Trace-Diagnostic for Signal Temporal Properties: an Evolutionary Approach

Author: Gabriel F P Araujo

Supervisor: Profa. Genaina Rodrigues

Ricardo Caldas and prof. Claudio Menghi and prof. Patrizio Pelliccione

Story time!

- Autonomous forklift fault while picking a pallet.
- We corrected a bug but we forgot to fix one of the parameters



Testing autonomous systems

- Testing robots is expensive
 - Takes time
 - Dangerous
 - Lots of modules to debug
- We need a smart way to test and find problems:
 - Unit tests
 - Integration tests
 - Hardware testing
 - Hardware in the loop



So...

- How do we know that the robots are working?
- How do we know that any change in the codebase will not break other features?
- Are the parameters right?
- Does the different modules work together?

"In the beginning..."

As engineers, we can always:

- Test system
- Record data
- Analyse data

To diagnose Any system



Trace-checking

- Engineers record and analyse a system traces to check whether they obey the system's requirements
- We can automate the checking using a tool, a trace-checking tool
- For each property the trace-checking tool outputs a verdict (property satisfied or unsatisfied)

Our Approach



To specify properties: HLS (Hybrid Logic of Signals)

- Extends existing specification languages
 - Time-based languages (e.g. STL) and
 - Sequence-based languages (e.g. LTL)
- Target Cyber-Physical Systems
- Design goals
 - Timestamp variables
 - Index variables
 - Real-valued variables
- ThEodorE is the trace-checker for HLS properties

[1] Menghi, C., Vigano, E., Bianculli, D., & Briand, L. C. (2021). Trace-checking CPS properties: Bridging the cyber-physical gap. *Proceedings - International Conference on Software Engineering*, 847–859. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE43902.2021.00082

Genetic programming

- Search algorithm based on natural selection
- The genetic algorithm repeatedly modifies a population of individuals
- Used to expand the search space

Decision Trees

- Supervised learning algorithm
- Used to classify GA's mutated properties
- To find the root cause in the property

Our Approach





Running example: Requirement

"The car has to follow the desired position in x axis with 20 cm tolerance and its distance to an obstacle must be greater than 45 cm"

 $\phi_o ::= \texttt{forall} \ \tau_0 \ \texttt{in} \ [0,\infty) \ \texttt{:} \ (\texttt{d_pos}_x(\tau_0) - \texttt{v_pos}_x(\tau_0)) > 80\texttt{cm} \ \texttt{and} \ \texttt{d2obs}(\tau_0) > 45\texttt{cm}$

Running example: Run (failure)



Our Approach



Generator of mutations

- Based-on genetic programming
- Creates several versions of the formula changing the terms

```
\begin{split} \phi_1 &::= \texttt{forall } \tau_0 \texttt{ in } [0,\infty) \texttt{ :} \\ & (\texttt{d_pos_x}(\tau_0) - \texttt{v_pos_x}(\tau_0)) > \texttt{80}\texttt{cm} \\ & \texttt{and } \texttt{d2obs}(\tau_0) > \texttt{45}\texttt{cm} \end{split}
```

$$\begin{split} \phi_2 &::= \texttt{forall } \tau_0 \texttt{ in } [0,\infty) \texttt{ :} \\ & (\texttt{d_pos}_x(\tau_0) - \texttt{v_pos}_x(\tau_0)) > 20\texttt{cm} \\ & \texttt{and } \texttt{d2obs}(\tau_0) \texttt{ < } 45\texttt{cm} \end{split}$$

Trace Checker

• For each generated formula, we check them using ThEodorE

$$\begin{array}{l} \phi_1 ::= \textbf{forall } \tau_0 \textbf{ in } [0,\infty) : \\ & (d_pos_x(\tau_0) - v_pos_x(\tau_0)) > \textbf{80cm} \longrightarrow \textbf{False} \\ & \textbf{and } d2obs(\tau_0) > 45cm \\ \phi_2 ::= \textbf{forall } \tau_0 \textbf{ in } [0,\infty) : \\ & (d_pos_x(\tau_0) - v_pos_x(\tau_0)) > 20cm \longrightarrow \textbf{True} \\ & \textbf{and } d2obs(\tau_0) < 45cm \end{array}$$

[1] Menghi, C., Vigano, E., Bianculli, D., & Briand, L. C. (2021). Trace-checking CPS properties: Bridging the cyber-physical gap. *Proceedings - International Conference on Software Engineering*, 847–859. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE43902.2021.00082

After, we run a lot of new formulas (>1000), we choose the best ones based on how distant they are from the **original** formula.



DG: Ranking mutated properties

We use the Smith-Waterman algorithm to calculate the similarity between two formulas.

Formulas
Score

$$\phi_o ::=$$
forall τ_0 in $[0, \infty)$: $(d_pos_x(\tau_0) - v_pos_x(\tau_0)) > 20$ cm and $d2obs(\tau_0) > 45$ cm
 $-\phi_1 ::=$ forall τ_0 in $[0, \infty)$: $(d_pos_x(\tau_0) - v_pos_x(\tau_0)) > 80$ cm and $d2obs(\tau_0) > 45$ cm
25

 $\phi_2 ::=$ forall τ_0 in $[0, \infty)$: $(d_pos_x(\tau_0) - v_pos_x(\tau_0)) > 20$ cm and $d2obs(\tau_0) < 45$ cm
25

 $\phi_2 ::=$ forall τ_0 in $[0, \infty)$: $(d_pos_x(\tau_0) - v_pos_x(\tau_0)) > 20$ cm or $d2obs(\tau_0) < 45$ cm
25

 $\phi_2 ::=$ forall τ_0 in $[0, \infty)$: $(d_pos_x(\tau_0) - v_pos_x(\tau_0)) > 20$ cm or $d2obs(\tau_0) < 45$ cm
20

MATCH = 3 MISMATCH = -3

We label the terms in the formula:



- Use J48 from WEKA to learn which terms change when verdict also changes
 - Unsupervised learning
 - Output a decision tree
 - Extract which terms on the formula are most relevant



We label the terms in the formula:





Related work



Conclusions and what is next?

- We achieved so far:
 - Definition of the problem
 - Running example
 - Approach working
- Running the experiments for the evaluation.

Thank you