recall curve and Figure 15 lists the chosen hyper-parameters.

```
class A{
    A f;
    void foo(A a){
        a.toString();
    }
}
class B extends A{
    void foo(A b){
        b.toString();
    }
}
class C extends B{
    void foo(A c){
        c.toString();
    }
}
```

```
A x = getObjC();
x.foo(x.f);
x.f = new A();
```

Figure 14: Program for the example in Section 2

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyperparameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Trees</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Depth</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bootstrapping</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum samples for split</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum features for split</td>
<td>sqrt(feature count)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum samples for leaf</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split quality criterion</td>
<td>Entropy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other hyper-parameters</td>
<td>Library default</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Figure 15: Hyper-parameters for Random-Forests

Zhang and Ryder [50] create precise application-only call graphs by identifying which edges from the standard library to the application are really false-positive. This is similar to the precision boost we gain for the edges that go via the standard library. However, while their technique calls for a new static analysis, our call-graph pruner learns all its edge probabilities from data about static and dynamic call-graphs. Further, their technique calls for a new static analysis, our call-graph pruner works as a black-box post-processor for existing call-graph construction tools.

More distantly related is the work by Blackshear et. al [8], which prunes control-flow edges representing interleavings between events in an event-driven system. This pruning task is different from our task which focuses on pruning call-graphs edges for sequential code.

There has also been prior work that uses a dynamic analysis to evaluate call-graph related static analysis tools [1, 11, 16, 38, 43]. Our tool additionally uses the dynamic analysis results as training labels to prune the result from a static call-graph construction tool.

7 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

Our approach to generating a high-precision call graph first runs an existing black-box call-graph constructor and then prunes the resulting call graph. A call-graph pruner uses a classifier, which is trained on a large number of static and dynamic call graphs, to predict the probability of an edge being a true-positive. Using different thresholds for the edge probabilities we can tune the precision-recall trade-off of the call graph. We empirically showed how a call-graph pruner can be used to boost precision and balance the recall and precision of call graphs produced by WALA, Doop and Petalbox, which are otherwise skewed towards high recall and low precision. We also ran a null-pointer analysis and a monomorphic call-sites analysis with these pruned call graphs, and we showed that they got much closer to the high-precision expectations of their users.

Future work includes automatically learning a feature-set for use by our pruner generator and our generated call-graph pruners. A particularly promising avenue for future work is to explore graph neural networks for automatic feature-learning. Recent work has used graph neural networks [17] for program analysis tasks like program similarity [34], variable misuse prediction [2, 48] variable name prediction [2], and method name prediction [48]. The features that are discovered in those papers are not features of call graphs and hence this remains an open problem.

A second future direction could be to replace dynamic-analysis ground-truth labeling with developer-labeling for call-graph edges. The challenge here is that the cumulative number of edges in the training dataset is nearly a million, and developer-labeling doesn’t scale to such a large dataset.

A third future direction could be to adapt our technique to heap-reachability queries [7].
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