



**HAL**  
open science

## ”These results must be false”: A usability evaluation of constant-time analysis tools

Marcel Fourné, Daniel de Almeida Braga, Jan Jancar, Mohamed Sabt, Peter Schwabe, Gilles Barthe, Pierre-Alain Fouque, Yasemin Acar

### ► To cite this version:

Marcel Fourné, Daniel de Almeida Braga, Jan Jancar, Mohamed Sabt, Peter Schwabe, et al.. ”These results must be false”: A usability evaluation of constant-time analysis tools. 2024 - 33rd USENIX Security Symposium, Aug 2024, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, United States. pp.1-18. hal-04712302

**HAL Id: hal-04712302**

**<https://inria.hal.science/hal-04712302v1>**

Submitted on 27 Sep 2024

**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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

# “These results must be false”: A usability evaluation of constant-time analysis tools

Marcel Fourné<sup>1,4</sup>, Daniel De Almeida Braga<sup>2</sup>, Jan Jancar<sup>3</sup>, Mohamed Sabt<sup>2</sup>, Peter Schwabe<sup>4,5</sup>,  
Gilles Barthe<sup>4,6</sup>, Pierre-Alain Fouque<sup>2</sup>, and Yasemin Acar<sup>1,7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Paderborn University, Paderborn, Germany*

<sup>2</sup>*Rennes University, CNRS, IRISA, Rennes, France*

<sup>3</sup>*Masaryk University, Brno, Czechia*

<sup>4</sup>*MPI-SP, Bochum, Germany*

<sup>5</sup>*Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands*

<sup>6</sup>*IMDEA Software Institute, Madrid, Spain*

<sup>7</sup>*George Washington University, Washington D.C., United States of America*

## Abstract

Cryptography secures our online interactions, transactions, and trust. To achieve this goal, not only do the cryptographic primitives and protocols need to be secure in theory, they also need to be securely implemented by cryptographic library developers in practice.

However, implementing cryptographic algorithms securely is challenging, even for skilled professionals, which can lead to vulnerable implementations, especially to side-channel attacks. For *timing attacks*, a severe class of side-channel attacks, there exist a multitude of tools that are supposed to help cryptographic library developers assess whether their code is vulnerable to timing attacks. Previous work has established that despite an interest in writing constant-time code, cryptographic library developers do not routinely use these tools due to their general lack of usability. However, the precise factors affecting the usability of these tools remain unexplored. While many of the tools are developed in an academic context, we believe that it is worth exploring the factors that contribute to or hinder their effective use by cryptographic library developers [61].

To assess what contributes to and detracts from usability of tools that verify constant-timeness (CT), we conducted a two-part usability study with 24 (post) graduate student participants on 6 tools across diverse tasks that approximate real-world use cases for cryptographic library developers.

We find that all studied tools are affected by similar usability issues to varying degrees, with no tool excelling in usability, and usability issues preventing their effective use.

Based on our results, we recommend that effective tools for verifying CT need usable documentation, simple installation, easy to adapt examples, clear output corresponding to CT violations, and minimal noninvasive code markup. We contribute first steps to achieving these with limited academic resources, with our documentation, examples, and installation scripts<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>Installation scripts, tasks, documentation and codebook are provided as an artifact, see [Footnote 3](#).

## 1 Introduction

Timing attacks [68] are side-channel attacks that measure program execution time to infer information about confidential data. They are practical and can be used by (remote) attackers to achieve full recovery of secrets including cryptographic keys [28]. This makes protection against timing attacks an important goal for developers of cryptographic libraries.

In his seminal work, Kocher [68] observes that making control flow and memory access independent of secret data can help protect programs against timing attacks. Over the years, this guideline has become known as the constant-time discipline, and has become a gold standard for cryptographic libraries. Unfortunately, constant-time programming can be error-prone, especially when programming under stringent efficiency constraints, as is the case for cryptographic libraries. In 2010, Langley developed ctgrind [75], a minimal patch to Valgrind for checking that crypto software is constant-time. Subsequently, the security community has developed a broad variety of tools for protecting against timing attacks. Two recent works [61] and [49] provide an overview of these tools, from complementary perspectives. Jancar *et al.* [61] conduct a survey about the use of constant-time analysis tools with 44 developers of 27 widely deployed open-source cryptographic libraries. Their survey shows that these developers do not leverage constant-time tools despite an interest in writing constant-time code. As reasons, they identify that tools are not ready-to use and their use therefore requires significant time and expertise. Geimer *et al.* [49] presents a systematic evaluation of five selected tools, and identifies several technical roadblocks for the usability of tools. In addition, both works provide a systematic classification of around 40 tools for checking constant-time, and provide recommendations for tool developers and users. Although both [61] and [49] provide valuable insights on these tools, an empirical study to corroborate and deepen their findings has been lacking.

Therefore, in this work, we aim to understand **which factors support and hinder effective use of CT tools** through an empirical usability investigation that analyzes participant

strategies while working with CT tools. Our investigation provides a complementary view on the issues discussed in [61]—which predates this work—and [49]—which was published after we completed the developer study. Our developer study is designed to provide deeper insight into usability requirements and how they influence their interaction with CT tools, to determine the features that tools should provide to achieve their full potential. Due to the broad range of tools, we designed a usability study with six CT tools. The participants of the study are 24 advanced CS students who had knowledge in cryptography (including about CT programming) and C programming. Our study comprises two phases: in the first phase, participants work through tasks escalating in difficulty while familiarizing themselves with a tool; in the second phase, they analyze real-world cryptographic libraries for CT-ness.

We identify usability issues that we group into seven categories that revolve around three high-level aspects: (1) required efforts to setup and start using the tool, (2) barriers and work overhead hindering the use of CT tools, and (3) functionality the developer wants in analysis to identify and fix problems. We aim to answer the following research questions:

**RQ1:** *What are the pain points when trying to use CT tools?*

**A:** Installation, setup for analytic use, and (long term) operationalization in a larger library context are challenges for effective CT tool usage.

**RQ2:** *How helpful are the tools at discovering and fixing problems? Which tool properties help or hinder effective use?*

**A:** Tools can help cut down the amount of work needed to analyze larger code bases rigorously, but if a tool is too much work to install and get to work, cryptographers might just “eyeball” the analysis without the tool. Meaningful documentation to get a tool working on simple examples effectively helps to overcome this.

**RQ3:** *How can we support potential users in using the tools?*

**A:** Easy setup, a set of simple examples to appropriate for the markup (which should be minimal and noninvasive to the source code), a tutorial on how to use the tool and get clear information from the output, and good general documentation were all found to be helpful.

Based on our findings, we suggest how the usability of CT tools can be improved to make CT analysis more accessible to developers. In summary, our contributions in this paper are:

- We concretize the problems mentioned by experts in the Jancar *et al.* survey [61] through a developer study with 24 newly trained potential crypto developers and publish the full procedure material (see **Footnote 3**) for replication.
- We offer a systematization of crypto developer workflow in using CT analysis tools, common to all 49 tools we found (see **Table 3**).
- We document pain points and their impact on crypto developer usage of CT analysis, giving an explanation on why the findings of Jancar *et al.* [61] are still prevalent.
- We propose what to consider during development of CT analysis tools by contrasting prior attempts.

**Supplementary material and disclosure.** We have communicated our results to the authors of the tools included in our study and made the artifacts available to them. We have received four responses; all four expressed interest, one said they plan to link to our study materials in their project. The supplementary material, including tutorials, installation guides, and codebooks is publicly available on a dedicated web page<sup>2</sup> and as an artifact<sup>3</sup>.

## 2 Background & Related Work

We give an overview over the background and related work to this research by first discussing impacts of timing attacks on security, then describing CT development and CT analysis as defenses. For context, we also discuss a new generation of timing attacks that exploit microarchitectural features of CPUs, and the related efforts to protect against these attacks. Finally, we explain how a lack of consideration of human factors in cryptographic development can hinder widespread effective use of cryptography.

**1. Timing attacks.** Since Kocher’s introduction of side-channel vulnerabilities in 1996 [68], these threats have persisted despite significant efforts to address them. Considering the vast range of side-channel attacks, we will highlight a few pivotal moments with a focus on timing attacks. Kocher’s seminal work highlighted vulnerabilities in asymmetric cryptographic algorithms like RSA and DSS through “Timing Attacks”, emphasizing the potential for exploitation based on secret-dependent operation times. In 2002, Tsunoo *et al.* [104, 105] expanded timing attacks to symmetric cryptography, noting vulnerabilities in MISTY1, DES, and suggesting AES being vulnerable to cache-timing attacks. Independent work by Bernstein [13] and Osvik *et al.* [87] confirmed these AES vulnerabilities. In 2003, Brumley and Boneh [28] revealed that these attacks could be conducted remotely via network timings. Subsequent vulnerabilities were discovered in the SSL/TLS libraries [3, 27, 29, 44] and on hardware-assisted defenses, such as Yarom *et al.*’s “CacheBleed” [125]. Kaufman *et al.* [66] also warned of persistent vulnerabilities post-compilation.

Despite these vulnerabilities and an emphasis on fixing them, side channels remain common in numerous platforms [19–21, 46–48, 79, 108, 109]. Some Common Criteria certified devices, despite their countermeasures, were found vulnerable [62]. Moreover, even recent post-quantum cryptographic efforts are affected [26, 54, 88, 89, 103, 113].

**2. Constant-time Analysis.** In this paper, we focus on investigating usability aspects of tools that evaluate timing leakages

<sup>2</sup><https://crocs-muni.github.io/ct-tools/>

<sup>3</sup><https://zenodo.org/records/11143400>

of (cryptographic) software. However, it is worth pointing out that the tools we consider also differ on a technical level in at least four different ways:

First, depending on the approach taken by different tools, they give very different soundness guarantees. Static *formal analysis* can achieve full soundness with regards to some leakage model. Slightly weaker guarantees are offered by tools performing *symbolic execution*; these tools achieve soundness only up to certain upper bounds on loop length. Tools based on *dynamic analysis* typically work with symbolic secret data but concrete public data; they achieve soundness up to code coverage for the concrete public values of the test cases. *Statistical analysis* performs measurements on (large sets of) concrete public and secret data. The advantage is that this approach does not require any leakage model, but on the downside, it also does not provide any soundness guarantees.

Second, the tools work on different levels of compilation. We distinguish tools working on source level, on some intermediate level, or on binary level. An example for a source-level tool would be the information-flow type system implemented by the `secret_integers` crate<sup>4</sup> in Rust. All tools we study (we will give detailed introductions later in Section 3.2) in this paper work on either intermediate-representation (IR) of the LLVM toolchain [90] or on binary level. Tools working on IR level are inherently limited in the sense that they are unable to find any leakages introduced by the compiler when translating from IR to binary [66, 98].

Third, the tools working on binary level differ in what architectures and extensions they support. In order to be used on production code, they need support not just for the core instruction sets of widely used architectures, but also for vector instructions and dedicated crypto extensions.

Finally—and here is where technical features overlap with usability—the tools differ in terms of performance. For example, for the analysis of Langley’s “*donna64*” implementation [74] of Curve25519 [14], the running time of just two of the tools we considered ranges between 0.38 and 225 seconds. This wide range may impact Continuous Integration (CI)/Continuous Deployment (CD) and developer workflows.

Table 3 presents the tools we found and categorized according to prior literature [60], appending a few tools previously not included; similar tables are found in [49, 61]. For each tool, we describe the target of analysis, the techniques used and whether the tools claim to provide some form of formal guarantees. We opted to err on the generous side of claimed soundness guarantees of each tool. For some tools the claims do not easily map to the soundness categories we discussed before, so we keep the unqualified “Other” category from the literature. As usual with this kind of classification, the categories are not exclusive, each tool may combine approaches in its design—we opted to continue with best-effort categorization like the established literature.

