Overview

My research mission is to make computer programming easier, more reliable, and more productive. Computer software has revolutionized our daily lives, but software developers’ lives have not advanced commensurately. Programming remains “one of our most demanding intellectual activities” as E.W. Dijkstra said three decades ago [2]. For example, as of 2018, it would cost approximately $14.7 billion USD to re-develop the Linux kernel [27], giving a cost per line equal to $733. The main thrust of my research is to develop algorithmic techniques to advance program synthesis — the process of automatically generating programs that meet the user’s intent. As one of the most central research problems in computer science and AI, program synthesis is notoriously challenging. Nonetheless, in the last two decades, largely driven by the flowering of constraint solving and machine learning techniques, this traditional research area has experienced a renaissance and witnessed emerging programming paradigms (e.g., program sketching [19]), automated tools (e.g., the plethora of syntax-guided synthesis solvers [1]), and prominent applications (e.g., the FlashFill feature of Microsoft Excel [3]).

Despite the promising progress, program synthesis still has a long way to go. On one hand, to replace human written code with machine generated code in any production software, the synthesizer has to formally guarantee that the produced program is functionally correct, performant, preferable etc. These topics intersect with program verification, a well known challenging research area which has been studied for more than five decades [4]. On the other hand, Today’s program synthesizers still can only be mastered by experts who can articulate their intent using formal specification or informative examples, determine preferable programs by writing ranking functions, and guide the synthesizer with domain knowledge. Moreover, while each of the two problems alone is already challenging enough, they are unfortunately tangled and have to be reconciled in a synthesizer. To this end, my general research program is to develop accessible synthesis tools that help regular programmers produce high-quality, trustworthy programs.

In the rest of this statement, I will highlight some of my main contributions to program synthesis, while mentioning along the way how the accessibility and trustworthiness are reconciled in these results. I will then conclude with my very recent or ongoing work and future directions.

Provably-Correct Heap-Manipulating Programs

Heap-manipulating programs are one of the least understood classes of programs. Manipulations of dynamically allocated memory are pervasive in low-level computer systems: garbage collectors, OS kernels, device drivers, mobile browsers, etc. Moreover, the functional correctness of these programs is highly desirable, as they should provide a secure and trustworthy platform for higher-level applications. Unfortunately, building programs in this class eludes existing automatic techniques and poses one of the greatest challenges in software verification and synthesis. I have developed novel logics, decision procedures and methodologies for verifying heap-manipulating programs.

Decidable Logics and Automated Reasoning

Programming tools are usually backed by efficient logic solvers for various theories such as integers, reals, bitvectors, arrays and strings. An important missing piece is decidable logics for tree data-structures,
which holds promise to automate many verification and synthesis problems not possible before. To this end, I have developed Strand (“STRucture ANd Data”) [13, 14], an expressive logic that combines graph-logic and data-logic, resulting in the first decision procedures that can prove properties of tree-like data-structures.

I have also developed Dryad\textit{dec}, another decidable logic that allows reasoning about tree data-structures with measurements [23]. The crux of the decidability proof is a small model property which allows us to reduce the satisfiability of Dryad\textit{dec} to quantifier-free linear arithmetic theory which can be solved efficiently using SMT solvers. This decision procedure has been the first one that can prove full correctness of programs manipulating AVL trees and red-black trees.

Many synthesis tasks are essentially optimization of program, and the correctness of the optimizations boils down to reasoning about transformations between tree traversals (over the abstract syntax trees representing the programs). Recently, my group has developed Retreet [26], a framework that reasons about transformations between tree-traversal programs. Our idea is a stack-based representation for iterations in tree traversals and an encoding to Monadic Second-Order logic over trees. Retreet can automatically discover and verify optimizations for complex traversals on real-world data structures, such as cascading style sheets (CSS) and cycletrees, which are not possible before.

### Natural Proofs and Natural Synthesis

The decision procedures above allow a class of verifiers to boil down the whole verification task to a set of queries to the decision procedure, leading to push-button systems which are fully-automatic. Unfortunately, theoretical results suggest their complexity is high and their expressivity is limited. Moreover, they are black boxes from the perspective of the synthesizer and hence hard to be integrated into existing synthesis frameworks such as counterexample-guided inductive synthesis (CEGIS).

