



HAL
open science

Strong Automated Testing of OCaml Libraries

François Pottier

► **To cite this version:**

François Pottier. Strong Automated Testing of OCaml Libraries. JFLA 2021 - 32es Journées Franco-phones des Langages Applicatifs, Feb 2021, Saint Médard d'Excideuil, France. hal-03049511

HAL Id: hal-03049511

<https://inria.hal.science/hal-03049511>

Submitted on 9 Dec 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Strong Automated Testing of OCaml Libraries

François Pottier

Inria Paris

Abstract

We present Monolith, a programmable tool that helps apply random testing or fuzz testing to an OCaml library. Monolith provides a rich specification language, which allows the user to describe her library’s API, and an engine, which generates clients of this API and executes them. This reduces the problem of testing a library to the problem of testing a complete program, one that is effectively addressed by off-the-shelf fuzzers such as AFL.

Prologue: How Ed Got Fired

Ed, an underpaid programmer at a company that sells software components, is assigned the task of implementing a persistent array library in OCaml. An “array”, in a broad sense, is a data structure that represents a map of some interval $[0, n)$ to values. A “persistent array” is immutable, or appears to be so. Ed is asked to implement the following signature:

```
type 'a t
val make : int -> 'a -> 'a t
val get : 'a t -> int -> 'a
val set : 'a t -> int -> 'a -> 'a t
```

`make n x` creates an array of size `n` where every cell contains the value `x`, while `get a i` returns the value stored in array `a` at index `i`, and `set a i x` creates a new array that is identical to `a` except that the value stored at index `i` is `x`. Note that `set a i x` does not modify the array `a`.

Because Ed is unhappy with his work, he decides to botch the job. After spending an afternoon at the swimming pool, he returns with the following two-line implementation:

```
include Stdlib.Array
let set a i x = set a i x; a
```

This implementation stores the data in a mutable array: it is incorrect. In the hope of disguising his fraud, Ed compiles it to machine code. Ed knows that the flaw cannot be detected by a “single-threaded” sequence of operations where each operation acts on the most recently-created array. To detect it, one must apply a `get` operation to an array that has already been the subject of a `set` operation. Ed happens to know that the employees of the company’s quality assurance department have been laid off a week earlier, and believes his boss incapable of imagining such a tricky scenario, so he thinks he can get away with it.

However, to Ed’s surprise, a few minutes after he has handed in his implementation, Bryn, his manager, barges into his office, yelling: “What is this? You’re fired!” as he slaps onto the desk a printout that reads as follows:

```
(* ./output/crashes/id:000000,sig:06,src:000000,op:flip16,pos:6 *)
(* @03: Failure in an observation: candidate and reference disagree. *)
(* @01 *) let a0 = make 1 0;;
(* @02 *) let a1 = set a0 0 1;;
(* @03 *) let observed = get a0 0;;
         assert (observed = 0);; (* candidate finds 1 *)
```

Ed is shocked: how could Bryn come up so quickly with this scenario? “How...”, Ed begins. “Oh, that was easy,” Bryn snarls. “All I had to do was write a reference implementation of persistent arrays, in two lines, like this..”

```
include Stdlib.Array
let set a i x = let a = Array.copy a in set a i x; a
```

“A copy! Why didn’t I do a copy,” thinks Ed, who realizes that he could have been just as lazy without getting caught so quickly, while Bryn goes on: “... and write down the specifications of the three operations, like this:”

```
open Monolith
module R = Reference (* the above reference implementation *)
module C = Candidate (* Ed's implementation *)
let () =
  (* Specs. *)
  let array = declare_abstract_type()
  and element = sequential()
  and length = interval 0 16
  and index a = interval 0 (R.length a) in
  (* Operations. *)
  declare "make" (length ^> element ^> array) R.make C.make;
  declare "get" (array ^>> fun a -> index a ^> element) R.get C.get;
  declare "set" (array ^>> fun a -> index a ^> element ^> array) R.set C.set;
  (* Run, with 5 units of fuel. *)
  main 5
```

Bryn is gone. While packing, Ed pieces together how Monolith [18] enabled his boss to expose him so easily. In a few lines of code, Bryn declared the existence of an abstract type `array` and of three operations `make`, `get`, `set`. For each operation, he gave one specification and two implementations. For instance, the specification `length ^> element ^> array` indicates that `make` expects an integer `length`, which must be drawn from the interval $[0, 16)$, an integer `element`, where elements must be generated in a sequential manner, and returns an array. It is implemented by `C.make` on the candidate side and by `R.make` on the reference side. The specification `array ^>> fun a -> index a ^> element` states that `get` expects an array `a`, a nonnegative integer `index` that is less than the length of `a`, and returns an integer `element`. The abstract type `array` is represented by distinct types on the reference side and on the candidate side: indeed, the result type of `R.make` is `int R.t`, whereas the result type of `C.make` is `int C.t`. Bryn did not even need to point this out explicitly; this information was inferred.

Ed imagines that `main` randomly generates scenarios that exploit `make`, `get` and `set`, executes these scenarios using both the reference implementation and the candidate implementation, and compares the results. Either by purely random testing or by giving control of the source of random bits to an efficient gray-box mutation-based fuzzer, such as AFL [24], one can very quickly discover a scenario where the two implementations disagree.

“Unit testing has never been so easy,” thinks Ed, sadly, as he exits his former office.

1 Introduction

Fuzz testing, or fuzzing [10, 25], is an extremely effective approach to finding bugs in software. Fuzzing is usually applied to a standalone executable program. This program is expected to read a stream of input bits and to respond by either crashing or not crashing. The fuzzer’s job, then, is to craft a sequence of bits that causes a crash.

Fuzz testing is very much akin to random testing. The only difference between the two lies in the fact that the input stream is not random; it is controlled by an adversary. From the point of view of the program under test, this makes no difference. In terms of effectiveness, this can make a big difference: fuzzing can be much more effective at finding bugs than random testing.

Submitting a complete program to random testing or fuzz testing is definitely very interesting and useful. Yet, this begs the question: can these methods be applied to a library, as opposed to a self-contained executable program?

At first sight, this may seem difficult, because a library presents a much more complex interface to the outside world than a standalone program. A library usually publishes many types and operations, and may impose complex constraints on their usage. Manually or automatically constructing a good test suite (that is, a collection of usage scenarios that exercises the library in a wide variety of ways) is difficult [1].