<sup>4</sup>See [https://docs.rs/secret\\_integers/](https://docs.rs/secret_integers/).

### 3. Microarchitectural side-channel attacks and defenses

While constant-time programming is still an important and increasingly standard baseline defense against software-visible side channels, research on more advanced microarchitectural attacks in the past few year has shown that this programming discipline is not a sufficient measure. This line of research started with the 2018 Spectre [67] and Meltdown [78] attacks, and has since identified multiple pathways for attacks that often—but not always—exploit speculative execution in modern CPUs. See, e.g., [70, 81, 86, 117].

The notion of constant-time can be extended to protections against more advanced microarchitectural attacks [67], leading to notions of speculative constant-time [31] or more generally of security with respect to a hardware/software leakage contract [58, 82, 83]. Many of the techniques used for analyzing constant-timeness can be extended to reason about speculative constant-time and related notions. In fact, there is already more than two dozen tools that analyze whether a program satisfies (some variant of) speculative constant-time. For an overview of these tools see [30, Fig. 2]; they generally suffer from similar usability issues as tools for constant-time.

Recent work [77, 110, 111] shows that aggressive optimizations used by modern CPUs to improve performance can lead to a new class of timing attacks. Many of the leakages are data-dependent and depend on prior execution history, making their detection extremely challenging. As a consequence, there is a strong incentive to develop analysis tools for checking the counterpart to constant-timeness; see [12, 45] for two very recent examples.

In both cases, we believe that the insights gained from [49, 61] and our work will provide valuable input for improving the usability of future tools in this space.

### 4. Human Factors in Cryptographic Development.

There is a large body of work on human factors in cryptographic development. Acar *et al.* establishes in a 2017 study that poor usability of cryptographic libraries contributes to misuse and insecure code [1]. Haney *et al.* investigate the mindset of cryptography developers [55], and observe that some developers do not adhere to mainstream software engineering practices.

Krueger *et al.* developed a wizard for secure code snippets for specific cryptographic applications, evaluating its effectiveness and usability in a programming study [71–73].

In the specific context of constant-time tools, a study by Cauligi *et al.* [32] was carried out with over 100 students to understand the benefits of the FaCT tool introduced in the paper. The tool support by FaCT is found helpful for generating new code that is CT. In extension of this work, we include a diverse set of CT tools, documentations, tutorials, as well as open source libraries in our study.

Unfortunately, while previous research suggests that lack of usability prevents effective use of security tools [36, 40, 50, 94, 112], and specifically for CT [61], the question of how to improve the usability of these tools has been understudied [2].

### 3 Usability criteria and tool selection

In this section we give a general description of our usability criteria, and explain how they impact users. In addition, we briefly introduce the six included CT tools in our study, organizing our presentation to inspect the previously defined criteria for each tool.

#### 3.1 Usability criteria

The main purpose of our evaluation is to assess the usability of current CT tools, and identify features that impact effective use. To expand on Jancar *et al.* [61], we define criteria revolving around three features: (1) the effort required to setup and familiarize, (2) the work overhead for secret designation and target building, and (3) the quality of output to identify and fix problems.

We define our criteria following how users would perform the tasks related to CT analysis [102]: how users might interact with the tool, what information is given to the user, and how analysis outcome is presented to the user. The categorization of CT testing workflow steps was created from our expert team’s experience in building CT tools and using them on real-world projects, combined with insights gained from piloting the study. We developed the categorization after all of the study results were gathered.

**Installation.** Every tool needs to be installed before use. There are two broad ways of installing CT tools. Some come pre-built and bundled for a package manager or in a container. Others involve manual installation by either building from the source, or by grabbing the available binary from a release page. For the latter method, the developer will be in charge of managing the necessary dependencies manually. CT analysis tools mostly come as proof-of-concept artifacts. According to [57], only 3% of artifacts are distributed in containers, while 23% are pre-built and 70% must be compiled from source code. Therefore, we expect that the installation step of CT tools may be very challenging for numerous tools, especially because of unmaintained dependencies, also confirmed by Jancar *et al.* [61], who point out that libraries maintainers do not consider use of hard-to-install CT tools.

**Familiarization.** Documentation is intended to provide a high-level overview of the tool and offers technical details for expert users. Help materials also include tutorials and examples. In this criterion, we focus on how quickly new users become comfortable running a tool on simple programs.

**Building and Secret Designation.** CT tools provide a means to tag secret data. This is typically achieved via either *code annotation* or the creation of an external function *wrapper*. Many CT tools operate on instrumented binaries or some abstract intermediate representation that is designed for program analysis. Very often, this implies a custom building and linking process. Usability is negatively impacted whenever

manual work is needed during this process. In other words, we look at how much tools modify a project to be analyzed: both in terms of code (for secret designation) and build workflow integration (for target generation). Little work overhead is commonly appreciated [64].

**Analysis Runtime.** Once the target is built, users can actually run the tool for CT analysis. Here, we look at two sub-criteria, the tool’s interface and its runtime. For a command-line interface tool, users may struggle with passing the right options. Importantly, tools are expected to yield results in an acceptable time frame. The longer the runtime of the analysis, the more difficult it is to integrate the analysis into the project workflow [64]. This problem hinders a feedback loop using CT analysis at coding time. This can be important both in CI workflows, which may have an upper time limit, and developer workflows, where each developer may only want to spend a small amount of time waiting for analysis results.

**CT Problem Fixing.** When the analysis is finished, CT tools display some output to direct the developer’s attention to detected issues. The purpose is to provide the developer with enough information to judge whether or not they care about the issue, and if yes, why the tool reports it. For example, it is not helpful if tools just display that there is an issue without any detail about the origin of the leakage. In addition, it is more productive for developers to be able to navigate and manage the list of reported issues. Otherwise, developers must linearly search through the (potentially large) list of results, making selective fixing more difficult.

**Specialized Output Generation.** To improve the experience of fixing problems, users might require customizing the generated analysis output. We introduce two features that we identify for CT tools. First, tools should also offer different verbosity in report details to avoid *excess of information* [50]. For example, a summary mode is beneficial in order to quickly skim the reported vulnerabilities to decide which one to inspect. Second, within the context of a CI pipeline, a delta report can be handy in assisting developers to determine whether a specific leakage has been correctly patched, and that the fix has not induced other leakage.

**Reliability / False Positives.** Ultimately, users need to trust the tool and its analysis. Therefore, any indication of potential false positives or missed issues could undermine user confidence, leading to tool abandonment. Solutions do not necessarily involve sound or complete tools, but also support for filtering user-supplied false positive patterns. This may help the user but can also lead to user filtering actually missing timing leaks, either mistakenly or lazily.

#### 3.2 Tools

We selected six tools for use in our study: MemSan, timecop, dudect, ctverif, BINSEC/REL, and haybale-pitchfork. These

tools were primarily chosen to include a representative from each analysis type. The selection of the tools was made towards the end of 2022, therefore more recent tools were not considered. We prioritized tools well-recognized in the community, ideally those used by developers, gauging their reputation through a recent survey [61]. Out of the tools, 4 (ctverif, MemSan, dudect and timecop) are 4 out of top 5 most known tools in [61], with the top one being ctgrind, which we replaced with the functionally equivalent and still maintained timecop. haybale-pitchfork and BINSEC/REL were selected as representatives of other tool approaches. The number of tools was also constrained by participant numbers to ensure even distribution. At the end of the subsection we compare our choice of tools with the five tools chosen in [49].

**MemSan [99].** MemSan is designed to leverage the Clang built-in memory sanitizer to dynamically analyze binaries for constant-time violations, thereby requiring Clang for installation (which is available in most Linux package managers). Clang sanitizers are well documented, but there is little documentation on how to use MemSan for CT analysis. Concerning secrets, users can declare private variables and/or memory regions containing secrets, and declassify variables within certain code sections if required. To run the tool, developers must compile the program with Clang, using the appropriate option to enable the memory sanitizer. All parts with no enabled sanitization are ignored—it is easy to get this wrong. Then, the analysis is performed by running the resulted binary. Note that only the executed code is analyzed, leading to different conclusions when running the same binary with different inputs. Indeed, code coverage is essential for MemSan. Upon the binary execution, errors will be displayed on branching or memory access indexing an annotated variable. The output details the path between the annotated variable and the cause of leakage. The output messages will be more related to the source code if the target is compiled in debug mode.

**timecop [84].** Similar to MemSan, timecop relies on the Valgrind memcheck module [39] to dynamically analyze binaries for CT violations. Therefore, for installation, it solely requires Valgrind (which is available in most Linux package managers) and an additional C header file that must be downloaded from the project page. The timecop page also contains several tutorials and examples to smooth its first uses by beginners. To analyze code, users need to annotate private variables in the source code and may declassify variables within certain code sections if needed. There is no need for changes in the compilation chain. Concerning the analysis, users can simply run Valgrind on the binary as if they were searching for memory leaks. Valgrind will raise warnings for CT violations just like it would for the use of uninitialized memory in a branching or memory access. The output details the path between the annotated variable and the cause of leakage. timecop relies on the debug information to display the lines of code in its warnings. With its use in SUPERCOP [15], it is widely used.

**dudect [91].** Installation for dudect is virtually non-existent as the tool is provided as a simple archive containing the C header file implementing it. The dudect documentation is rather limited. The tool operates via a black-box evaluation of a function, obviating the need for code annotation. The user, however, is required to implement an external wrapper in charge of setting the analysis parameters and options, as well as two functions to initialize the secret input classes and call the code to assess, respectively. Then, the target program must be compiled (with no custom build) and executed for analysis. The dudect approach is statistical, and it thus outputs values of statistics after code analysis. The output does not underline any source leakage, but only some probabilistic conclusion about the target CTness.

**ctverif [4].** The installation of ctverif presents a significant challenge, requiring undocumented versions of specific dependencies and manual patches across different projects, such as SMACK and Bam-Bam-Boogiemán. Aside from the paper, there is no or little documentation available. As for secret designation, users must declare private and public variables and/or memory regions (arrays) containing secret or public inputs. In addition, they could declassify outputs, and assert the non-overlapping nature of these regions. The tool operation is straightforward, requiring only the source code file as input, in addition to the entry point to analyze. Thus, ctverif does not need any custom build. However, ctverif can process a C translation unit only when all the called functions inside are defined by other input files, otherwise it produces an unknown error. After a run, ctverif only highlights the leakage location in the source code, without a dependency chain of variables or memory locations that lead to each leaked secret. Surprisingly, ctverif may raise some warnings even after a successful run without CT violations. It is worth mentioning that ctverif, instead of making some approximate analysis, informs developers when it cannot conclude about some leakage, displaying inconclusive output.

**BINSEC/REL [38].** BINSEC/REL comes as source code, an extension to the Binsec tool. Some dependencies, such as an SMT solver and the OCaml package manager, shall be installed manually, before compiling the project source available on GitHub. BINSEC/REL offers a comprehensive list of supported command-line options and numerous examples to start with. On the analyzed project, users shall employ markup declarations to annotate the source code, thereby designating public and private data. The analysis of BINSEC/REL operates over binaries. The version utilized in this study only supports ARM 32 and x86\_32 architectures, necessitating the target to be compiled accordingly. This might require to add additional compiler flags, since in numerous compilers, the default mode supports 64-bit. Upon completion of the analysis, a report is produced including the number of CT violations and an assembler dump correlating with the violation location. The assembler dump does not point to the leaked secret, but only

to the instruction causing the leakage. Note that during our study, BINSEC/REL received a major update that integrated the CT checking functionality into the main tool Binsec.

