

# Lecture 15

## *Debugging*

Zach Tatlock / Spring 2018

## A Bug's Life

*defect* – mistake committed by a human

*error* – incorrect computation

*failure* – visible error: program violates its specification

Debugging starts when a failure is observed

Unit testing

Integration testing

In the field

Goal is to go *from failure back to defect*

– **Hard:** trying to solve an “inverse problem” (work backward)

## Why “bugs”?

## Why “bugs”?

CS pioneer Grace Hopper coined the term during early days of the field.




Lt. Hopper at desk in the  
Computation Lab, 1947

## Why “bugs”?

CS pioneer Grace Hopper coined the term during early days of the field.



Lt. Hopper at desk in the Comptona Lab, 1947



Bug found in  
Mark II Aiken Relay Calculator  
Harvard University  
September 9, 1947

## Ways to get your code right

### Design + Verification

- Ensure there are no bugs in the first place

### Testing + Validation

- Uncover problems (even in spec?) and increase confidence

### Defensive programming

- Programming with debugging in mind, failing fast

### Debugging

- Find out why a program is not functioning as intended

### Testing ≠ debugging

- *test*: reveals existence of problem
  - test suite can also increase overall confidence
- *debug*: pinpoint location + cause of problem

## Read this.

<http://blog.regehr.org/archives/199>

### Embedded in Academia



{ 2010 07 04 }

#### How to Debug

One of the painful parts of teaching a lab-based embedded systems course is that over and over I have to watch a team with a relatively simple bug in their code, but who is trying to fix it by repeatedly making random changes. Generally they start with code that's pretty close to working and break it worse and worse. By the end of the lab they're frustrated, aren't any closer to finding the bug, and have made a complete mess of their code, forcing them to go back to the previous day or week's version.

A typical Computer Science curriculum fails to teach debugging in any serious way. I'm not talking about teaching students to use debugging tools. Rather, we fail to teach the thing that's actually important: how to think about debugging. Part of the problem is that most CS programming assignments are small, self-contained, and not really very difficult. The other part of the problem is that debugging is not addressed explicitly. After noticing these problems I started to focus on teaching students how to debug during lab sessions and also made a lecture on debugging that I give each year; this piece elaborates on that lecture.

## Defense in depth

Levels of defense:

1. Make errors *impossible*
  - Examples: Java prevents type errors, memory corruption
2. Don't introduce defects
  - “get things right the first time”
3. Make errors *immediately visible*
  - Examples: assertions, **checkRep**
  - Reduce distance from error to failure
4. Debug [last level/resort: needed to get from failure to defect]
  - Easier to do in modular programs with good specs & test suites
  - Use scientific method to gain information

## First defense: Impossible by design

### In the language

- Java prevents type mismatches, memory overwrite bugs; guaranteed sizes of numeric types, ...

### In the protocols/libraries/modules

- TCP/IP guarantees data is not reordered
- **BigInteger** guarantees there is no overflow

### In self-imposed conventions

- Immutable data structure guarantees behavioral equality
- **finally** block can prevent a resource leak

Caution: You must maintain the discipline

## Second defense: Correctness

### Get things right the first time

- **Think** before you code. Don't code before you think!
- If you're making lots of easy-to-find defects, you're also making hard-to-find defects – don't rush toward "it compiles"

### Especially important when debugging is going to be hard

- Concurrency, real-time environment, no access to customer environment, etc.


The key techniques are everything we have been learning:

- Clear and complete specs
- Well-designed modularity with no rep exposure
- Testing early and often with clear goals
- ...

These techniques lead to *simpler software*

## Strive for simplicity

There are two ways of constructing a software design: One way is to make it **so simple** that there are obviously no deficiencies, and the other way is to make it **so complicated** that there are no obvious deficiencies. The first method is far more difficult.