In the setting of OCaml, this paper attempts to answer this question in the affirmative. We present Monolith [18], a programmable tool that helps transform a library into a self-contained program, therefore reducing the problem of testing this library to the problem of testing a complete program. Monolith offers a rich set of combinators that allow a library author to construct a description of her library’s API. The author must also provide a reference implementation of her library. Once these two pieces are provided, Monolith takes care of the rest. Its engine generates a valid usage scenario, executes this scenario, and (if an incorrect behavior is detected) prints this scenario and crashes. Thus, the library under test, combined with Monolith’s engine, forms a self-contained executable program that can be submitted to random testing or fuzz testing via standard means.

The paper is structured as follows. First (§2), we describe the combinators out of which specifications are built, which form a rich domain-specific language. Then, we briefly describe Monolith’s engine (§3), give a few more examples of the use of Monolith (§4), and discuss some of its limitations (§5). Finally, we give a brief review of the related work (§6) and conclude (§7).

2 A Specification Language

To be able to invoke the operations of the library under test, Monolith must have access to their specifications. There are two reasons why this is so: first, because OCaml is a typed language, Monolith must at least know the type of each operation; second, to be able to generate suitable arguments and to determine what to do with the results, Monolith must have access to richer specifications that may carry generators, preconditions, postconditions, and so on.

For this purpose, Monolith gives the user a means of constructing specifications. There is a type `(’r, ’c) spec` of specifications, together with a rich collection of combinators that build complex specifications out of simpler ones.

The type `spec` is parameterized with the types `’r` and `’c` of the values that a specification describes. The type `’r` is for the reference side, while `’c` is for the candidate side. Because an abstract type can be implemented in different ways by the reference implementation and by the candidate implementation, an operation may have different types on either side.

To summarize, a specification of type `(’r, ’c) spec` is a runtime description of a pair of OCaml values whose respective types are `’r` and `’c`. We refer to such a pair as a *dual value*. The specification tells Monolith in what way the two components of this pair are related: it is in fact a runtime description of a *logical relation* [22].

Within the universe of specifications, we distinguish subsets of *constructible* specifications, which describe values that Monolith is able to construct, and *deconstructible* specifications, which describe values that Monolith can deconstruct or test for equality. We impose a number of rules, such as the following: (1) a function argument must be constructible; (2) a function

```

(* The type of specifications. *)
type ('r, 'c) spec
(* Basic constructible type. *)
val constructible: (unit -> 't) -> ('t, 't) spec
(* Basic deconstructible type. *)
val deconstructible: ('t -> 't -> 'bool) -> ('t, 't) spec
(* Basic abstract type. *)
val declare_abstract_type: unit -> ('r, 'c) spec
(* Combining a constructible spec and a deconstructible spec. *)
val ifpol: ('r, 'c) spec -> ('r, 'c) spec -> ('r, 'c) spec
(* Pair. *)
val ( *** ): ('r1, 'c1) spec -> ('r2, 'c2) spec -> ('r1 * 'r2, 'c1 * 'c2) spec
(* Option. *)
val option : ('r, 'c) spec -> ('r option, 'c option) spec
(* Result. *)
val result : ('r1, 'c1) spec -> ('r2, 'c2) spec -> (('r1, 'r2) result, ('c1, 'c2) result) spec
(* Recursion. *)
val fix: (('r, 'c) spec -> ('r, 'c) spec) -> ('r, 'c) spec
(* Function. *)
val (^>) : ('r1, 'c1) spec -> ('r2, 'c2) spec -> ('r1 -> 'r2, 'c1 -> 'c2) spec
(* Dependent function. *)
val (^>>) : ('r1, 'c1) spec -> ('r1 -> ('r2, 'c2) spec) -> ('r1 -> 'r2, 'c1 -> 'c2) spec
(* Subset / precondition. *)
val (%): ('r -> bool) -> ('r, 'c) spec -> ('r, 'c) spec
(* Nondeterminism / postcondition. *)
type 'r diagnostic = Valid of 'r | Invalid
val nondet: ('r, 'c) spec -> ('c -> 'r diagnostic, 'c) spec
(* Transformation into or out of a known specification. *)
val map_into: ('r1 -> 'r2) -> ('c1 -> 'c2) -> ('r2, 'c2) spec -> ('r1, 'c1) spec
val map_outof: ('r1 -> 'r2) -> ('c1 -> 'c2) -> ('r1, 'c1) spec -> ('r2, 'c2) spec

```

Figure 1: The specification language: core combinators

result must be deconstructible; (3) a function is neither constructible nor deconstructible (§5). By lack of space, we omit the details. This discipline is currently enforced at runtime. In the future, we hope to enforce it statically via extra parameters of the type `spec`.

2.1 Core Specification Combinators

A slightly simplified presentation of the core specification combinators appears in Fig. 1. When displaying a scenario, Monolith must be able to print values, operations, and so on. In the figure, for the sake of simplicity, we have removed everything that has to do with printing.

Basic concrete types The function `constructible` (Fig. 1) lets Monolith regard an OCaml type `'t` as constructible: that is, it equips Monolith with a way of constructing values of type `'t`. No runtime description of this type needs be given. A generator, a function of type `unit -> 't`, must be provided. Through an API not shown in this paper, a generator has access to a source of “random” bits, which may be either truly random or controlled by a fuzzer. The values produced by the generator are used both by the reference implementation and by the candidate implementation. For this reason, the return type of `constructible` is `('t, 't) spec`.

The function `deconstructible` lets Monolith regard an OCaml type `'t` as deconstructible:

that is, it equips Monolith with a way of deconstructing values of type `'t`. More accurately, it lets Monolith observe these values, that is, test them for equality. An equality test of type `'t -> 't -> bool` must be provided. It is used by Monolith to compare the values produced by the reference implementation and by the candidate implementation. A discrepancy is regarded as a fatal error, causing a report and a crash.

A constructible specification is used to describe an argument of an operation, whereas a deconstructible specification is used to describe the result of an operation. The combinator `ifpol` allows combining one specification of each kind into a single specification that is both constructible and deconstructible. It can be used to describe base types (§2.2), algebraic data types, first-class function types, and more (§5).

Basic abstract types The function `declare_abstract_type` makes Monolith aware of the existence of an abstract type, represented by the OCaml types `'r` and `'c` on the reference side and on the candidate side, respectively. The two implementations are allowed to use different runtime representations of this abstraction.

The specification returned by `declare_abstract_type` is constructible and deconstructible. Yet, Monolith never generates or observes a value of this type. When it must construct such a value, it *selects* a value of this type from those that have been produced by previous operations. (The source of randomness is used to choose among them.) When it must deconstruct such a value, it simply *records* this value in an environment, for use in a future operation.