**haybale-pitchfork [106].** Written in Rust, haybale-pitchfork can be installed from source using `cargo`, although its dependencies must be manually installed beforehand as documented on the project page, which includes multiple examples and different documentation materials. haybale-pitchfork runs its analysis over the LLVM intermediate representation. Thus, users need to modify the compilation chain to produce the corresponding LLVM bitcode of the target. Any symbol in the generated bitcode must be correctly resolved, or haybale-pitchfork stops the analysis, while printing a message raising “other errors”. Instead of relying on annotations to mark secrets, users are instructed to implement an external wrapper in Rust, in order to define an abstract signature of the target function. Here, each function parameter can be declared as public or secret using the appropriate Rust type. This wrapper also contains other configurations, such as the bitcode path to inspect. Users carry out the analysis by compiling and executing the Rust wrapper. haybale-pitchfork provides conclusive results, displaying the leakage origin whenever a CT issue is found, together with a tree path to the leaked secret.

**Comparison with the tools of Geimer et al. [49].** Geimer et al. [49] explores five tools in depth: Abacus [9], BINSEC/REL, ctgrind, dudect, and MicroWalk-CI [122]. Two of these tools (BINSEC/REL and dudect) are also included in our study. As explained above, we selected timecop and MemSan over ctgrind, because the ctgrind patches are outdated and do not work with recent versions of Valgrind and the Linux kernel anymore. In contrast, timecop and MemSan can be seen as more usable versions of ctgrind. We did not select Microwalk-CI [122], because it was released after we had initiated our study. We also did not select Abacus, because its focus is quantitative information flow rather than constant-timeness. We included ctverif for its strong correctness and coverage guarantees. We also included haybale-pitchfork, as an instance of a tool that covers both constant-time and speculative constant-time—however, to our knowledge, the tool was eventually not extended to speculative constant-time.

## 4 Methodology

In this section, we provide details on the procedure and structure of the study we conducted with (initially) 31 participants. We describe the experimental setup including choice of libraries, surveys, and experimental infrastructure. We also describe our coding process of qualitative data, including participant behavior and free-text responses, as well as the approach for statistical analysis of quantitative data, such as success measures and quantitative survey items. Finally, we explain our data collection and ethical considerations, and discuss the limitations of this work.




Figure 1. Study flow for each participant.

**1. Recruitment and Participants.** Due to the challenges of recruiting professional developers with security expertise, we targeted CS students for participation. We engaged Master’s and early PhD students from 5 universities across 4 countries, as recommended by [101]. From the 74 students we approached with an eligibility survey, 31 began the study. A tools assignment error led us to exclude one participant.

**Eligibility Criteria.** We only consider participants having the minimum knowledge necessary to run CT tools. We asked them to self-report their knowledge of the C programming language and the CT paradigm. Naturally, considering our usability criteria, we also verify that they had never used any of the tools that are part of this study. Finally, to distinguish our work from [61], participants needed to lack experience in working on production-quality cryptographic code.

**Compensation.** Participants were compensated with 200 euros on completion of the study in exchange for 16 hours of participation; this compares to the hourly payment for student research assistants in participating countries.

**2. Study Procedure.** After a short eligibility and demographics survey which preceded the study, we asked participants to assess code for vulnerability to timing attacks using a CT verification tool across ten tasks that escalated in complex-

ity, as well as to audit (parts of) two cryptographic libraries. Assignment of participants to tools and libraries was done by hand, following a pattern of complete coverage of all possible tool combinations. The study flow is described below as well as visualized in Fig. 1.

During the study, participants were assigned ten successive *repair tasks*—tasks building upon tool-support specifics tested in prior tasks, which we will explain in detail—in which they were instructed to use a pre-installed CT analysis tool (`tool 1`) to identify whether a given code snippet is CT regarding a well-defined secret. If the code was not CT, participants were asked to fix it. The repair tasks represent textbook examples of secret-dependent branching and memory access, and their CT variant. After working on the first task, participants were given a tutorial that we had written for the tool. After the second task, we gave them the solutions to previous tasks, to be used as examples. Tasks 3 to 8 added various elements to increase difficulty, such as calls to `libc` functions (`memcmp`), reading randomness from the operating system and particular source code designed to trigger optimization during compilation. The goal of these repair tasks is to assess the participants’ ability to use the tool to evaluate and fix a rather simple code snippet.

After completing work on the ten repair tasks (or exhausting the allotted time of 8 hours), and so becoming familiar with the tool, we asked them to audit well-known cryptographic libraries using the same tool (`tool 1`). In this *audit task*, participants were asked to compile the library (`library 1`) in such a way that enables them to use the tool, and audit a much larger code base. They were pointed at potentially interesting parts of the library, but not at specific functions. After a first library audit with a tool they had used for the entire study up to that point, we provided them with a new tool (`tool 2`), a tutorial, and a new library (`library 2`) to start a second audit task. These audit tasks aim at assessing the tools’ usability in a setting more closely resembling a real-world use case.

For both parts of the study, we consider that a participant successfully completed a task if they underline the CT violation using the respective CT tool, and recognize it as such to fix it. The task structure was monolithic, simply stating that the task was to find CT violations with the given tool. Participants had to find out the necessary steps themselves.

After each of the repair tasks, participants were given a brief survey asking about their results (was the code CT or not, etc.), their experience with the tool during the task, and issues they encountered. After the last of the repair tasks, we gave participants a longer exit survey, which included the System Usability Scale [24] and questions regarding their overall experience with the tool. Participants were asked, e.g., whether they trust their tool to give them correct results and what their biggest problem was while using it. A similar survey was included after each audit task.

**Instrument Development.** Our group of authors consisted of experts in cryptographic engineering, side-channel attacks,

and CT tool developers, as well as one human-factors researcher. We based the study development on our usability criteria and related features. We also let our experience with the development of cryptographic libraries and CT verification tools (as authors as well as users) influence the study design. The human-factors researcher introduced and facilitated the use of human-factors research methodology to better explore the identified usability criteria. In particular, the human-factors researcher explained methods when appropriate, facilitated discussions and helped the team to develop the study, pilot it, gather feedback, and evaluate the results.

**Pre-Testing.** Three co-authors dry-ran the study, followed by one student from the targeted population. Using their feedback we updated, expanded, and clarified the study.

**Time Frame.** Every participant had a recommended and self-enforced time limit of 8 hours to work on each part of the study (repair and audit, thus a total of 16 hours), within a soft frame of 2 weeks. We allowed extension of the 2-week time frame. Participants, although encouraged to fully use their time, were allowed to hand in their results earlier.

**Repair Task Details.** The first four of our tasks demonstrate the main points of the CT criterion: Secret-dependent branching and secret-dependent memory access. Repair tasks 01 and 02 are non-CT and CT examples of a selection based on a secret value, once with a branch and once with an arithmetic transformation like the one presented by Schwabe at ShmooCon 2015 [96]. Repair tasks 03 and 04 are likewise memory accesses depending on a secret value or boolean arithmetic for selecting a value loaded from all addresses without depending on the secret for the load address.

Repair task 05 introduces the use of a C programming language standard library function, `memcmp`, which is non-CT, to compare secret values. Tools which depend on static binaries and cannot inspect dynamically loaded libraries—which are the majority of deployed software today—are expected to fail here and show no CT violation. Repair task 06 includes a system call to read random numbers. System calls are on most operating systems implemented in a way that cannot be seen from user space, the memory area that is analyzable to most CT analysis tools. The tools can work around this, for example by recognizing a set of known system calls and their expected behavior. This task greatly differs from previous tasks, as it does not include secrets, but only checks for support analyzing this code. Task 07 starts to build up problems toward a harder criterion than CT - probabilistic CT, which is a criterion for functions that behave CT by default except for a subset of cases. Indeed, the program reads a random number like in task 06, but in 1 out of 256 cases, it will perform secret-dependent branching like in task 03. This may sound easy to spot manually by most users, but statistics-based CT tools were expected to underperform on this task. Task 08 introduces a different, and on first sight trivial problem: the same function is called, but in two branches based on the value of a secret. This may seem to be CT, but in practice a



compiler may transform this into assembly code that does not branch on the secret, even though in the given source code the CT criterion is violated. The intent behind this task is to see if the abstraction level of a tool, whether it works on binaries or instrumented source code, has a measurable impact on the success of participants. Task 09 makes the compiler transform impossible by changing the branching structure, passing a secret variable as a function input. The called function just returns a constant, which makes the whole program CT. Finally, task 10 is distinguished from previous tasks. It is formally non-CT and can be repaired in two non-obvious ways: users can either make it CT, but only probabilistically correct, or correct, but only probabilistically CT. With this last task, we wanted to see how participants pick up on less trivial code, inspired by techniques used in some cryptographic algorithms recently standardized by NIST, such as Kyber [10, 18] and Dilithium [43].

**3. Study Setup.** Our tool selection is explained in [Section 3.2](#). Note that one of the included tools (BINSEC/REL) did receive a substantial update during the study, that we did not include as not to invalidate our study.

In order to have similar working environments, we deployed one VM for each tool, and gave SSH access to the participants. Each participant had restricted access to their home directory, with all necessary material (such as instructions and source code of the task and the library) available. For each resource, a clean copy was available as read-only in case they needed a fresh start. We decided to pre-install the tools on the VMs. The reasoning for that choice is twofold.

First and foremost, most tools are the outcome of academic research, and served the purpose of demonstrating new techniques and approaches, without aiming for maintainability. Hence, some tools are not maintained, and rely on specific version of dependencies that are outdated and deprecated. This can make the installation particularly complex and time consuming, especially on recent systems. Second, given that participants using the same tools were co-located on a VM, we could deploy the tool globally to ensure a functional setup, and avoid unintentional corruption of the tool by participants.

As an effort to make the first step easier, we implemented installation scripts for each tool present in our study—for possible difficulties in the installation phase, see Reynolds et al. [92]. We made them publicly available (see [Footnote 3](#)), along with the repair tasks and a small functional tutorial we provided to the participants. We hope this can prove useful, and motivate tool developers to do the same.

To make sure the participants have something to find in the audit tasks, we needed to include libraries that had problems with CT-ness, therefore we chose the following: two of them—OpenSSL and GNUTLS/Nettle—were chosen because they are in ubiquitous use in open-source software projects. The other—mbedtls—was chosen because it was common *and* is targeted more for use on embedded devices. Other libraries

like BearSSL were not included due to fewer documented CT issues and fewer prior audits of those libraries compared to the first two. We specifically audited the libraries ourselves, first, to see if participants can meaningfully find code that is non-CT in those libraries, either by looking at public documentation and then verifying with a CT verification tool, or direct analysis. All three chosen libraries document which parts of their code bases are not expected to be CT, so our participants could be expected to find them.

**4. Coding and Analysis.** All qualitative coding and data analysis were done by multiple researchers from a set of four, each coding part done by at least two, from diverse backgrounds and views. All of those researchers were familiar with CT verification, open-source and cryptographic code development practices, while two researchers had additional experience with human factors research with developers. We followed the process for thematic analysis [22]. The four coders familiarized themselves with the free-text answers in their part of the analysis, adding annotations and developing themes as well as codebooks.

Codebooks were first developed deductively based on the questions on each subtask, then changed inductively. The codebooks were iteratively changed while extracting themes from the free-text answers. Coders discussed until agreement was reached to make unanimous decisions; we therefore do not calculate inter-coder reliability [80]. The codebooks codify experiences—good or bad—as well as misconceptions, insecurities, and wishes encountered during the study’s surveys.