Sir Anthony Hoare

Debugging is twice as hard as writing the code in the first place. Therefore, if you write the code as cleverly as possible, you are, by definition, **not smart enough to debug it.**



Brian Kernighan

## Third defense: Immediate visibility

If we can't prevent errors, we can try to localize them

**Assertions:** catch errors early, before they contaminate and are perhaps masked by further computation

**Unit testing:** when you test a module in isolation, any failure is due to a defect in that unit (or the test driver)

**Regression testing:** run tests as often as possible when changing code. If there is a failure, chances are there's a mistake in the code you just changed

If you can localize problems to a single method or small module, defects can usually be found simply by studying the program text

## Benefits of immediate visibility

The key difficulty of debugging is to find the defect: the code fragment responsible for an observed problem

- A method may return an erroneous result, but be itself error-free if representation was corrupted earlier

The earlier a problem is observed, the easier it is to fix

- In terms of code-writing to code-fixing
- And in terms of window of program execution

Don't program in ways that hide errors

- This lengthens distance between defect and failure

## Don't hide errors

```
// k must be present in a
int i = 0;
while (true) {
    if (a[i]==k) break;
    i++;
}
```

This code fragment searches an array **a** for a value **k**

- Value is guaranteed to be in the array
- What if that guarantee is broken (by a defect)?

## Don't hide errors

```
// k must be present in a
int i = 0;
while (i < a.length) {
    if (a[i]==k) break;
    i++;
}
```

Now the loop always terminates

- But no longer guaranteed that **a[i]==k**
- If other code relies on this, then problems arise later

## Don't hide errors

```
// k must be present in a
int i = 0;
while (i < a.length) {
    if (a[i]==k) break;
    i++;
}
assert (i!=a.length) : "key not found";
```

- Assertions let us document and check invariants
- Abort/debug program as soon as problem is detected
  - Turn an **error** into a **failure**
- Unfortunately, we may still be a long distance from the **defect**
  - The defect caused **k** not to be in the array

## Inevitable phase: debugging

Defects happen – people are imperfect

- Industry average (?): 10 defects per 1000 lines of code

Defects happen that are not immediately localizable

- Found during integration testing
- Or reported by user

**step 1** – Clarify symptom (simplify input), create “minimal” test

**step 2** – Find and understand cause

**step 3** – Fix

**step 4** – Rerun *all* tests, old and new

## The debugging process

**step 1** – *find small, repeatable test case that produces the failure*

- May take effort, but helps identify the defect *and* gives you a regression test
- Do *not* start step 2 until you have a simple repeatable test

**step 2** – *narrow down location and proximate cause*

- *Loop*: (a) Study the data (b) hypothesize (c) experiment
- Experiments often involve changing the code
- Do *not* start step 3 until you understand the cause


**step 3** – *fix the defect*

- Is it a simple typo, or a design flaw?
- *Does it occur elsewhere?*


**step 4** – *add test case to regression suite*

- Is this failure fixed? Are any other new failures introduced?

## The Debugging Process




## The Debugging Process




## Debugging and the scientific method

- Debugging should be *systematic*
  - Carefully *decide* what to do
    - Don't flail!
  - Keep a *record* of everything that you do
  - Don't get sucked into fruitless avenues



- Use an iterative scientific process:



## Example

```
// returns true iff sub is a substring of full
// (i.e. iff there exists A,B such that full=A+sub+B)
boolean contains(String full, String sub);
```

User bug report:

It can't find the string "very happy" within:

"Fáilte, you are very welcome! Hi Seán! I am very very happy to see you all."

Poor responses:

- See accented characters, panic about not knowing about Unicode, begin unorganized web searches and inserting poorly understood library calls, ...
- Start tracing the execution of this example

Better response: simplify/clarify the symptom...

## Reducing *absolute* input size

Find a simple test case by divide-and-conquer

Pare test down:

*Can not* find "very happy" within

"Fáilte, you are very welcome! Hi Seán! I am very very happy to see you all."

"I am very very happy to see you all."

"very very happy"

*Can* find "very happy" within

"very happy"

*Can not* find "ab" within "aab"

## Reducing relative input size

Can you find two almost identical test cases where one gives the correct answer and the other does not?

*Can not* find "very happy" within

"I am very very happy to see you all."

*Can* find "very happy" within

"I am very happy to see you all."