An abstract type is by default opaque: when a candidate-side data structure has abstract type, Monolith has no way of checking at runtime that this data structure is well-formed or that it agrees with the data structure maintained by the reference implementation. Yet, it can be desirable to allow Monolith to see under the hood, so to speak, and to perform a well-formedness check. This can be done by supplying a check function of type `'r -> 'c -> unit` as an optional argument to `declare_abstract_type`. (This is not shown in Fig. 1.) This function is expected to either silently succeed or fail by raising an exception. It is up to the user to decide how thorough, and how costly, this check should be.

The check function is applied by Monolith after *every* operation and to *every* dual value that has been recorded in the environment, even if this value is not ostensibly affected by this operation (that is, even if it is not an argument of this operation). This can be very useful when the candidate implementation involves shared mutable state: if an operation on a candidate data structure `c` corrupts another candidate data structure `c'` that happens to share part of its representation with `c`, this can be detected immediately, whereas in the absence of a check function, one or more operations on `c'` would be required for the problem to become apparent.

Structural types The combinator `***` describes a value of a product type, that is, a pair. The combinators `option` and `result` describe values of two common sum types. These product and sum combinators produce constructible (resp. deconstructible) specifications when they are applied to constructible (resp. deconstructible) specifications.

Monolith is able to construct a value of a product or sum type out of smaller values. When constructing a sum type, this involves a choice: for this purpose, one random bit is read.

Monolith is able to deconstruct a value of a product or sum type into smaller values. A pair is decomposed into its components. When deconstructing a sum type, Monolith checks whether the reference implementation and the candidate implementation agree on the tag. For instance, if one implementation produces `None` while the other implementation produces a value of the form `Some _`, then a discrepancy has been detected, causing a report and a crash. If both implementations produce values of the form `Some _`, then the data constructor `Some` can be stripped off on both sides, and the deconstruction process can continue.

By combining basic concrete types, basic abstract types, products, and sums, one teaches

Monolith how to handle values of composite structural types. For instance, suppose that some operation named `choose` has type `set -> (element * set) option`. Assuming that `element` has been declared as a (constructible and deconstructible) concrete type and assuming that `set` has been declared as an abstract type, the result of this operation can be described by the specification `option (element *** set)`, which is constructible and deconstructible. In particular, to deconstruct the result of `choose`, Monolith checks that either the reference implementation and the candidate implementation both return `None`, or they respectively return `Some (re, rs)` and `Some (ce, cs)`. In the latter case, Monolith further checks that the elements `re` and `ce` are equal and records the existence of a new dual value of abstract type `set`, whose reference-side and candidate-side projections are respectively `rs` and `cs`. This dual value can be passed as an argument to a future operation that requires a `set`.

Recursive types The combinator `fix` allows the user to construct a recursive specification, that is, a cyclic specification. This feature can be used to describe algebraic data types, such as lists and trees (§5). It can in theory cause Monolith to diverge while attempting to construct a value. This is not a problem in practice, because the probability of divergence is usually zero, and because a limit on execution time is usually imposed. AFL imposes such a limit.

Function types The combinator `^>` constructs a simple (nondependent) function specification. Its two arguments describe the function’s domain and codomain. For instance, the operation `choose` that was mentioned above has specification `set ^> option (element *** set)`. Like the function type constructor `->`, the combinator `^>` is right-associative, so curried functions can be easily described: for instance, an operation `add` that inserts an element into a set could have specification `element ^> set ^> set`.

The combinator `^>>` constructs a dependent function specification. In contrast with `^>`, it allows the specification of the codomain to depend on the function’s argument. That is, the codomain is not just a specification, of type `('r2, 'c2) spec`, but a function of an argument to a specification, of type `'r1 -> ('r2, 'c2) spec`. This function has access to the reference-side projection of the actual argument generated by Monolith, and can refer to it in the specification of the codomain. This feature is typically exploited in concert with either `constructible` or the subset combinator `%`. Either way, the point is to let the value of an earlier argument influence the choice of a later argument, either by dictating how it must be generated, or, after it has been generated, by rejecting it if it is unsuitable. This is explained next.

Preconditions Broadly speaking, there are two ways of expressing a precondition: either a priori, by influencing the manner in which an argument is generated, or a posteriori, by filtering out unsuitable values for this argument.

Let us illustrate the first approach via an example. Suppose that the library under test involves an abstract type of sequences. Suppose that `get` expects two arguments, namely a sequence `s` and an index `i` into the sequence `s`, and returns an element. The specification of this operation could be `seq ^>> fun s -> interval 0 (R.length s) ^> element`. The dependent function combinator `^>>` is used to bind the variable `s` to the reference-side projection of the first argument. This enables the function call `R.length`, which queries the reference implementation for the length of the sequence `s`. This in turn allows generating an integer index directly in the desired range. The constructible specification `interval i j` describes an integer in the semi-open interval $[i, j)$. It is defined in terms of `constructible`, `deconstructible`, and `ifpol`.

The second approach exploits the subset combinator `%`. This combinator must be applied to a constructible specification and produces a constructible specification. It carries a predicate of type `'r -> bool`, which has access to the reference-side projection of the value that has been constructed and must indicate whether this value is acceptable.

As an example, suppose that one wishes to test a library that involves an abstract type of file descriptors. Suppose that, via `declare_abstract_type`, one has obtained a specification `fd` of type $(R.f\!d, C.f\!d)$ `spec`, where `R.f\!d` and `C.f\!d` are the types of file descriptors on each side. A file descriptor is either valid or invalid. Suppose that the reference implementation keeps track of this information: the function `R.valid`, of type `R.f\!d -> bool`, determines whether a reference-side file descriptor is valid. Finally, let us assume that `close` requires a valid file descriptor, and invalidates it. The specification of this operation could be `R.valid % fd ^> unit`. (The combinator `%` binds tighter than `^>`.) The precondition `R.valid` prevents Monolith from applying `close` to an invalid file descriptor, which would not make sense. The fact that `close` invalidates its argument is not visible in the specification; it is visible in the implementation of the functions `R.close` and `R.valid`, which must update and consult the validity information associated with a descriptor. On the candidate side, no function `C.valid` is required: the candidate implementation need not keep track of validity at runtime.

Postconditions Whereas a precondition expresses a property of an argument, which the library under test expects to hold, a postcondition expresses a property of a result, which the library under test must guarantee.

It is often the case that the postcondition of an operation is deterministic, that is, a single value is considered a valid result. As this is the common case, Monolith adopts it as the default. Monolith requires the user to provide a reference implementation of each operation (§3.1) and, by default, expects the reference implementation and the candidate implementation to produce the same result. In that case, no explicit postcondition needs be given.