**5. Data Collection and Ethics.** Our invitations were sent to participants of thematically fitting courses of five participating universities. We invited students by emailing them individually. During and after the study they could opt-out of participation. We only linked participants names to results for payment, not during analysis and not by members of the research team who had prior contact to those students. We keep the participant responses as confidential as possible and do not link quotes to them by name, only by pseudonyms. The study protocol and consent forms (for study participation and surveys) were approved by our lead institution’s data protection officer and ethics board, who determined that the study poses minimal risk. Identifying data of the participants, like names, email addresses, and payment information, were stored separately from study data, and were only used to contact the participants; we did not retain any identifying data in excess of following laws.

**6. Data cleaning & Presentation.** From the 74 students we invited, 31 started our study, of which we were able to use the results of 24 participants. We only evaluate the results of participants who finished a meaningful part of our study and

compared results with and without familiarization with each tool on each library to offset possibly bad pairings, but did not find any meaningful differences between the two groups. As for the 7 incomplete results, we were not meaningfully able to incorporate them in most of the statistics—to not over represent results from simpler tasks—but we used partial results that were complete in appropriate sections.

Participants were paid for and expected to spend two days of eight hours each on the study, leaving rich free text comments in the surveys as well as comments in source code of their task solutions. We received mixed feedback, from disillusioned responses to high interest in further research on CT verification and coding practice. Generally, the feedback to our study was positive, even when the comments about the experience with some tasks were less so.

**7. Familiarization.** By design of our study, we set our participants up for familiarization with one tool each, then we ask to analyze a common real-world cryptographic library with the same tool. The repair tasks during the familiarization procedure were optimized for familiarization with the tool from simple examples to simplified current research problems.

**8. Limitations.** Survivorship bias [76] might taint the results, due to the study not reporting all the results of participants which dropped out. Selection bias due to comparatively high requirements in recruiting for the study as well as selective perception due to recruiting from student population who is accustomed to writing exams and tests might both also be relevant, but are both similar to the population which might use one of the CT tools. Participants may have reported more familiarity with the subject matter than they actually had, but due to our recruiting criteria, this was limited to a minimum actually necessary for participation. Our study may also suffer from the typical effects of fatigue in participating in a study, frustrations, and, of course, took place during the later years of the COVID-19 pandemic. Finally, our low participant numbers (due to the significant time investment and prerequisites) does not allow for statistical inference; we report numbers to highlight trends and/or outstanding observations.

**Problem Fixing.** When participants marked a repair task as already constant-time they were not asked to fix the code.

**Library Selection.** The projects we included for the audit task represents a selection and are not representative of all open-source cryptographic libraries. We are aware that other libraries might lead to different usability results.

**Unknown Code.** Our participants were not familiar with the cryptographic libraries used in this study. Annotating and custom-building are likely to be different when analyzing a project the participants are familiar with. Developers might achieve different results if they have a rough overview of the code base. We expect completing the repair tasks to be easier to our participants than the open-ended audit tasks.

**VMs, Tutorials, and Examples.** By including ready-made virtual machines with each installed CT tool, combined with layered introduction of tasks and documentation, not restricting online documentation and providing some as a backup ourselves, we provided our participants with a best-case scenario to learn how to work with each of the tools. Participants could approach the study as they saw fit, while being able to adapt example solutions and their own prior solutions to everything after a first introduction to the base cases for CT programming practice in minimal examples (tasks 01 to 04). This was a trade-off to gather more data about all CT analysis steps, not being stuck over installation or finding documentation. Nevertheless, this means that our participants had an easier task with the tools than users would have in real world.

## 5 Results

Tool (Tech., Guar.)	Repair	Audit 1	Audit 2
BINSEC/REL (Sy, ●)	33.5 (3.8)	38.7 (11.8)	45.6 (7.2)
ctverif (F, ●)	30.6 (18.4)	34.4 (8.5)	31.5 (14.8)
dudect (St, ○)	53.1 (29.1)	65 (5.9)	59.4 (23.8)
haybale-pitchfork (Sy, ●)	64.4 (6.6)	52.5 (13.7)	50.6 (26.6)
MemSan (Dy, ●)	49.5 (20.3)	41.3 (22)	49.4 (20.1)
timecop (Dy, ●)	71.2 (6)	69.4 (10.3)	70.6 (24.1)

Table 1. Average and standard deviation of System Usability Scale scores from exit surveys after repair and audit tasks.

Technique: Sy—Symbolic, St—Statistics, Dy—Dynamic, F—Formal  
Guarantees: ●—sound, ●—sound with restrictions, ○—no guarantee

Table 1 showcases the System Usability Scale (SUS) scores [24] for each tool on both repair and audit tasks. The SUS is supposed to give a quick overview of a tool’s overall usability; a score above 68 would be “above average” across software types. From the scores presented, usability remains fairly consistent between repair and audit, with notable exceptions for haybale-pitchfork, which had a noticeable dip during audits, and dudect, which exhibited enhanced usability in the audit tasks. Among the tools, timecop has the highest and most consistent score, suggesting superior usability. In contrast, ctverif and BINSEC/REL emerge as the least usable. For the correctness of solving the repair tasks, see Table 2.

Through thematic analysis of feedback during repair tasks, we identified common usability issues with the tools. Feedback points, categorized according to our codebooks, often overlapped, except for the “no issue” category. The distribution, depicted in Fig. 2, gave insights into tool perceptions and task challenges.

In Section 6, we delve into the diverse factors impacting usability, as organized by the criteria introduced in Section 3.1, and report on participants’ confidence in their results. Each criterion corresponds to a step in detecting/fixing CT violations, and each subsequent step depends on the success of its predecessor. Those who encountered initial setbacks of-




Figure 2. Participant’s major issues during the repair tasks. (Left) For tools over all tasks. (Right) For tasks over all tools.

ten did not report in the later stages. This was particularly pronounced when auditing real-world software libraries.

Our findings spotlight factors affecting the tools’ usability: Clear and intuitive outputs stood out as extremely important, and a lack of beginner-friendly documentation emerged as a recurrent issue. Though well-structured documentation is invaluable during the familiarization phase, participants reported distinct challenges as they delved deeper into the tools, but mixed with positive feedback as well. This disparity became evident when contrasting feedback between standard textbook examples and real-world audits, emphasizing different stages of tool assimilation.

Although the participants were equipped with the tools for the tasks, their installation and setup experiences could not be included in our data as we set up the tools for them.

**1. Familiarization.** During the first task, the main issue reported was unclear and non-user-friendly documentation, with 16 complaints (18 overall). Although the tools had associated academic papers, participants felt these didn’t serve as effective documentation. They particularly missed step-by-step setup and results interpretation examples. “[T]he documentation about every command doesn’t exist or I didn’t find them. Maybe a beginner-friendly aspect of the tool would have been good for me to start.” (P19)

Notably, participants had no complaints about ctverif documentation—possibly due to its basic user interface—but most of them faced issues with its operational aspects until they consulted our tutorial.

Despite the issues, our study also highlighted successes in the familiarization phase. Concise, beginner-focused documentation was identified as a significant upside in enhancing user engagement. The turnaround is likely a direct result of the tutorial we provide upon the completion (or non-completion) of the first task.

None of the participants managed to solve the second task using ctverif, and all expressed complaints about the output. After the tutorial and solution were provided, 3 out of the 4 participants were able to solve the subsequent task. This improvement persisted through the remaining tasks and can be

attributed largely to the alleviation of difficulties in correctly interpreting the output and running the tool.

The effect was similar with BINSEC/REL. While none of the participants solved the first task, 4 out of 5 successfully solved the second task following the tutorial.

We noticed that our tutorials had a particularly strong impact on the usage of dudect, a tool that elicited the most complaints about lack of documentation. One participant even expressed their appreciation with the following: “Great tutorial about dudect on the previous study page. Why it is not included in the official documentation?” (P31)

Overall, the tutorial was appreciated for every tool in the repair tasks, as suggested by the following quote. “I am just really using the template provided in the tutorial” (P14),

During the audit task, 15 struggled to start using the tool, despite our tutorial. This was especially true for BINSEC/REL (3), ctverif (5) and haybale-pitchfork (4). Complaints mainly referred to lack of guidance in more complex tool usage, such as hooking functions, or bypassing some tool limitations. Tools with a more straightforward functioning, such as timecop and MemSan, did not suffer from these complaints.

**2. Building and Secret Designation.** This crucial preprocessing step is fraught with complexity, leading to 30 complaints from the study’s participants during the repair task.

Central to the participants’ challenges was the task of designating the secret within the given code snippets. The complexities arose either from the need to annotate the code, leading to 17 complaints, or the requirement to design a wrapper, which received 7 grievances in total. In particular, the annotation APIs provided by BINSEC/REL and ctverif were deemed overly complicated. This perspective was substantiated by 7 and 9 complaints, respectively, suggesting poor usability. In contrast, MemSan and timecop offered more streamlined processes, simply enabling users to flag a memory region as secret. The challenge of implementing external wrappers for tools like dudect and haybale-pitchfork was accentuated by insufficient documentation, evidenced by 4 and 3 feedback reports. A unique challenge presented by haybale-pitchfork was its reliance on the Rust language, which impeded 3 par-

ticipants. This prerequisite even pushed one to abandon the study. Hesitance to continue, even when participants were provided with ready-to-use tools and monetary encouragement, underscores usability concerns for the target user base.

Interestingly, the audit tasks unveiled a new set of foundational hurdles. A seemingly rudimentary step - local library installation - became a roadblock for 13 participants across all tools. While participants found the compilation of minor repair tasks with specified options manageable, the challenge escalated when they had to adapt intricate compilation chains to enable the tool use. In this regard, 16 participants faced hurdles when gearing up the libraries for suitable compilation to enable analysis. The architectural constraints of BINSEC/REL, especially the need to compile libraries for a 32-bit architecture, caused difficulties for 7 participants (given the study reliance on an older tool version). haybale-pitchfork posed its unique challenge, with 5 participants coping to generate the necessary bitcode of the library. The tools dudect and haybale-pitchfork added another layer of complexity by necessitating external wrappers, proving problematic for 4 and 1 users. The demands of accurate code annotation further intensified the complexities during this phase for 4 participants. This was notably severe for BINSEC/REL users and MemSan, 2 reports each. Overall, 10 participants faced significant hurdles in advancing further in the library audit, and did not manage to run the tool. 6 of them were blocked when using ctverif.

**3. Analysis Runtime.** In the context of the repair tasks, while many tools were wielded effortlessly on multiple tasks—indicated by the "no issue" category in Fig. 2—both BINSEC/REL and ctverif manifested signs of a higher barrier, even for tasks that appeared superficially straightforward. Specifically, BINSEC/REL was utilized seamlessly on 15 occasions, whereas ctverif demonstrated hassle-free operation only 9 times. We want to highlight the particular difficulty participants faced with BINSEC/REL during the first repair task. Users were presented with a multitude of options, some of which tangential to the main task, leading to 3 complaints.

The audit phase, characterized by the need to analyze larger code bases, brought forth a different set of issues. The time-consuming nature of the analysis was a concern, particularly for haybale-pitchfork and dudect. Analysis processes were identified as overly protracted by 1 and 2 participants respectively. This drawn-out analysis underscored concerns over the efficiency and practicality of these tools in real-world settings.

**4. CT Problem Fixing.** A preliminary glance at the success metrics in utilizing the tools, referenced in Table 2, exhibited significant disparities among the tools. Some adopted a tool-reliant strategy, while others, having initially engaged with a tool, later pivoted to manual code analysis. Given the easy nature of most tasks, forcing participants to resort to manual analysis is a witness of poor usability. We recorded these events mostly with ctverif, BINSEC/REL and dudect.