To this end, I proposed a radically new methodology called natural proofs [15]. The key insight behind natural proofs was that, to automate the verification process, it is unnecessary to thoroughly search for all possible proofs, which is the case for all decidability-based approaches. The idea of the natural proof methodology is: a) to identify a class of natural proof tactics that mimics the human way of proving heap-manipulating programs; and b) to build algorithms that efficiently and thoroughly search this class of proofs. Based on this methodology, I have developed VCDryad [21, 17], the first SMT-based program verifier against separation logic. VCDryad showed that the combination of separation logic, natural proofs and SMT solving is amenable to automated reasoning with structure, data and separation: it has automatically verified the full correctness of a wide variety of challenging C programs, including a large number of well-known routines from open-source libraries (GTK library, OpenBSD, etc.) and operating systems (Linux kernel and ExpressOS, a secure mobile OS).

I further integrated above verification techniques to synthesis tools. For instance, I extended Natural Proofs to the context of program synthesis and proposing Natural Synthesis [22], a novel verification-synthesis integration. In particular, he designed ImpSynt, a synthesis-enabled language that allows the user to describe only a high-level skeleton of the program, and developed the first synthesizer that can produce imperative, data-structure manipulations and their proofs in tandem, from these skeletons.

Other researchers have explored natural proofs in a different context and successfully verified the Windows Phone Universal Serial Bus (USB) driver. The natural synthesis methodology has influenced researchers from the Database community.

### General-Purpose Synthesis Algorithms and Tools

I have co-developed several influential, user-friendly program synthesis tools, including Sketch, JSketch and DryadSynth.
Scalable Sketch-Based Synthesis

Sketch-based synthesis lets the programmer specify a synthesis problem as a sketch or template, which is a program that contains some unknowns to be solved for and some assertions to constrain the choice of unknowns. Sketch-based synthesis was popularized by the Sketch [20] synthesis tool, which has seen many successful applications. As a developer of Sketch, I have co-developed several techniques that make Sketch more useful in practice. The following techniques have been implemented and integrated into the latest Sketch distribution.

Despite many successful applications, Sketch still does not scale to programs that are even hundreds of lines long, and making sketch-based synthesis technology more scalable is an important research question. When a sketch involves too many unknowns which encode a too large search space, the user typically needs to concretize/fill some of the critical unknowns to reduce the size of the search space. Based on this key observation, I co-developed a novel synthesis algorithm called Adaptive Concretization [11, 12]. The key idea is to automate the human concretization process by estimating highly influential unknowns. Then by randomly concretizing these unknowns we can often speed up the overall synthesis algorithm, especially when we add parallelism. Experiments show that the new algorithm often outperforms vanilla Sketch, sometimes very significantly.

Program Sketching for Java

I have also co-developed JSketch, the first Java sketching tool that delivers sketch-based synthesis to the hands of Java programmers [10]. JSketch’s input is a partial Java program that may include holes, expression generators, and class generators. JSketch then translates the synthesis problem into a Sketch problem, and synthesizes an executable Java program by interpreting the output of Sketch. JSketch has also inspired the development of other Sketch-based synthesizers, such as EdSketch [5] and SkASP [18].

A special challenge for JSketch is synthesizing programs that use standard Java libraries. The known approach was to model libraries with mock library implementations that perform the same function in a simpler way. However, mocks may still be large and complex, and must include many implementation details, both of which could limit synthesis performance. To address this problem, we extended JSketch with algebraic specifications for describing library behaviors, e.g., encryption followed by decryption (with the same key) is the identity. This enhanced JSketch handles algebraic specifications with a rewriting-based encoding. With this extension, JSketch successfully synthesized provably correct Java programs that use data structure libraries, cryptography libraries, or the file system. Most of them were synthesized within 10 minutes [16].

Syntax-Guided Synthesis Algorithms

Sketch-based synthesis belongs to a more general theme called Syntax-Guided Synthesis (SyGuS), which formulates the synthesis task as a computational problem of searching for a program expression that meets both syntactic and logical constraints. Inspired by other solver competitions which have catalyzed the plethora of SMT solvers and verifiers, the community has standardized the problem input format and held an annual competition called SyGuS-Comp since 2014 [1].

I have been leading the development of DryadSynth, the most recent winner solver of SyGuS-Comp in the conditional linear integer arithmetic (CLIA) track (2018 and 2019). A key novelty behind DryadSynth is Cooperative Synthesis [7], a framework in which a synthesis problem is repeatedly split into subproblems and solved by deduction or enumeration separately.
Lowering the Barrier for Users

While program synthesis has advanced a lot and enabled real-life code generation, modern-day synthesizers (including those I co-developed) can still only be mastered by experts. One vital problem is that these techniques have not been integrated to the traditional software development process that most regular programmers are familiar with. In recent years, I have made inroads toward lowering the barrier of algorithmic program synthesis for regular programmers – in several disparate contexts.