Sometimes, however, an operation has a nondeterministic specification: that is, several distinct results are permitted. In such a situation, the `nondet` combinator must be used. It produces a deconstructible specification. It is typically placed in the codomain of a function specification, that is, after the rightmost arrow combinator `^>`. Using `nondet` changes the type and the role of the reference implementation. Whereas the reference implementation normally returns a result of type `'r`, it must now return a function of type `'c -> 'r diagnostic` (Fig. 1). This function is a postcondition: it has access to the value of type `'c` produced by the candidate implementation and must return a value of type `'r diagnostic`. Such a value can be viewed as a truth value, enriched with additional information. Indeed, the type `'r diagnostic` is a sum type: the data constructor `Valid` indicates that the candidate result is acceptable, whereas `Invalid` indicates that it is not. In the former case, the diagnostic includes the result of type `'r` that the reference implementation wishes to return. An example use of `nondet` appears in §4.1.

Input and output transformations `map_into` and `map_outof` describe a transformation that must be applied by Monolith to a piece of data. They require the user to supply two transformation functions: a transformation of type `'r1 -> 'r2` for use on the reference side, and a transformation of type `'c1 -> 'c2` for use on the candidate side.

In the case of `map_outof`, the user must provide a specification of type $('r1, 'c1)$ `spec`, that is, a description of the input of the transformation. This means that the transformation can be used to map data out of a type whose structure is known to Monolith. Thus, `map_outof` must be applied to a constructible specification, and returns one. It is typically used to preprocess an argument of an operation.

In the case of `map_into`, the user must provide a specification of type $('r2, 'c2)$ `spec`, that is, a description of the output of the transformation. Thus, the transformation maps data into a type whose structure is known. Therefore, `map_into` must be applied a deconstructible specification, and returns one. It can be used to postprocess the result of an operation. It can also be exploited to wrap an operation in an OCaml context that alters its calling convention: this is illustrated by the manner in which we handle exceptions (§2.2).


```

(* Predefined concrete types. *)
val unit    : (unit, unit) spec
val bool    : (bool, bool) spec
val int     : (int, int) spec
val interval : int -> int -> (int, int) spec
val exn     : (exn, exn) spec
(* Function with an exception effect. *)
val (^!>)   : ('r1, 'c1) spec -> ('r2, 'c2) spec ->
              ('r1 -> 'r2, 'c1 -> 'c2) spec
(* Function with a nondeterminism effect. *)
val (^?>)   : ('r1, 'c1) spec -> ('r2, 'c2) spec ->
              ('r1 -> 'c2 -> 'r2 diagnostic, 'c1 -> 'c2) spec
(* Function with exception and nondeterminism effects. *)
val (^!?!>) : ('r1, 'c1) spec -> ('r2, 'c2) spec ->
              ('r1 -> ('c2, exn) result -> ('r2, exn) result diagnostic, 'c1 -> 'c2) spec
(* Moving the second argument to the first place. *)
val rot2    : ('r1 -> 'r2 -> 'r3, 'c1 -> 'c2 -> 'c3) spec ->
              ('r2 -> 'r1 -> 'r3, 'c2 -> 'c1 -> 'c3) spec

```

Figure 2: The specification language: some derived combinators

2.2 Derived Specification Combinators

Predefined concrete types A number of concrete types are predefined using `constructible`, `deconstructible`, and `ifpol`. They include `unit`, `bool`, `int`, `exn` (Fig. 2). All are deconstructible. The types `unit` and `bool` are constructible, whereas `int` and `exn` are not, as it seems desirable to let the user ponder the choice of a suitable generator. `interval i j` is constructible, and causes an integer in the semi-open interval $[i, j)$ to be generated.

Effectful functions By default, Monolith allows neither the reference implementation nor the candidate implementation to raise an exception: both events are considered abnormal. If an operation is expected to raise an exception under normal circumstances, then it must be wrapped in an exception handler. This is done in a couple lines of code, as follows:

```

let handle f x = try Ok (f x) with e -> Error e
let (^!>) a b = map_into handle handle (a ^> result b exn)

```

The function `handle` turns a function that can raise an exception, whose type is `'a -> 'b`, into one that cannot raise an exception, whose type is `'a -> ('b, exn) result`. The application of `handle` to an operation is hidden underneath a thin layer of sugar: the exceptional function combinator `a ^!> b` is a short-hand for an application of `map_into` that instructs Monolith to use `handle`, both on the reference side and on the candidate side, and to deconstruct the value of type `('b, exn) result` that is thus obtained. When this combinator is used, Monolith checks that either the reference implementation and candidate implementation both return a value, or they both raise an exception. In the latter case, Monolith uses the equality function at type `exn` to check that they raise related exceptions. By default, equality at type `exn` is OCaml's generic equality; however, this can be customized via a mechanism not described in this paper.

To sum up, the combinators `^>` (Fig. 1) and `^!>` (Fig. 2) have the same type. The former forbids raising an exception, while the latter allows the two implementations to raise the same exception (or related exceptions).

It seems convenient to also define `a ^?> b` as a short-hand for `a ^> nondet b`, suggesting that nondeterminism is an effect:

```
let (^?>) a b = a ^> nondet b
```

Finally, it seems useful to define an arrow combinator that combines the exception effect and the nondeterminism effect. The combinator `^!>` is used to describe an operation that may choose whether it wishes to raise or not raise an exception. It is defined as follows:

```
let (^!>) a b = map_into (fun x -> x) handle (a ^> nondet (result b exn))
```

The candidate implementation is wrapped with `handle`, so as to catch all exceptions. Thanks to `nondet`, the reference implementation has access to the behavior of the candidate, a value of type `('c2, exn) result`. It must describe its own behavior by returning either `Valid (Ok _)` or `Valid (Error _)`. It is not allowed to raise an exception, so it need not be wrapped with `handle`: it is wrapped with the identity function instead.

Rearranging arguments Sometimes, the arguments of an operation come in an inconvenient order: for instance, the first argument may be subject to a precondition that refers to the second argument. This is the case, for example, of a `remove` operation of type `element -> set -> set`, where the element that is passed as the first argument is required to be a member of the set that is passed as the second argument. When testing this operation, one would like to first pick a set `s` that is at hand, then pick a member `x` of this set. It would not make much sense to first blindly generate `x` and then hope that some set that contains `x` is at hand. Fortunately, it is easy to define a combinator `rot2` that exchanges the order of the two arguments:

```
let rot2 f y x = f x y
let rot2 spec = map_into rot2 rot2 spec
```

Using `rot2`, it is easy to express the specification of `remove`. It can be written under the form `rot2 (R.nonempty % set ^>> fun s -> choose s ^> set)`, where `choose s` is an abbreviation for `constructible (fun () -> R.choose s)`. It can be read informally as follows: once its arguments are exchanged, `remove` expects a nonempty set `s` and an element that must be chosen in the set `s` and returns a set. We assume that `R.nonempty` tests whether a set is nonempty and that `R.choose`, which has access to the source of randomness, chooses an element in a nonempty set.