Participants unanimously agreed that discerning the leakage and subsequently mitigating it constituted the principal challenges. These were reflected in 77 grievances. The main subset of these, amounting to 51, expressed that after detecting the leakage, the repair process itself posed difficulties. These difficulties could arise from both details of the tasks and participants' limited familiarity with CT programming. The documentation most consulted by participants was related to CT programming methodologies, suggesting that the primary impediment might be their inexperience in this domain rather than difficulties with the tools themselves. We think this inexperience is not an impediment to use the tools, just in fixing more advanced problems in the code. This observation aligns with our expectations given the demographic we recruited for the study.

Tool outputs and how to interpret them emerged as a recurring concern, in 26 documented instances. Participants grappled with either a lack of comprehensive documentation to interpret the output (15 instances) or ambiguous outputs that did not offer a conclusive determination on the code CTness (11 instances). Here, dudect and haybale-pitchfork stood out for their clarity and precision as seen from little complaints in participant feedback. This likely results from tools concluding their analysis with a definitive statement about the status of the analyzed code, whereas other tools tend to provide information about possible issues, which can be confusing for beginners. BINSEC/REL and ctverif gathered criticism for occasional vagueness, with 2 and 9 mentions.

The relatively fewer complaints associated with dudect (3 instances) can likely be attributed to its methodology and careful wording of reports.

Even though we knew of pre-existing CT violations, 12 participants reported to be unable to detect any of them. These observations include use of haybale-pitchfork (4 participants) and BINSEC/REL, dudect, and timecop (2 participants). For both MemSan and ctverif it was reported once.

**5. Specialized Output Generation.** Participants voiced concerns with the verbosity and confusing nature of elaborate error reports. A segment of the study population—3 participants out of 24—grappled with decoding these verbose outputs during the audit tasks. These participants found it challenging to distinguish actual CT violations amid the warnings, and were overwhelmed by the volume of output. Specifically, participant feedback highlighted ctverif as the most problematic in this regard, accounting for 3 complaints. These complaints were directed toward errors preventing its proper usage, and not CT violations. timecop had 2 mentions, while other tools, barring haybale-pitchfork, were criticized once each.

**6. Reliability / False Positives.** Throughout the repair tasks, participants expressed skepticism regarding the tools, registering 18 complaints centered on perceived reliability issues.

Tool	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Task 5	Task 6	Task 7	Task 8	Task 9	Task 10
BINSEC/REL	0%	40%	80%	100%	80%	40%	100%	80%	80%	60%
ctverif	25%	0%	75%	75%	100%	50%	67%	67%	100%	33%
dudect	60%	100%	75%	100%	100%	50%	75%	75%	75%	50%
MemSan	60%	60%	100%	60%	100%	75%	67%	100%	100%	0%
haybale-pitchfork	80%	100%	100%	75%	75%	75%	100%	100%	100%	75%
timecop	75%	100%	100%	75%	75%	50%	25%	75%	75%	50%
<b>Mean</b>	50%	67%	88%	81%	88%	57%	72%	83%	88%	45%

Table 2. Proportion of participants who solved each task per assigned tool (rounded to the nearest percent).

Such concerns typically revolved around reports of false positives (recorded 4 times), false negatives (4 times), mistrust in the results (2 instances), or specific tool reasoning limitations (8 times). Among all the tools evaluated, timecop stood out with no reliability complaints. In stark contrast, MemSan found itself at the receiving end of the most criticisms—amounting to 5, predominantly targeting perceived limitations in its analysis. BINSEC/REL follows with the same amount of complaints, but mostly on false positive.

9 participants successfully modified task 10, which was designed to be easily detectable as non-CT yet challenging to fix, in a manner where they discussed their solutions statistically probable CT-ness or correctness compared to the given setting. These successes provide a valuable insight: even when faced with complex tasks, participants can learn and adapt to the nuances of the tools. Due to our provided documentation and the ramp-up of repair task difficulty, we allege that these findings underline the significant role of quality documentation in the tool experience.

Upon transitioning to library audits, participants generally exhibited more restraint in identifying false positives or negatives than in the repair tasks. They mostly expressed low confidence in their analysis, evidenced by 20 self-report on low confidence. *“I have very low confidence in these results that must be false due to my usage of the tool.”* (P06) This reticence was particularly pronounced for BINSEC/REL and MemSan, which gathered 5 and 4 reports, respectively. The participants detected few to no CT violations while analyzing libraries using haybale-pitchfork. This was reported 4 times. With BINSEC/REL, dudect and timecop, only two such cases were reported, and with MemSan and ctverif only one each. Low detection rates are usually correlated with issues during prior steps of the analysis, whether for preparing the library for audit or for using the tool. We conclude this by looking at inter repair task success rates in the first part of the study.

Despite the grievances recorded, most tools, except for ctverif, proved effective in detecting non-CT code during the audit tasks. dudect emerged as the front runner, recording 6 reports of successful detection, followed by BINSEC/REL and timecop, which facilitated 4 reports of discoveries each. Further, haybale-pitchfork accounted for 2 instances, and MemSan contributed 1 finding. We regard these outcomes as practical successes in identifying potential CT-violating bugs in

the analyzed open source production code. We did not report these known and (upstream) documented findings.

## 6 Discussion

Building on the results of our study, we discuss the usability of different tools and make a series of recommendations based on the different stages of usage used in our study.

### 6.1 Usability vs verification approaches

Our results provide relevant information on the usability of tools relative to the verification approach they use.

Our study suggests that users found dudect intuitive to use. On the other hand, the underlying approach of statistical time measurement demands a strategic minimization of test parts when dealing with large code bases. Interestingly, the technique that lengthened dudect’s processing time might have also contributed to its user-friendliness. The developers of dudect appeared to balance precision with early termination options for less accurate but faster results. Consequently, our participants found the output more intuitive. Whether participants knew they were trading accuracy for speed is unclear. Although it operates as a *“black box”*, a careful balance of precision, speed, and clarity in dudect made it an effective tool for our participants, as seen from their success rates—as seen in [Table 2](#)—and feedback.

Dynamic instrumentation tools often have a tug-of-war between technical efficiency and user experience, posing challenges during the setup phase. MemSan also faced significant trust issues due to perceived unreliability. timecop stood out with its blend of efficiency and user-friendliness. haybale-pitchfork, proficient yet challenging for some users, hinted at possible issues in the prior analysis steps.

Formal analysis tools, namely BINSEC/REL and ctverif, stand out due to their capacity to offer strong guarantees based on rigorous semantics. While robust, the theoretical foundation of these tools can come at a cost in terms of user experience. Specifically, ctverif presented a series of usability hurdles, from its initial installation to operational procedures. Many participants encountered challenges despite being provided with a working installation and sample use cases, leading to less successful task resolutions. In addi-

tion, our participants did not report particularly more trust in ctverif’s output, despite the strong guarantees it claims. On the other hand, BINSEC/REL demonstrated that it is possible to maintain strong analytical guarantees while ensuring a more straightforward setup and operational process. This contrast between the two tools underscores the significance of balancing analytical capabilities with an intuitive user experience when time efficiency and ease of use are highly valued [61].

Our study offers a nuanced perspective on the usability-efficacy spectrum of different analysis tools. While strong guarantees are a primary concern, the trade-offs with usability can sometimes diminish a tool’s practical application. The findings emphasize the need for tool developers to prioritize both rigorous analysis capabilities and a seamless user experience, ensuring that state-of-the-art tools are not just theoretically sound but also practically adoptable.

## 6.2 Recommendations

We combine the data from our empirical study with expert insights to curate a suite of recommendations. Our observations indicate that the tool usage is divided into multiple stages. Of particular concern, inhibiting complexities at early stages can deter users from progressing.

**Installation.** Many tools have a large number of dependencies and require custom building paths. As a result, installing these tools may be highly challenging in the mid-term, even if all the tool’s dependencies are maintained. From study setup and piloting we extract the following recommendations:

- Reduce and avoid less maintained dependencies.
- Make tools available via package managers.

A more general recommendation would be to embrace the best practices of open-source software development, which has a long, integrated maintenance period and is often available as native packages in software distributions—native packages through distributions also make for discoverable tools.

**Familiarization.** After installation, users may run the tool on common examples, in this case crypto libraries, just to make sure that the tool is indeed running, and without caring for the tool’s results. However, there are many obstacles to such dry runs. This includes, for instance, the need to compile libraries using specific compilation flags, different from the flags used to produce code, or the need to rewrite libraries to overcome limitations in the coverage of the tool. To avoid such situations and to ensure that tools provide adequate support for beginners, we make the following recommendations:

- Provide support for processing inline assembly and vectorized cryptographic code.
- Provide support for processing precompiled code, statically or dynamically linked.
- Provide user-friendly examples amenable to adaptations.
- Design intuitive tutorials catering to novices, and covering all the aspects of tool-usage.

- Prioritize a comprehensive documentation structure, accentuating essentials before delving into details. Make sure that the documentation avoids overly specialized jargon.

The latter recommendations are based on the feedback from the study participants.

**Secret Designation.** Most constant-time tools require users to provide security annotations. The annotations are typically given in the code or through some external wrapper. Moreover, many cryptographic libraries require users to declassify computations, for example to make ciphertexts public. From prior literature on different tool designs and their problem areas, we extract the following recommendations:

- Make annotations simple and external in additional files.
- Provide mechanisms to declare internal secrets [49].
- Provide mechanisms to allow to *declassify* computations.

**Output generation.** Results of analysis tools must be semantically rich, easy to navigate, and exploitable in a broader setting. Based on our interpretation of the results of the study, and our expertise, we make the following recommendations:

- Provide output that is readily understandable by users, including origin of leakage.
- Offer the possibility to report all leakage violations at once. Deduplicate findings in order to avoid repeating violations.
- Offer export formats for integration with bug-tracking tools.
- Have a delta mode for CI.

**Analysis Runtime.** For integration into users’ workflows or CI, analysis should be possible in reasonable time—we think a few minutes are fine even for interactive use, but hours or longer are not. From Jancar et al. [61] as well as our own study participants’ feedback and the CPU utilization of our study setup, we make the following recommendations:

- Use progress indicators (progress bar or logs) to ensure the user understands the tool is not stalled.
- If applicable, leverage multiple CPU cores for large tasks.

## 7 Conclusion

We collected data from 24 participants using 6 CT analysis tools to analyze small tasks and audit 3 open-source cryptographic libraries that are documented not to be fully CT. Our broad conclusion is that CT analysis tools have usability shortcomings that prevent them from being integrated into developers’ workflows. Although our analysis focused on CT tools, we believe that many of our findings also apply to tools for analyzing microarchitectural side-channels. We believe the community should address these shortcomings by focusing on a handful of easy-to-use and maintained tools that go beyond the CT leakage model and cover a broad range of leakage models.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the European Commission through the ERC Starting Grant 805031 (EPOQUE). J. Jancar was supported by MV AI-SecTools (VJ02010010) project and by Red Hat Czech. Daniel De Almeida Braga was funded by the Direction Générale de l'Armement (Pôle de Recherche CYBER). We thank Anna Lena Rothaler, our anonymous reviewers, and our shepherd for helpful comments. We thank all participants for their time and effort spent on this research.