## General strategy: simplify

In general: find simplest input that will provoke failure

- Usually not the input that revealed existence of the defect

Start with data that revealed the defect

- Keep paring it down (“binary search” can help)
- Often leads directly to an understanding of the cause

When not dealing with simple method calls:

- The “test input” is the set of steps that reliably trigger the failure
- Same basic idea

## Localizing a defect

Take advantage of modularity

- Start with everything, take away pieces until failure goes away
- Start with nothing, add pieces back in until failure appears


Take advantage of modular reasoning

- Trace through program, viewing intermediate results


Binary search speeds up the process

- Error happens somewhere between first and last statement
- Do binary search on that ordered set of statements

## Binary search on buggy code



## Binary search on buggy code





## Logging Events

Log (record) events during execution as program runs (at full speed)

Examine logs to help reconstruct the past

- Particularly on failing runs
- And/or compare failing and non-failing runs

The log may be all you know about a customer's environment

- Needs to tell you enough to reproduce the failure

Performance / advanced issues:

- To reduce overhead, store in main memory, not on disk (performance vs stable storage) (???)
- Circular logs avoid resource exhaustion and may be good enough (???)

## Detecting Bugs in the Real World

### Real Systems

- Large and complex (duh ☺)
- Collection of modules, written by multiple people
- Complex input
- Many external interactions
- Non-deterministic

### Replication can be an issue

- Infrequent failure
- Instrumentation eliminates the failure

### Defects cross abstraction barriers

Large time lag from corruption (defect) to detection (failure)


## Debugging In Harsh Environments

Failure is non-deterministic,  
difficult to reproduce



Can't print or use debugger

Can't change timing of program  
(or failure depends on timing)



## Look inside the machine

Mark Oskin was hacking on a kernel.

No GDB, no printf, no kprintf, ...

But, did have beep from mobo!

A --	J ----	S ...	1 ----
B ----	K ----	T --	2 ----
C ----	L ----	U ...	3 ----
D ---	M --	V ----	4 ----
E .	N --	W ---	5 ----
F ----	O ----	X ----	6 ----
G ---	P ----	Y ----	7 ----
H ----	Q ----	Z ----	8 ----
I ..	R ---	0 ----	9 ----





## “Heisenbugs”

In a sequential, deterministic program, failure is repeatable

But the real world is not that nice...

- Continuous input/environment changes
- Timing dependencies
- Concurrency and parallelism

Failure occurs randomly

- Literally depends on results of random-number generation

Bugs hard to reproduce when:

- Use of debugger or assertions makes failure goes away
  - Due to timing or assertions having side-effects
- Only happens when under heavy load
- Only happens once in a while

## More Tricks for Hard Bugs



Rebuild system from scratch, or restart/reboot

- Find the bug in your build system or persistent data structures

Explain the problem to a friend (or to a rubber duck)

Make sure it is a bug

- Program may be working correctly and you don't realize it!

And things we already know:

- Minimize input required to exercise bug (exhibit failure)
- Add more checks to the program
- Add more logging

## Where is the defect?

The defect is not where you think it is

- Ask yourself where it can not be; explain why
- Self-psychology: look forward to being wrong!

Look for simple easy-to-overlook mistakes first, e.g.,

- Reversed order of arguments:  
`Collections.copy(src, dest);`
- Spelling of identifiers: `int hashCode()`  
`@Override` can help catch method name typos
- Same object vs. equal: `a == b` versus `a.equals(b)`
- Deep vs. shallow copy

Make sure that you have correct source code!

- Check out fresh copy from repository; recompile everything
- Does a syntax error break the build? (it should!)

## When the going gets tough

Reconsider assumptions

- e.g., has the OS changed? Is there room on the hard drive?  
Is it a leap year? 2 full moons in the month?
- Debug the code, *not* the comments
  - Ensure that comments and specs describe the code

Start documenting your system

- Gives a fresh angle, and highlights area of confusion

Get help

- We all develop blind spots
- Explaining the problem often helps (even to rubber duck)

Walk away

- Trade latency for efficiency – sleep!
- One good reason to start early

# Key Concepts

Testing and debugging are different

- Testing reveals failures, debugging pinpoints defect location

Debugging should be a systematic process

- Use the *scientific method*

Understand the source of defects

- To *find similar ones and prevent them in the future*