3 Monolith's Engine

3.1 Usage

Once the specification language described in the previous section is mastered, using Monolith is very easy. The engine's API consists of just two functions, `declare` and `main` (Fig. 3). `declare` declares the existence of an operation, and must be called once per operation; `main` runs the engine, and must be called once, after all operations have been declared.

```
(* Declaring an operation. *)
val declare : string -> ('r, 'c) spec -> 'r -> 'c -> unit
(* Starting the engine, with some fuel. *)
val main : int -> unit
```

Figure 3: Monolith's engine: main functions

An operation is described by its name, by a specification of type $('r, 'c)$ `spec`, and by its implementations on the reference side and on the candidate side, whose respective types are $'r$ and $'c$. OCaml’s type discipline guarantees that the specification provided by the user is consistent with the types of the two implementations.

When the engine is started, by invoking `main`, an integer number n , which represents a certain amount of “fuel”, must be given. This number bounds the length of the scenarios that Monolith investigates: Monolith generates and executes sequential scenarios of at most n instructions. An instruction is of the form `let $p = e$` , where e is an OCaml expression, typically an application of an operation to a suitable series of arguments, and p is an OCaml pattern, which deconstructs the result of executing e . Each scenario is executed both under the reference implementation and under the candidate implementation, step by step, synchronously. If a discrepancy is detected, then Monolith prints the entire scenario and crashes. Otherwise, the scenario is abandoned after n instructions have been generated and executed, and Monolith moves on to another scenario.

During this process, every time a choice must be made, the source of randomness is used. This occurs when Monolith chooses an operation or generates an argument for an operation. Thus, viewed from the outside, the complete executable program is a black box that reads a stream of bits and responds (in a deterministic way) by either terminating normally or crashing.

The goal of the testing process, then, is to feed this executable program with random data, or with adversely crafted data, in order to cause a crash.

Random testing can be performed by letting the executable program read data from the pseudo-device `/dev/urandom`. Grey-box mutation-based fuzzing can be performed by requesting the OCaml compiler to instrument the executable program with AFL-specific instructions and by letting AFL drive its execution. A blog post by Rebours [20] explains the workflow. The scripts in `Makefile.monolith`, which is bundled with Monolith, automate most of it.

When the executable program is about to crash, it first prints a scenario on its standard output channel. This is a sequence of OCaml instructions that leads to a discrepancy between the reference implementation and the candidate implementation. The user can copy and paste this scenario directly into the OCaml REPL in order to reproduce the problem.

3.2 Implementation

Monolith’s implementation is a few thousand lines of OCaml code. The type $(_, _)$ `spec` is a generalized algebraic data type (GADT). The engine simultaneously generates a well-typed straight-line scenario and executes this scenario both under the reference implementation and under the candidate implementation. Each instruction in this scenario is of the form `let $p = e$` , where the expression e is built by choosing an operation and constructing a series of arguments for it, while the pattern p is obtained by deconstructing the result of executing this operation. Both of these processes, namely construction of arguments and deconstruction of results, are driven by the structure of the specification provided by the user for this operation.

All of the variables introduced by a pattern p have abstract type. Indeed, a result whose type is concrete need not be bound to a variable; it can be deconstructed, checked for validity, and forgotten. A result whose type is abstract, however, cannot be validated. It must be bound to a variable, so it can later be passed to another operation. Monolith internally maintains a runtime environment where every variable has abstract type and is bound to a dual value.

The fact that the scenario is generated and executed at the same time plays an important role in a few places. When a value of a sum type must be deconstructed, this value is available already, so its tag can be inspected, and a suitable pattern can be constructed. In other words, there is no need for generating case analysis constructs with multiple branches: one branch, the correct branch, is always enough. When a variable of a certain abstract type must be chosen

among those that exist in the environment while respecting a certain precondition, the fact that every variable is already bound to a value is essential: this means that one can effectively test which choices satisfy the precondition and which do not.

4 Examples

We present a few examples of the use of Monolith. In each case, we give a specification and a reference implementation, but do not show the candidate implementation, which is irrelevant.

4.1 Nondeterministic Increasing-Sequence Generators

We wish to specify nondeterministic generators of integer sequences, whose API is as follows:

```
type t
val create : unit -> t
val next : t -> int
```

There is an abstract type `t` of generators. The function `create` returns a fresh generator. The function `next` queries a generator for the next element of the sequence that it represents. The function call `next g` must produce a number that is nonnegative and strictly greater than the number produced by any previous call `next g`.

To test an implementation of this API, one can write the following main program, which declares the type `t` and its operations and runs Monolith:

```
let t = declare_abstract_type() in
declare "create" (unit ^> t) R.create C.create;
declare "next" (t ^?> int) R.next C.next;
main 5
```

The specification `t ^?> int` indicates that the operation `next` is nondeterministic. According to it, whereas the candidate function `C.next` has type `C.t -> int`, the reference function `R.next` has type `R.t -> int -> int diagnostic`. A reference implementation can be written as follows:

```
type t = int ref
let create () = ref 0
let next (g : t) (candidate : int) : int diagnostic =
  if !g < candidate then (g := candidate; Valid candidate)
  else Invalid
```

The reference implementation uses mutable state to record the last value produced by the candidate. The function `R.next` reads this state to determine whether `candidate` is an acceptable result. If it is, then it updates this state and returns `Valid _`; otherwise, it returns `Invalid`.

4.2 Semi-Persistent Arrays

Semi-persistent arrays [6] resemble persistent arrays, which we have encountered in the prologue. However, they offer a more restrictive API, which disallows certain access patterns. For this reason, they can be implemented more efficiently. Their API is as follows:

```
type 'a t
val make : int -> 'a -> 'a t
val length : 'a t -> int
val get : 'a t -> int -> 'a
val set : 'a t -> int -> 'a -> 'a t
```

There is an abstract type `'a t` of arrays of elements of type `'a`. The operation `make n x` creates a fresh array of length `n` that holds `n` times the element `x`. The operation `length a` returns the length of the array `a`. The operation `get a i` reads the array `a` at offset `i`, while `set a i x` updates the array `a` at offset `i` with the value `x`, producing a new array, which is considered a *child* of `a`. At any point in time, the arrays that have been created so far, equipped with the child relationship, form a forest. Within each tree, an array is considered *valid* if and only if it is a (reflexive, transitive) parent of the array that was most recently accessed via `get` or `set`. Whereas `length` can be applied to any array, `get` and `set` must be applied to a valid array.