## References

- [1] Yasemin Acar, Michael Backes, Sascha Fahl, Simson L. Garfinkel, Doowon Kim, Michelle L. Mazurek, and Christian Stransky. Comparing the usability of cryptographic APIs. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2017*, pages 154–171. IEEE, 2017.
- [2] Yasemin Acar, Sascha Fahl, and Michelle L. Mazurek. You are not your developer, either: A research agenda for usable security and privacy research beyond end users. In *IEEE Cybersecurity Development, SecDev 2016*, pages 3–8, Boston, MA, USA, November 2016. IEEE.
- [3] Martin R. Albrecht and Kenneth G. Paterson. Lucky microseconds: A timing attack on Amazon's *s2n* implementation of TLS. In *Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT 2016*, volume 9665 of *LNCS*, pages 622–643. Springer, 2016.
- [4] José Bacelar Almeida, Manuel Barbosa, Gilles Barthe, François Dupressoir, and Michael Emmi. Verifying constant-time implementations. In *25th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2016*, pages 53–70. USENIX Association, 2016.
- [5] José Bacelar Almeida, Manuel Barbosa, Jorge Sousa Pinto, and Bárbara Vieira. Formal verification of side-channel countermeasures using self-composition. *Sci. Comput. Program.*, 78(7):796–812, 2013.
- [6] Timos Antonopoulos, Paul Gazzillo, Michael Hicks, Eric Koskinen, Tachio Terauchi, and Shiyi Wei. Decomposition instead of self-composition for proving the absence of timing channels. In *Proceedings of the 38th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI 2017*, pages 362–375. ACM, 2017.
- [7] Konstantinos Athanasiou, Byron Cook, Michael Emmi, Colm MacCárthaigh, Daniel Schwartz-Narbonne, and Serdar Tasiran. SideTrail: Verifying time-balancing of cryptosystems. In *Verified Software: Theories, Tools, and Experiments - 10th International Conference, VSTTE 2018*, volume 11294 of *LNCS*, pages 215–228. Springer, 2018.
- [8] Musard Balliu, Mads Dam, and Gurvan Le Guernic. ENCoVer: Symbolic exploration for information flow security. In *25th IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium, CSF 2012*, pages 30–44. IEEE, 2012.
- [9] Qinkun Bao, Zihao Wang, James R. Larus, and Dinghao Wu. Abacus: A tool for precise side-channel analysis. In *43rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering: Companion Proceedings, ICSE Companion 2021*, pages 238–239. IEEE, 2021.
- [10] Manuel Barbosa and Peter Schwabe. Kyber terminates. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Paper 2023/708, 2023. <https://eprint.iacr.org/2023/708>.
- [11] Gilles Barthe, Gustavo Betarte, Juan Diego Campo, Carlos Daniel Luna, and David Pichardie. System-level non-interference for constant-time cryptography. In *CCS '14: 2014 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1267–1279. ACM, 2014.
- [12] Gilles Barthe, Marcel Böhme, Sunjay Cauligi, Chitchanok Chuengsatiansup, Daniel Genkin, Marco Guarnieri, David Mateos Romero, Peter Schwabe, David Wu, and Yuval Yarom. Testing side-channel security of cryptographic implementations against future microarchitectures. arXiv preprint 2402.00641, 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.00641>.
- [13] Daniel J. Bernstein. Cache-timing attacks on AES, 2005. <http://cr.yp.to/antiforgery/cachetiming-20050414.pdf>.
- [14] Daniel J. Bernstein. Curve25519: new Diffie-Hellman speed records. In *Public Key Cryptography – PKC 2006*, volume 3958 of *LNCS*, pages 207–228. Springer, 2006.
- [15] Daniel J. Bernstein and Tanja Lange (eds.). eBACS: Ecrypt benchmarking of cryptographic systems. <https://bench.cr.yp.to>.
- [16] Sandrine Blazy, David Pichardie, and Alix Trieu. Verifying constant-time implementations by abstract interpretation. In *ESORICS 2017 - 22nd European Symposium on Research in Computer Security*, volume 10492 of *LNCS*, pages 260–277. Springer, 2017.
- [17] Pietro Borrello, Daniele Cono D'Elia, Leonardo Querzoni, and Cristiano Giuffrida. Constantine: Automatic side-channel resistance using efficient control and data flow linearization. In *CCS '21: 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 715–733. ACM, November 2021.
- [18] Joppe W. Bos, Léo Ducas, Eike Kiltz, Tancrede Lepoint, Vadim Lyubashevsky, John M. Schanck, Peter Schwabe, Gregor Seiler, and Damien Stehlé. CRYSTALS-Kyber: A CCA-Secure module-lattice-based KEM. In *2018 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy, EuroS&P 2018*, pages 353–367. IEEE, 2018.
- [19] Daniel De Almeida Braga, Pierre-Alain Fouque, and Mohamed Sabt. Dragonblood is still leaking: Practical cache-based side-channel in the wild. In *ACSAC 2020: Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*, pages 291–303. ACM, 2020.
- [20] Daniel De Almeida Braga, Pierre-Alain Fouque, and Mohamed Sabt. The long and winding path to secure implementation of GlobalPlatform SCP10. *IACR Trans. Cryptogr. Hardw. Embed. Syst.*, 2020(3):196–218, 2020.
- [21] Daniel De Almeida Braga, Pierre-Alain Fouque, and Mohamed Sabt. PARASITE: Password recovery attack against SRP implementations in the wild. In *CCS '21: 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 2497–2512. ACM, 2021.
- [22] Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2):77–101, 2006.
- [23] Tegan Brennan, Seemanta Saha, Tefvik Bultan, and Corina S. Pasareanu. Symbolic path cost analysis for side-channel detection. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis, ISSTA 2018*, pages 27–37. ACM, 2018.
- [24] John Brooke. SUS: A quick and dirty usability scale. *Usability Eval. Ind.*, 189, 11 1995.
- [25] Robert Brotzman, Shen Liu, Danfeng Zhang, Gang Tan, and Mahmut Kandemir. CaSym: Cache aware symbolic execution for side channel detection and mitigation. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2019*, pages 505–521, 2019.
- [26] Leon Groot Bruinderink, Andreas Hülsing, Tanja Lange, and Yuval Yarom. Flush, Gauss, and Reload – A cache attack on the BLISS lattice-based signature scheme. In *Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems – CHES 2016*, volume 9813 of *LNCS*, pages 323–345. Springer, 2016.
- [27] Billy Bob Brumley and Nicola Taveri. Remote timing attacks are still practical. In *ESORICS 2011 - 16th European Symposium on Research in Computer Security*, volume 6879 of *LNCS*, pages 355–371. Springer, 2011.
- [28] David Brumley and Dan Boneh. Remote timing attacks are practical. In *SSYM'03: Proceedings of the 12th conference on USENIX Security Symposium - Volume 12*. ACM, 2003.

- [29] Brice Canvel, Alain P. Hiltgen, Serge Vaudenay, and Martin Vuagnoux. Password interception in a SSL/TLS channel. In *Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO 2003, 23rd Annual International Cryptology Conference*, volume 2729 of *LNCS*, pages 583–599. Springer, 2003.
- [30] Sunjay Cauligi, Craig Disselkoben, Daniel Moghimi, Gilles Barthe, and Deian Stefan. SoK: Practical foundations for software Spectre defenses. In *43rd IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2022*, pages 666–680. IEEE, 2022.
- [31] Sunjay Cauligi, Craig Disselkoben, Klaus von Gleissenthall, Dean M. Tullsen, Deian Stefan, Tamara Rezk, and Gilles Barthe. Constant-time foundations for the new Spectre era. In *Proceedings of the 41st ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI 2020*, pages 913–926. ACM, 2020.
- [32] Sunjay Cauligi, Gary Soeller, Brian Johannsmeyer, Fraser Brown, Riad S. Wahby, John Renner, Benjamin Grégoire, Gilles Barthe, Ranjit Jhala, and Deian Stefan. FaCT: a DSL for timing-sensitive computation. In *Proceedings of the 40th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI 2019*, pages 174–189. ACM, 2019.
- [33] Sudipta Chattopadhyay, Moritz Beck, Ahmed Rezine, and Andreas Zeller. Quantifying the information leakage in cache attacks via symbolic execution. *ACM Trans. Embed. Comput. Syst.*, 18(1), January 2019.
- [34] Sudipta Chattopadhyay and Abhik Roychoudhury. Symbolic verification of cache side-channel freedom. *IEEE Trans. Comput. Aided Des. Integr. Circuits Syst.*, 37(11):2812–2823, 2018.
- [35] Jia Chen, Yu Feng, and Isil Dillig. Precise detection of side-channel vulnerabilities using quantitative cartesian Hoare logic. In *CCS '17: 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 875–890. ACM, 2017.
- [36] Maria Christakis and Christian Bird. What developers want and need from program analysis: an empirical study. In *Proceedings of the 31st IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2016*, pages 332–343. ACM, 2016.
- [37] Pascal Cuoq. tis-ct. <http://web.archive.org/web/20200810074547/http://trust-in-soft.com/tis-ct/>.
- [38] Lesly-Ann Daniel, Sébastien Bardin, and Tamara Rezk. Binsec/rel: Efficient relational symbolic execution for constant-time at binary-level. In *2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2020*, pages 1021–1038. IEEE, 2020.
- [39] Valgrind Developers. <https://valgrind.org/docs/manual/mc-manual.html>.
- [40] Lisa Nguyen Quang Do, James R. Wright, and Karim Ali. Why do software developers use static analysis tools? A user-centered study of developer needs and motivations. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, 48(3):835–847, 2022.
- [41] Goran Doychev, Dominik Köpf, Laurent Mauborgne, and Jan Reineke. Cacheaudit: A tool for the static analysis of cache side channels. In *22th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2013*, pages 431–446. USENIX Association, 2013.
- [42] Goran Doychev and Boris Köpf. Rigorous analysis of software countermeasures against cache attacks. In *Proceedings of the 38th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI 2017*, pages 406–421, Barcelona, Spain, June 2017. ACM.
- [43] Léo Ducas, Eike Kiltz, Tancrède Lepoint, Vadim Lyubashevsky, Peter Schwabe, Gregor Seiler, and Damien Stehlé. CRYSTALS-Dilithium: A lattice-based digital signature scheme. *IACR Trans. Cryptogr. Hardw. Embed. Syst.*, 2018(1):238–268, 2018.
- [44] Nadhem J. Al Fardan and Kenneth G. Paterson. Lucky thirteen: Breaking the TLS and DTLS record protocols. In *2013 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2013*, pages 526–540. IEEE, 2013.
- [45] Michael Flanders, Reshabh K Sharma, Alexandra E. Michael, Dan Grossman, and David Kohlbrenner. Avoiding instruction-centric microarchitectural timing channels via binary-code transformations. In *29th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, page to appear. ACM, 2024.
- [46] Cesar Pereida García and Billy Bob Brumley. Constant-time callees with variable-time callers. In *26th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2017*, pages 83–98. USENIX Association, 2017.
- [47] Cesar Pereida García, Billy Bob Brumley, and Yuval Yarom. "Make sure DSA signing exponentiations really are constant-time". In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1639–1650. ACM, 2016.
- [48] Cesar Pereida García, Sohaib ul Hassan, Nicola Tuveri, Iaroslav Gridin, Alejandro Cabrera Aldaya, and Billy Bob Brumley. Certified side channels. In *29th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2020*, pages 2021–2038. USENIX Association, 2020.
- [49] Antoine Geimer, Mathéo Vergnolle, Frédéric Recoules, Lesly-Ann Daniel, Sébastien Bardin, and Clémentine Maurice. A systematic evaluation of automated tools for side-channel vulnerabilities detection in cryptographic libraries. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1690–1704. ACM, 2023.
- [50] Peter Leo Gorski, Yasemin Acar, Luigi Lo Iacono, and Sascha Fahl. Listen to developers! A participatory design study on security warnings for cryptographic apis. In *CHI '20: Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–13. ACM, 2020.
- [51] Ben Gras, Cristiano Giuffrida, Michael Kurth, Herbert Bos, and Kaveh Razavi. Absynthe: Automatic blackbox side-channel synthesis on commodity microarchitectures. In *27th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium, NDSS 2020*, San Diego, California, USA, February 2020. The Internet Society.
- [52] Iaroslav Gridin, Cesar Pereida García, Nicola Tuveri, and Billy Bob Brumley. Triggerflow: Regression testing by advanced execution path inspection. In *Detection of Intrusions and Malware, and Vulnerability Assessment - 16th International Conference, DIMVA 2019*, volume 11543 of *LNCS*, pages 330–350. Springer, 2019.
- [53] Daniel Gruss, Raphael Spreitzer, and Stefan Mangard. Cache template attacks: Automating attacks on inclusive last-level caches. In *24th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2015*, pages 897–912, Washington, D.C., USA, August 2015. USENIX Association.
- [54] Qian Guo, Thomas Johansson, and Alexander Nilsson. A key-recovery timing attack on post-quantum primitives using the Fujisaki-Okamoto transformation and its application on FrodoKEM. In *Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO 2020*, volume 12171 of *LNCS*, pages 359–386. Springer, 2020.
- [55] Julie M. Haney, Mary Theofanos, Yasemin Acar, and Sandra Spickard Prettyman. "We make it a big deal in the company": Security mindsets in organizations that develop cryptographic products. In *Fourteenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security, SOUPS 2018*, pages 357–373. USENIX Association, 2018.
- [56] Shaobo He, Michael Emmi, and Gabriela F. Ciocarlie. ct-fuzz: Fuzzing for timing leaks. In *13th IEEE International Conference on Software Testing, Validation and Verification, ICST 2020*, pages 466–471. IEEE, 2020.
- [57] Robert Heumüller, Sebastian Nielebock, Jacob Krüger, and Frank Ortmeier. Publish or perish, but do not forget your software artifacts. *Empir. Softw. Eng.*, 25(6):4585–4616, 2020.
- [58] Jana Hofmann, Emanuele Vannacci, Cédric Fournet, Boris Köpf, and Oleksii Oleksenko. Speculation at fault: Modeling and testing microarchitectural leakage of CPU exceptions. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2023*, pages 7143–7160. USENIX Association, 2023.