Program Sketching without Custom Templates

A fundamental problem that significantly impacts the usability of Sketch (and all sketch-based synthesis techniques) is the requirement to provide a template for every synthesis task. We showed in [8] that, at least in the context of recursive transformations on algebraic data-types (ADTs), a user does not have to write a custom template for every synthesis problem, but can instead rely on a generic template from a library. Moreover, we developed a new optimization called inductive decomposition, which achieves asymptotic improvements in synthesis times for large and non-trivial ADT transformations. This optimization, together with the user guidance in the form of reusable templates, allows the enhanced Sketch to attack problems that are out of scope for prior synthesis techniques.

Library-Based Synthesis without Hand-Crafted Models

While the algebraic library models in [16] let JSketch handle libraries more efficiently, it is not too different from a user’s perspective – they still have to provide carefully crafted mocks or models to JSketch, requiring a lot of extra manual work. Recently, I explored an approach aiming at reducing the user’s burden of writing library models, and developed Toshokan (“library” in Japanese) [6], a bootstrapping synthesis framework which extends traditional counterexample guided inductive synthesis (CEGIS) with an automatically built library model from logged behavior of the library. Toshokan has been implemented and integrated into JSketch. Comparing to vanilla JSketch using mocks or models, Toshokan reduces up to 159 lines of code of required manual inputs, at the cost of less than 40 second of performance overheads.

Similar challenges are also faced by the users of static analyzers for Android apps, who have to provide abstract models for Java frameworks (e.g., Swing and Android). I have co-developed Pasket [9], a first step toward automatically generating Java framework models. Pasket takes as input the framework API, together with tutorial programs that exercise the framework, and emits framework models by instantiating design patterns to the framework API. This tool has been able to synthesize models for a subset of Swing and a subset of Android.

Quantitative Synthesis without Hand-Crafted Objectives

Writing formal specification for synthesis is a major barrier for average programmers. In particular, in some quantitative synthesis scenarios (such as network design), the first challenge faced by the user is expressing their optimization targets. To address this problem, my group developed Comparative Synthesis [24, 25], an interactive synthesis framework that learns near-optimal programs through comparative queries, without user-specified optimization targets. We developed a voting-guided learning algorithm which provides a provable guarantee on the quality of the found program. This approach has been embodied in a system called Net10Q for wide-area network design. Experiments with oracles and a pilot user study with network practitioners and researchers show Net10Q is effective in finding allocations that meet diverse user policy goals in an interactive fashion.
Ongoing and Future Work

I will continue his work on making program synthesis more trustworthy and user-friendly, by developing advanced programming systems and making them accessible to domain users.

On the Systems side, I will continue developing and improving practical, general-purpose program synthesis tools including DryadSynth and JSketch. These tools have the potential to significantly broaden the base of people who can overcome the programming-related challenges in their own fields, by delivering the power of algorithmic program synthesis to their hands. In particular, I believe that modularity — a key enabling concept in many disciplines for hiding and managing complexity of large systems — is still a missing piece and will potentially lead to the next wave of breakthrough for program synthesis. I envision a modular synthesis framework which decouples complex verification and synthesis tasks, decomposes a large synthesis task to multiple verification or synthesis subtasks, and delegates each subtask to an appropriate, off-the-shelf solver. This line of work is currently supported by my NSF CAREER award.

On the Domain side, I will explore novel applications of synthesis techniques to the fields of Networking and Compilers. For Networking, I believe what remains missing is a domain-specific language for optimal network design. Such a language will complement the Comparative Synthesis techniques, allow both qualitative and quantitative description of network configurations and make my verification and synthesis techniques available to more networking researchers and practitioners. This language will raise the level of abstraction for managing large networks, leading to much lower management costs, and better performance, security, and reliability. This direction is a continuation of my current NSF Formal Methods in the Field (FMitF) award. For Compilers, I envision integrating my prior work on tree logics and comparative synthesis to a new programming framework for tree manipulations. This framework will be self-adapting and automatically customize tree-manipulating programs for different platforms, without the pain of hand-tuning the optimization configurations of the compiler. This direction is a continuation of my current NSF Scalable Parallelism in the Extreme (SPX) award.
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