To test an implementation of this API, one can write the following main program:

```
let elt = sequential()
and t = declare_abstract_type() in
declare "make" (lt 16 ^> elt ^> t) R.make C.make;
declare "length" (t ^> int) R.length C.length;
declare "get" (R.valid % t ^>> fun a -> lt (R.length a) ^> elt) R.get C.get;
declare "set" (R.valid % t ^>> fun a -> lt (R.length a) ^> elt ^> t) R.set C.set;
main 5
```

We use `lt j` as a short-hand for interval θj . The operation `length`, which can be applied to any array, does not have a precondition, while `get` and `set`, which must be applied to a valid array, have the precondition `R.valid`. This prevents Monolith from generating an access pattern that violates the semi-persistent array API.

There remains to provide a reference implementation of semi-persistent arrays, which must offer not only the four operations `R.make`, `R.length`, `R.get`, and `R.set`, but also the runtime validity test `R.valid` that has been used above as part of the specification. One of the simplest possible implementations, inspired by Conchon and Filliâtre's paper [6], is to associate with each tree a stack of currently valid arrays. This stack represents a path from the most-recently accessed array in this tree up to the root of this tree. To test whether an array is valid, one searches for it in the stack. To invalidate the strict descendants of a valid array, one truncates the stack after this array. Both `get` and `set` perform such an invalidation step.

```
type 'a t = { data: 'a array; stack: 'a t list ref }
(* Stack operations. *)
let peek stack = match !stack with [] -> assert false | x :: _ -> x
let pop stack = match !stack with [] -> assert false | _ :: xs -> stack := xs
let push x stack = stack := x :: !stack; x
(* A validity test and an invalidation operation. *)
let valid spa = List.memq spa !(spa.stack)
let invalidate_descendants spa = while peek spa.stack != spa do pop spa.stack done
(* Operations on semi-persistent arrays. *)
let make n x =
  let data = Array.make n x and stack = ref [] in push { data; stack } stack
let length spa =
  Array.length spa.data
let get spa i =
  invalidate_descendants spa; Array.get spa.data i
let set spa i x =
  invalidate_descendants spa;
  let data = Array.copy spa.data and stack = spa.stack in
  Array.set data i x; push { data; stack } stack
```

4.3 Sek

We have used Monolith in conjunction with AFL in order to test Sek [4], a library that offers efficient implementations of ephemeral sequences, persistent sequences, and ephemeral iterators on both kinds of sequences. Sek publishes 4 abstract types and over 150 operations. Its data structures involve complex balancing invariants, shared mutable state, and a subtle ownership policy that determines when an object can be updated in place and when it must be copied. Sek itself represents about 6000 lines of nonblank noncomment lines of code. The reference implementation and the specifications together occupy about 1500 lines of code, that is, about 10 lines per operation on average. As Sek evolved over the course of several months, we found fuzzing extremely effective in uncovering bugs: in our experience, many bugs can be found in minutes, and some more can be found in hours. The fact that Monolith always produces a short scenario is invaluable. It is of course impossible to tell how many bugs in Sek were *not* found. Still, we can confidently say that testing has saved us a lot of trouble and embarrassment.

5 Limitations and Work-Arounds

User-defined algebraic data types Only a fixed collection of product types and sum types are known to Monolith (§2.1). There is no built-in support for tuple types of arity greater than two, for sum types other than `option` and `result`, or for algebraic data types. Such support can however be programmed by the user. Indeed, thanks to the combinators `fix`, `ifpol`, `map_outof`, and `map_into`, the isomorphism between an algebraic data type and a sum of products can be declared and exploited.

The algebraic data type `list`, for instance, could be described in this way. However, such an approach would perhaps be too simple-minded. It would cause Monolith to construct a list by first flipping a coin so as to choose between the data constructors `[]` and `::` and then, if `::` has been chosen, by constructing an element and a sublist, thereby repeating the process. This approach would make it unlikely for long lists to be constructed. In practice, it seems preferable to generate a list by first selecting its length within a certain range, then generating as many elements as necessary. Fortunately, the core combinators that we have presented allow using this strategy on the construction side while sticking with the simple-minded approach on the deconstruction side.

Because lists are so common, Monolith does provide a `!list` combinator (not shown in Fig. 1 or Fig. 2). This combinator could in principle be defined by the user outside Monolith.

Functions as arguments Monolith currently does not allow an operation to take a function as an argument: a specification of the form $(a \wedge b) \wedge c$ is rejected. This is a consequence of the rules set forth at the beginning of §2: a function argument must be constructible, and a function is not constructible. It is not clear at this time how one might relax this restriction. Indeed, several of Monolith’s design principles seem incompatible with the desire of generating a function that satisfies a certain specification. The fact that Monolith generates code and executes it on the fly, the fact that it generates straight-line code only, and the fact that it generates code without a predetermined goal, all seem incompatible with the idea of generating code for a function with the goal of obeying a predetermined specification.

Fortunately, it is possible to some extent to work around this limitation. Using `constructible` to equip the function type `a -> b` with a custom generator is one possible workaround. Using `map_outof` to transform some other constructible type into the function type `a -> b` is another approach. Finally, one could also declare `a -> b` as an abstract type and equip it with one or more operations that construct values of this type. Although these approaches are limited to generating values in a strict subset of the type `a -> b`, they can be good enough.

In some cases, testing a higher-order function can be reduced to testing a well-chosen first-order function. For instance, to test a `fold` function that iterates over a collection, one could argue that it suffices to define the function `elements` (which constructs a list of all elements of the collection) in terms of `fold`, and to test `elements`. Indeed, no information other than a sequence of elements can be extracted out of `fold`.¹

Functions as results One could say that Monolith does not allow an operation to return a function as a result. Indeed, although a specification of the form $a \wedge b \wedge c$ is accepted, it is treated as the specification of a function of arity two. Thus, an operation `op` whose specification is $a \wedge (b \wedge c)$ is always applied to two arguments: Monolith does not perform partial applications. Furthermore, the specification $a \wedge (b1 \wedge c1) * (b2 \wedge c2)$ is rejected altogether. This is a consequence of the rules set forth at the beginning of §2: a function result must be deconstructible, and a function is not deconstructible.

Fortunately, these restrictions are superficial and can be worked around. A function type such as $b \rightarrow c$ can be declared as an abstract type `t` and equipped with an identity operation `id` of type $t \wedge b \wedge c$. The operation `op` above can then receive the specification $a \wedge t$. This yields the desired behavior: Monolith applies `op` to just one argument, binds the resulting function to a variable, and (in subsequent operations) can apply this function several times. For convenience, Monolith offers a derived combinator `declare_semi_abstract_type` (not shown in Fig. 2) that does this on the fly. Thus, the operation `op` can be given the specification $a \wedge \text{declare_semi_abstract_type } (b \wedge c)$.