- [59] Intel. pin-based-cec. <https://github.com/intel/pin-based-cec>.
- [60] Jan Jancar. The state of tooling for verifying constant-timeness of cryptographic implementations. <https://neuromancer.sk/article/26>, 2021.
- [61] Jan Jancar, Marcel Fourné, Daniel De Almeida Braga, Mohamed Sabt, Peter Schwabe, Gilles Barthe, Pierre-Alain Fouque, and Yasemin Acar. "They're not that hard to mitigate": What cryptographic library developers think about timing attacks. In *43rd IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2022*, pages 632–649. IEEE, 2022.
- [62] Jan Jancar, Vladimir Sedlacek, Petr Svenda, and Marek Šýs. Minerva: The curse of ECDSA nonces; systematic analysis of lattice attacks on noisy leakage of bit-length of ECDSA nonces. *IACR Trans. Cryptogr. Hardw. Embed. Syst.*, 2020(4):281–308, 2020.
- [63] Ke Jiang, Yuyan Bao, Shuai Wang, Zhibo Liu, and Tianwei Zhang. Cache refinement type for side-channel detection of cryptographic software. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, November 2022.
- [64] Brittany Johnson, Yoonki Song, Emerson R. Murphy-Hill, and Robert W. Bowdidge. Why don't software developers use static analysis tools to find bugs? In *35th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2013*, pages 672–681. IEEE, 2013.
- [65] Hubert Kario. Everlasting ROBOT: the Marvin attack. In *ESORICS 2023 - 28th European Symposium on Research in Computer Security*, volume 14346 of *LNCS*, pages 243–262, The Hague, The Netherlands, September 2023. Springer.
- [66] Thierry Kaufmann, Hervé Pelletier, Serge Vaudenay, and Karine Villegas. When constant-time source yields variable-time binary: Exploiting curve25519-donna built with MSVC 2015. In *Cryptology and Network Security*, volume 10052 of *LNCS*, pages 573–582. Springer, 2016.
- [67] Paul Kocher, Jann Horn, Anders Fogh, Daniel Genkin, Daniel Gruss, Werner Haas, Mike Hamburg, Moritz Lipp, Stefan Mangard, Thomas Prescher, Michael Schwarz, and Yuval Yarom. Spectre attacks: Exploiting speculative execution. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2019*, pages 1–19. IEEE, 2019.
- [68] Paul C. Kocher. Timing attacks on implementations of Diffie-Hellman, RSA, DSS, and other systems. In *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO '96*, volume 1109 of *LNCS*, pages 104–113. Springer, 1996.
- [69] Boris Köpf, Laurent Mauborgne, and Martín Ochoa. Automatic quantification of cache side-channels. In *Computer Aided Verification - 24th International Conference, CAV 2012*, volume 7358 of *LNCS*, pages 564–580. Springer, 2012.
- [70] Esmaeil Mohammadian Koruyeh, Khaled N. Khasawneh, Chengyu Song, and Nael B. Abu-Ghazaleh. Spectre returns! speculation attacks using the return stack buffer. In *12th USENIX Workshop on Offensive Technologies, WOOT 2018*, Baltimore, MD, USA, August 2018. USENIX Association.
- [71] Stefan Krüger, Sarah Nadi, Michael Reif, Karim Ali, Mira Mezini, Eric Bodden, Florian Göpfert, Felix Günther, Christian Weinert, Daniel Demmler, and Ram Kamath. CogniCrypt: supporting developers in using cryptography. In *Proceedings of the 32nd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2017*, pages 931–936. IEEE, 2017.
- [72] Stefan Krüger, Michael Reif, Anna-Katharina Wickert, Sarah Nadi, Karim Ali, Eric Bodden, Yasemin Acar, Mira Mezini, and Sascha Fahl. Securing your crypto-api usage through tool support - A usability study. In *IEEE Secure Development Conference, SecDev 2023*, pages 14–25, Atlanta, GA, USA, October 2023. IEEE.
- [73] Stefan Krüger, Johannes Späth, Karim Ali, Eric Bodden, and Mira Mezini. Crysl: An extensible approach to validating the correct usage of cryptographic APIs. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, 47(11):2382–2400, 2021.
- [74] Adam Langley. curve25519-donna. <https://github.com/agl/curve25519-donna>, 2008.
- [75] Adam Langley. ctgrind. <https://github.com/agl/ctgrind>, 2010.
- [76] Jonathan Lazar, Jinjuan Feng, and Harry Hochheiser. *Research Methods in Human-Computer Interaction, 2nd Edition*. Morgan Kaufmann, 2017.
- [77] Mengyuan Li, Yinqian Zhang, Huibo Wang, Kang Li, and Yueqiang Cheng. CIPHERLEAKS: breaking constant-time cryptography on AMD SEV via the ciphertext side channel. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2021*, pages 717–732. USENIX Association, August 2021.
- [78] Moritz Lipp, Michael Schwarz, Daniel Gruss, Thomas Prescher, Werner Haas, Anders Fogh, Jann Horn, Stefan Mangard, Paul Kocher, Daniel Genkin, Yuval Yarom, and Mike Hamburg. Meltdown: Reading kernel memory from user space. In *27th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2018*, pages 973–990. USENIX Association, 2018.
- [79] Xiaoxuan Lou, Tianwei Zhang, Jun Jiang, and Yinqian Zhang. A survey of microarchitectural side-channel vulnerabilities, attacks, and defenses in cryptography. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 54(6):122:1–122:37, 2022.
- [80] Nora McDonald, Sarita Schoenebeck, and Andrea Forte. Reliability and inter-rater reliability in qualitative research: Norms and guidelines for CSCW and HCI practice. *Proc. ACM Hum. Comput. Interact.*, 3(CSCW):72:1–72:23, 2019.
- [81] Daniel Moghimi. Downfall: Exploiting speculative data gathering. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2023*, pages 7179–7193. USENIX Association, 2023.
- [82] Gideon Mohr, Marco Guarnieri, and Jan Reineke. Synthesizing hardware-software leakage contracts for RISC-V open-source processors. In *Proceedings of the 27th Design, Automation and Test in Europe Conference and Exhibition*, page to appear. ACM/IEEE, 2024.
- [83] Nicholas Mosier, Hanna Lachnitt, Hamed Nemati, and Caroline Trippel. Axiomatic hardware-software contracts for security. In *ISCA '22: Proceedings of the 49th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture*, pages 72–86. ACM, 2022.
- [84] Moritz Neikes. Timecop. <https://www.post-apocalyptic-crypto.org/timecop/>.
- [85] Shirin Nilizadeh, Yannic Noller, and Corina S. Păsăreanu. DiffFuzz: differential fuzzing for side-channel analysis. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE '19*, page 176–187. IEEE, 2019.
- [86] Tavis Ormandy. Zenbleed, 2023. <https://lock.cmpxchg8b.com/zenbleed.html>.
- [87] Dag Arne Osvik, Adi Shamir, and Eran Tromer. Cache attacks and countermeasures: The case of AES. In *Topics in Cryptology - CT-RSA 2006, The Cryptographers' Track at the RSA Conference 2006*, volume 3860 of *LNCS*, pages 1–20. Springer, 2006.
- [88] Thales Bandiera Paiva and Routo Terada. A timing attack on the HQC encryption scheme. In *Selected Areas in Cryptography – SAC 2019*, volume 11959 of *LNCS*, pages 551–573. Springer, 2019.
- [89] Peter Pessl, Leon Groot Bruinderink, and Yuval Yarom. To BLISS-B or not to be – attacking strongSwan's implementation of post-quantum signatures. In *CCS '17: 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, 2017.
- [90] LLVM project. <https://llvm.org/docs/LangRef.html>.
- [91] Oscar Reparaz, Josep Balasch, and Ingrid Verbauwhede. Dude, is my code constant time? In *Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition, DATE 2017*, pages 1697–1702. IEEE, 2017.