Sequences OCaml’s standard library defines the type `'a Seq.t` to represent on-demand sequences of elements of type `'a`. An element is produced only when the sequence is queried by a consumer. The type of sequences is not an abstract type: instead, it is a function type. It is therefore an example of a procedural abstraction [21].

Sequences can be given Monolith specifications by using the techniques described in the previous two paragraphs. The combinator `ifpol` allows specifying separately how to construct and how to deconstruct sequences. On the construction side, one can generate a sequence essentially in the same way as one generates a list. On the deconstruction side, one can declare a type `seq` of sequences as an abstract type and equip it with a `query` operation whose specification is $\text{seq} \wedge \text{option } (\text{element} *** \text{seq})$. This allows Monolith to demand elements one at a time, and also allows it to make multiple queries (possibly interleaved with other instructions) on a single sequence. This is appropriate when dealing with persistent sequences, which can be queried as many times as one wishes.

The treatment of affine sequences, which can be queried at most once, is slightly different. On the construction side, one must construct a sequence that fails at runtime (by raising an exception) if it is queried twice. This allows detecting a situation where an operation queries an affine sequence several times. On the deconstruction side, Monolith must be instructed that an affine sequence must not be queried twice, so as to prevent it from generating illegal usage scenarios. To do so, one must first map a sequence into a custom representation that supports not only querying a sequence, but also testing whether a sequence is valid (that is, whether it has not yet been queried). This custom representation of sequences (which the end user remains unaware of) is then declared as an abstract type `seq`, whose `query` operation is assigned the specification $\text{valid} \% \text{seq} \wedge \text{option } (\text{element} *** \text{seq})$, where the precondition `valid` prevents Monolith from attempting to query a sequence twice.

¹The reader might remark that this fails to exercise some exotic scenarios, such as a scenario where `fold` is applied to a function that raises an exception, or a scenario where `fold` is applied to a function that invokes `fold` in a reentrant manner. This is true. It is up to the user to think about these scenarios and to decide whether, by not exercising them, she is likely to miss some bugs.

Because sequences are commonly used, Monolith provides two functions `declare_seq` and `declare_affine_seq` (not shown in Fig. 2) that implement these ideas.

Polymorphism Monolith has no explicit support for polymorphic functions or parameterized types. To test a polymorphic function, one must test one or more monomorphic instances of it. Bernardy *et al.* [2] discuss systematic ways of choosing a single monomorphic instance. To work with a parameterized type, such as `'a set`, one can choose to work with a specific monomorphic instance of it, such as `int set`. One can also define a parameterized combinator that represents this parameterized type: as an example, Monolith’s `list` combinator has type `('r, 'c) spec -> ('r list, 'c list) spec`.

Shrinking Monolith does not currently perform any shrinking [9, 14]. AFL provides a tool, `afl-tmin`, which performs a certain amount of shrinking, and appears to give relatively good results. However, because this tool is unaware of the structure of the instruction sequences built by Monolith, its effectiveness remains limited. It would be interesting to build a custom shrinking algorithm into Monolith. A related technique that can be used today is iterated narrowing: as soon as a scenario of length n is reported by Monolith, one can reduce the amount of fuel to n so as to narrow the search space and increase the chances that Monolith finds a shorter scenario.

Life without a reference implementation Monolith requires a reference implementation of the library under test. One might think that this is a limitation. Indeed, it can be difficult to write a simple yet reasonably efficient reference implementation. However, it is in fact possible to use Monolith in the absence of a full-fledged reference implementation. To do so, one provides a trivial reference implementation, whose operations do nothing, and one instructs Monolith to use a trivial comparison relation, which always returns `true`, when comparing a candidate result against a reference result.² This method allows testing the candidate implementation in isolation; it can detect crashes and violations of runtime assertions.

Another interesting idea, suggested by an anonymous reviewer, is to use version n of a library as a reference implementation while testing version $n + 1$ of this library. This technique could conceivably be exploited as part of a continuous integration system.

6 Related Work

Perhaps the best-known and most influential approach to testing in the functional programming community is QuickCheck [9]. QuickCheck offers a library of generators that can construct various kinds of typed data. One popular style of use of QuickCheck is property-based testing, where the user states a universally quantified property, such as `remove x (insert x s) = s`, and the system verifies that a finite number of randomly-selected instances of this property hold. To do so, QuickCheck must generate candidate-side data: if a set `s` is represented in the candidate implementation as a balanced binary search tree, then QuickCheck must be programmed so as to generate such trees. This style is well-suited to a purely functional programming setting, where data structures are immutable and sharing is unobservable, but not to an imperative programming setting, where data structures are mutable and involve sharing. In such a setting, another style of use of QuickCheck, investigated by Claessen and Hughes [5], is model-based testing. This style involves generating sequences of instructions and verifying that the candidate implementation executes them in a manner that is deemed correct with respect to a model. Midtgaard [15] uses this style to test an OCaml implementation of Patricia trees, and finds a

²One is likely to need variants of the combinators `^>>` and `%` that give access to the candidate-side projection instead of (or in addition to) the reference-side projection. We plan to provide these combinators in the future.

bug in it. This bug can be found also by Monolith [17], in a few seconds when in random testing mode, and in about one minute when driven by AFL. This requires using an integer generator that has a nonnegligible probability of producing the integer `min_int`.

Gast [13, 12] seems closely related to QuickCheck and supports the same testing methodologies as QuickCheck.

Monolith encourages model-based testing: it automatically generates and executes sequences of instructions, and requires the user to provide a reference implementation. It can generate concrete data, but does not generate inhabitants of abstract types: it obtains them only as the result of executing instructions. If desired, Monolith can also be used to test properties, such as `remove x (insert x s) = s`. To test this property, one embeds it inside a pseudo-operation of type `element ^> set ^> unit`, whose reference implementation does nothing, and whose candidate implementation tests the property and fails if the property is violated.

Dolan introduces support for AFL in the OCaml compiler and is the author of Crowbar [7], a library of data generators that facilitates property-based testing in conjunction with AFL. Crowbar does not offer any support for model-based testing.

Like Monolith, Articheck [3] requires the user to provide a description of each operation, and executes operations in order to construct values of abstract types. However, it differs from Monolith in several key ways. It does not require a reference implementation: it searches for faults in a candidate implementation. It runs for a long time, potentially accumulating many values of each type, whereas Monolith investigates very short scenarios. When it detects a fault, it cannot print a short scenario that exhibits the fault, whereas Monolith can. Finally, it is not designed to be externally controlled by a fuzzer. The authors of Articheck report being able to detect the balancing violation reported by Filliâtre in OCaml’s AVL trees [8]. This bug is in fact very easy to find: Monolith, in random testing mode, reliably finds it in a few seconds [16]. This requires writing a check function that performs a well-formedness check; the bug cannot otherwise be detected, as it does not endanger functional correctness.