- [92] Joshua Reynolds, Trevor Smith, Ken Reese, Luke Dickinson, Scott Ruoti, and Kent E. Seamons. A tale of two studies: The best and worst of yubikekey usability. In *2018 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2018*, pages 872–888, San Francisco, California, USA, May 2018. IEEE.
- [93] Bruno Rodrigues, Fernando Magno Quintão Pereira, and Diego F. Aranha. Sparse representation of implicit flows with applications to side-channel detection. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Compiler Construction, CC 2016*, pages 110–120. ACM, 2016.
- [94] Caitlin Sadowski, Edward Aftandilian, Alex Eagle, Liam Miller-Cushon, and Ciera Jaspán. Lessons from building static analysis tools at Google. *Commun. ACM*, 61(4):58–66, 2018.
- [95] Alexander Schaub. *Formal methods for the analysis of cache-timing leaks and key generation in cryptographic implementations*. Theses, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, December 2020.
- [96] Peter Schwabe. Eliminating timing side-channels. a tutorial. <https://cryptojedi.org/peter/data/shmoocon-20150118.pdf>, 2015.
- [97] Young-joo Shin, Hyung Chan Kim, Dokeun Kwon, Ji-Hoon Jeong, and Junbeom Hur. Unveiling hardware-based data prefetcher, a hidden source of information leakage. In *CCS '18: 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 131–145, Toronto, ON, Canada, October 2018. ACM.
- [98] Laurent Simon, David Chisnall, and Ross J. Anderson. What you get is what you C: controlling side effects in mainstream C compilers. In *2018 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy, EuroS&P 2018*, pages 1–15, London, United Kingdom, April 2018. IEEE.
- [99] Evgeniy Stepanov and Konstantin Serebryany. MemorySanitizer: fast detector of uninitialized memory use in C++. In *2015 IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (CGO)*, pages 46–55. IEEE, 2015.
- [100] Chung-ha Sung, Brandon Paulsen, and Chao Wang. CANAL: A cache timing analysis framework via LLVM transformation. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM/IEEE International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE '18*, page 904–907, New York, NY, USA, 2018. ACM.
- [101] Mohammad Tahaei and Kami Vaniea. Recruiting participants with programming skills: A comparison of four crowdsourcing platforms and a CS student mailing list. In *CHI '22: Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 590:1–590:15. ACM, 2022.
- [102] Technical Committee ISO/TC 159. Subcommittee SC 4. *ISO 9241-11:2018 Ergonomics of Human-system Interaction. Usability: definitions and concepts. Part 11*. International standard. ISO, 2018.
- [103] Mehdi Tibouchi and Alexandre Wallet. One bit is all it takes: A devastating timing attack on BLISS’s non-constant time sign flips. *J. Math. Cryptol.*, 15(1):131–142, 2021.
- [104] Yukiyasu Tsunoo, Teruo Saito, Tomoyasu Suzuki, Maki Shigeri, and Hiroshi Miyauchi. Cryptanalysis of DES implemented on computers with cache. In *Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems – CHES 2003*, volume 2779 of *LNCS*, pages 62–76. Springer, 2003.
- [105] Yukiyasu Tsunoo, Etsuko Tsujihara, Kazuhiko Minematsu, and Hiroshi Miyauchi. Cryptanalysis of block ciphers implemented on computers with cache. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Information Theory and Its Applications, ISITA 2002*, pages 803–806, 2002.
- [106] UCSD PLSysSec. haybale-pitchfork. <https://github.com/PLSysSec/haybale-pitchfork>.
- [107] UCSD PLSysSec. pitchfork-angr. <https://github.com/PLSysSec/pitchfork-angr>.
- [108] Sohaib ul Hassan, Iaroslav Gridin, Ignacio M. Delgado-Lozano, Cesar Pereida García, Jesús-Javier Chi-Domínguez, Alejandro Cabrera Aldaya, and Billy Bob Brumley. Déjà vu: Side-channel analysis of mozilla’s NSS. In *CCS '20: 2020 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1887–1902. ACM, 2020.
- [109] Mathy Vanhoef and Eyal Ronen. Dragonblood: Analyzing the dragonfly handshake of WPA3 and EAP-pwd. In *2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2020*, pages 517–533. IEEE, 2020.
- [110] Jose Rodrigo Sanchez Vicarte, Michael Flanders, Riccardo Paccagnella, Grant Garrett-Grossman, Adam Morrison, Christopher W. Fletcher, and David Kohlbrenner. Augury: Using data memory-dependent prefetchers to leak data at rest. In *43rd IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2022*, pages 1491–1505. IEEE, 2022.
- [111] Jose Rodrigo Sanchez Vicarte, Pradyumna Shome, Nandeeeka Nayak, Caroline Trippel, Adam Morrison, David Kohlbrenner, and Christopher W. Fletcher. Opening Pandora’s box: A systematic study of new ways microarchitecture can leak private data. In *42nd IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2022*, pages 347–360. IEEE, 2021.
- [112] Daniel Votipka, Kelsey R. Fulton, James Parker, Matthew Hou, Michelle L. Mazurek, and Michael Hicks. Understanding security mistakes developers make: Qualitative analysis from build it, break it, fix it. In *29th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2020*, pages 109–126. USENIX Association, 2020.
- [113] Guillaume Wafo-Tapa, Slim Bettaieb, Loïc Bidoux, Philippe Gaborit, and Etienne Marcotel. A practicable timing attack against HQC and its countermeasure. *Advances in Mathematics of Computation*, 2020.
- [114] Shuai Wang, Yuyan Bao, Xiao Liu, Pei Wang, Danfeng Zhang, and Dinghao Wu. Identifying Cache-Based side channels through Secret-Augmented abstract interpretation. In *28th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2019*, pages 657–674, Santa Clara, CA, USA, August 2019. USENIX Association.
- [115] Shuai Wang, Pei Wang, Xiao Liu, Danfeng Zhang, and Dinghao Wu. Cached: Identifying cache-based timing channels in production software. In *26th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2017*, pages 235–252. USENIX Association, 2017.
- [116] Wubang Wang, Yinqian Zhang, and Zhiqiang Lin. Time and order: Towards automatically identifying Side-Channel vulnerabilities in enclave binaries. In *22nd International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses (RAID 2019)*, pages 443–457, Chaoyang District, Beijing, China, September 2019. USENIX Association.
- [117] Yingchen Wang, Riccardo Paccagnella, Elizabeth Tang He, Hovav Shacham, Christopher W. Fletcher, and David Kohlbrenner. Hertzbleed: Turning power side-channel attacks into remote timing attacks on x86. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2022*, pages 679–697, Boston, MA, USA, August 2022. USENIX Association.
- [118] Conrad Watt, John Renner, Natalie Popescu, Sunjay Cauligi, and Deian Stefan. CT-wasm: type-driven secure cryptography for the web ecosystem. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 3(POPL):77:1–77:29, 2019.
- [119] Samuel Weiser, David Schrammel, Lukas Bodner, and Raphael Spreitzer. Big numbers - big troubles: Systematically analyzing nonce leakage in (EC)DSA implementations. In *29th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2020*, pages 1767–1784. USENIX Association, 2020.
- [120] Samuel Weiser, Andreas Zankl, Raphael Spreitzer, Katja Miller, Stefan Mangard, and Georg Sigl. DATA - Differential address trace analysis: Finding address-based side-channels in binaries. In *27th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2018*, pages 603–620. USENIX Association, August 2018.

- [121] Jan Wichelmann, Ahmad Moghimi, Thomas Eisenbarth, and Berk Sunar. MicroWalk: A framework for finding side channels in binaries. In *ACSAC 2018: Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*, pages 161–173. ACM, 2018.
- [122] Jan Wichelmann, Florian Sieck, Anna Pättschke, and Thomas Eisenbarth. Microwalk-CI: Practical side-channel analysis for JavaScript applications. In *CCS '22: 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 2915–2929, Los Angeles, CA, USA, November 2022. ACM.
- [123] Meng Wu, Shengjian Guo, Patrick Schaumont, and Chao Wang. Eliminating timing side-channel leaks using program repair. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis, ISSTA 2018*, pages 15–26. ACM, 2018.
- [124] Yuan Xiao, Mengyuan Li, Sanchuan Chen, and Yinqian Zhang. STACCO: Differentially analyzing side-channel traces for detecting SSL/TLS vulnerabilities in secure enclaves. In *CCS '17: 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 859–874, Dallas, TX, USA, October 2017. ACM.
- [125] Yuval Yarom, Daniel Genkin, and Nadia Heninger. CacheBleed: a timing attack on OpenSSL constant-time RSA. *J. Cryptogr. Eng.*, 7(2):99–112, 2017.
- [126] Tuba Yavuz, Farhaan Fowze, Grant Hernandez, Ken Yihang Bai, Kevin R. B. Butler, and Dave Jing Tian. ENCIDER: detecting timing and cache side channels in SGX enclaves and cryptographic apis. *IEEE Trans. Dependable Secur. Comput.*, 20(2):1577–1595, 2023.
- [127] Yuanyuan Yuan, Zhibo Liu, and Shuai Wang. CacheQL: Quantifying and localizing cache side-channel vulnerabilities in production software. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2023*, pages 2009–2026, Anaheim, CA, USA, August 2023. USENIX Association.
- [128] Yuanyuan Yuan, Qi Pang, and Shuai Wang. Automated side channel analysis of media software with manifold learning. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2022*, pages 4419–4436, Boston, MA, USA, August 2022. USENIX Association.

## Summary of CT analysis tools

Tool	Target	Tech.	Guar.	Available
Abacus [9]	Binary	Stat	○	<a href="#">Github</a>
ABPV13 [5]	C	Fo	●	no
ABSynthe [51]	Leakage	Dyn	■	<a href="#">Github</a>
ANABLEPS [116]	Binary	Dyn	○	<a href="#">Github</a>
BINSEC/REL [38]	Binary	Sym	◐	<a href="#">Github</a>
Blazer [6]	Java	Fo	●	no
BPT17 [16]	C	Sym	●	<a href="#">irisa.fr</a>
CacheAudit [41]	Binary	Fo	■	<a href="#">Github</a>
CacheAudit2 [42]	Binary	Dyn	●	<a href="#">Github</a>
CacheD [115]	Trace	Sym	○	no
CacheFix [34]	Trace	Sym	◐	<a href="#">BitBucket</a>
CacheQL [127]	Binary	Dyn	○	<a href="#">Github</a>
CacheS [114]	Binary	Fo	◐	no
CANAL [100]	LLVM	Fo	●	<a href="#">Github</a>
Cache Templates [53]	Binary	Stat	■	<a href="#">Github</a>
CaSym [25]	LLVM	Sym	●	no
CaType [63]	Binary	Fo	●	no
CHALICE [33]	LLVM	Sym	■	<a href="#">BitBucket</a>
COCO-CHANNEL [23]	Java	Sym	●	no
Constantine [17]	LLVM	Dyn	◐	<a href="#">Github</a>
ctgrind [75]	Binary	Dyn	◐	<a href="#">Github</a>
ct-fuzz [56]	LLVM	Dyn	○	<a href="#">Github</a>
ct-verif [4]	LLVM	Fo	●	<a href="#">Github</a>
CT-WASM [118]	WASM	Fo <sup>†</sup>	●	<a href="#">Github</a>
DATA [119, 120]	Binary	Dy	◐	<a href="#">Github</a>
DiffFuzz [85]	Java	Dyn	○	no
dudect [91]	Binary	Stat	○	<a href="#">Github</a>
ENCIDER [126]	LLVM	Sym	◐	<a href="#">Github</a>
ENCoVer [8]	Java	Fo	●	<a href="#">kth.se</a>
FlowTracker [93]	LLVM	Fo	●	<a href="#">ufmg.br</a>
haybale-pitchfork [106]	LLVM	Sym	◐	<a href="#">Github</a>
KMO12 [69]	Binary	Fo	■	no
Manifold [128]	Binary	Stat	○	<a href="#">Zenodo</a>
MemSan [99]	LLVM	Dyn	◐	<a href="#">llvm.org</a>
MicroWalk [121]	Binary	Dyn	◐	<a href="#">Github</a>
MicroWalk-CI [122]	Binary	Dyn	◐	<a href="#">Github</a>
PinCEC [59]	Binary	Dyn	◐	<a href="#">Github</a>
Pitchfork-angr [107]	Binary	Sym	○	<a href="#">Github</a>
SC-Eliminator [123]	LLVM	Fo <sup>†</sup>	●	<a href="#">Zenodo</a>
Shin et al. [97]	Binary	Stat	○	no
SideTrail [7]	LLVM	Fo	■	<a href="#">Github</a>
STACCO [124]	Binary	Dyn	○	no
STAnalyzer [95]	C	Fo	●	no
Themis [35]	Java	Fo	●	<a href="#">Github</a>
timecop [84]	Binary	Dyn	◐	<a href="#">blog</a>
tis-ct [37]	C	Sym	◐	no
TLSfuzzer [65]	Network	Stat	■	<a href="#">Github</a>
TriggerFlow [52]	Binary	Dyn	○	<a href="#">Gitlab</a>
VirtualCert [11]	x86	Fo	●	<a href="#">edu.uy</a>

Targets: LLVM—intermediate representation, DSL—domain-specific language, WASM—Web Assembly, Network—network-reachable TLS implementation

Technique: Sym—Symbolic, Stat—Statistics, Dyn—Dynamic, Fo—Formal, <sup>†</sup>—also performs code transformation/synthesis

Guarantees: ●—sound, ◐—sound with restrictions, ○—no guarantee, ■—other property

Table 3. Classification of CT tools.