Klein *et al.* [11] perform random testing of Scheme programs that may involve higher-order functions and mutable state. They use higher-order contracts both as generators and as oracles: we use Monolith specifications for the same dual purpose. Whereas we perform code generation and execution at the same time, they separate these tasks. For this reason, code generation has access to the type of every variable, but not to its value, and code generation is performed with the goal of constructing a value of a certain predetermined type. On the positive side, this allows generating an inhabitant of a function type, and allows the generation process to involve backtracking search. On the negative side, this requires exploring a huge search space, and requires generating conditional instructions: this is the case, in particular, when a pre- or postcondition must be met, and when a value of a sum type must be deconstructed.

7 Conclusion

We have presented Monolith, a powerful tool for testing an OCaml library in isolation. Monolith requires a reference implementation and a concise specification of each operation. It supports random testing and fuzzing. Its combinators allow constructing a runtime description of the logical relation that connects the reference and candidate implementations. Monolith’s engine is both a program generator and a dual well-typed interpreter: it generates a scenario and runs it under two distinct interpretations of the library’s abstract types and operations. Although using GADTs to express unary runtime type descriptions and implement well-typed interpreters is by now common [23, 3, 19], this may be the first example of using a GADT to express a binary logical relation and implement a dual well-typed interpreter.

References

- [1] Saswat Anand, Edmund K. Burke, Tsong Yueh Chen, John A. Clark, Myra B. Cohen, Wolfgang Grieskamp, Mark Harman, Mary Jean Harrold, and Phil McMinn. [An orchestrated survey of methodologies for automated software test case generation](#). *Journal of Systems and Software*, 86(8):1978–2001, 2013.
- [2] Jean-Philippe Bernardy, Patrik Jansson, and Koen Claessen. [Testing polymorphic properties](#). In *European Symposium on Programming (ESOP)*, volume 6012 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 125–144. Springer, March 2010.
- [3] Thomas Braibant, Jonathan Protzenko, and Gabriel Scherer. [Articheck: well-typed generic fuzzing for module interfaces](#). In *ACM Workshop on ML*, August 2014.
- [4] Arthur Charguéraud, François Pottier, and Émilie Guermeur. [Sek](#). <https://gitlab.inria.fr/fpottier/sek/>, 2020.
- [5] Koen Claessen and John Hughes. [Testing monadic code with QuickCheck](#). *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, 37(12):47–59, 2002.
- [6] Sylvain Conchon and Jean-Christophe Filliâtre. [Semi-persistent data structures](#). In *European Symposium on Programming (ESOP)*, volume 4960 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 322–336. Springer, April 2008.
- [7] Stephen Dolan. [Crowbar](#). <https://github.com/stedolan/crowbar>.
- [8] Jean-Christophe Filliâtre. [AVL mal équilibrés dans Set](#). <https://github.com/ocaml/ocaml/issues/8176>, June 2003.
- [9] John Hughes. [QuickCheck testing for fun and profit](#). In *Practical Aspects of Declarative Languages (PADL)*, volume 4354 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–32. Springer, January 2007.
- [10] George Klees, Andrew Ruef, Benji Cooper, Shiyi Wei, and Michael Hicks. [Evaluating fuzz testing](#). In *Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*, pages 2123–2138. ACM, October 2018.
- [11] Casey Klein, Matthew Flatt, and Robert Bruce Findler. [Random testing for higher-order, stateful programs](#). In *Object-Oriented Programming, Systems, Languages, and Applications (OOPSLA)*, pages 555–566, October 2010.
- [12] Pieter W. M. Koopman, Peter Achten, and Rinus Plasmeijer. [Model based testing with logical properties versus state machines](#). In *Implementation of Functional Languages (IFL)*, volume 7257 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 116–133. Springer, October 2011.
- [13] Pieter W. M. Koopman, Artem Alimarine, Jan Tretmans, and Marinus J. Plasmeijer. [Gast: Generic automated software testing](#). In *Implementation of Functional Languages (IFL)*, volume 2670 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 84–100. Springer, September 2002.
- [14] Fang-Yi Lo, Chao-Hong Chen, and Ying-Ping Chen. [Shrinking counterexamples in property-based testing with genetic algorithms](#). In *IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation*, pages 1–8, July 2020.
- [15] Jan Midtgaard. [QuickChecking Patricia trees](#). In *Trends in Functional Programming (TFP)*, volume 10788 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 59–78. Springer, 2017.
- [16] François Pottier. [A demo of Monolith: faulty/avl](#). <https://gitlab.inria.fr/fpottier/monolith/-/tree/master/demos/faulty/avl>, 2020.
- [17] François Pottier. [A demo of Monolith: faulty/map](#). <https://gitlab.inria.fr/fpottier/monolith/-/tree/master/demos/faulty/map>, 2020.
- [18] François Pottier. [Monolith](#). <https://gitlab.inria.fr/fpottier/monolith/>, 2020.
- [19] Casper Bach Poulsen, Arjen Rouvoet, Andrew Tolmach, Robbert Krebbers, and Eelco Visser. [Intrinsically-typed definitional interpreters for imperative languages](#). *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 2(POPL):16:1–16:34, 2018.
- [20] Nathan Rebour. [An introduction to fuzzing OCaml with AFL, Crowbar and Bun](#). <https://>

- tarides.com/blog/2019-09-04-an-introduction-to-fuzzing-ocaml-with-afl-crowbar-and-bun, 2019.
- [21] John C. Reynolds. *User-defined types and procedural data structures as complementary approaches to data abstraction*. Technical Report 1278, Carnegie Mellon University, August 1975.
 - [22] John C. Reynolds. *Types, abstraction and parametric polymorphism*. In *Information Processing 83*, pages 513–523. Elsevier Science, 1983.
 - [23] Hongwei Xi, Chiyang Chen, and Gang Chen. *Guarded recursive datatype constructors*. In *Principles of Programming Languages (POPL)*, pages 224–235, January 2003.
 - [24] Michal Zalewski. American Fuzzy Lop. <https://github.com/google/AFL>, 2020.
 - [25] Andreas Zeller, Rahul Gopinath, Marcel Böhme, Gordon Fraser, and Christian Holler. *The fuzzing book: tools and techniques for generating software tests*. <https://www.fuzzingbook.org/>, 2020.