

CITADEL: Context Similarity Based Deep Learning Framework Bug Finding

Xiaoyu Zhang*, Juan Zhai†, Shiqing Ma†, Shiwei Wang*, Chao Shen*

*School of Cyber Science and Engineering, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, China

†Manning College of Information & Computer Sciences, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, United State

Email: zxy0927@stu.xjtu.edu.cn, {juan.zhai, shiqing.ma}@umass.edu, shiwei.wang@stu.xjtu.edu.cn, chaoshen@xjtu.edu.cn

Abstract—With deep learning (DL) technology becoming an integral part of the new intelligent software, tools of DL framework testing and bug-finding are in high demand. Existing DL framework testing tools have limited coverage on bug types. For example, they lack the capability of finding performance bugs, which are critical for DL model training and inference regarding performance, economics, and the environment. This problem is challenging due to the difficulty of getting test oracles of performance bugs. Moreover, existing tools are inefficient, generating hundreds of test cases with few trigger bugs. In this paper, we propose CITADEL, a method that accelerates the finding of bugs in terms of efficiency and effectiveness. We observe that many DL framework bugs are similar due to the similarity of operators and algorithms belonging to the same family (e.g., Conv2D and Conv3D). Orthogonal to existing bug-finding tools, CITADEL aims to find new bugs that are similar to reported ones that have known test oracles. It works by first collecting existing bug reports and identifying problematic APIs. CITADEL defines *context similarity* to measure the similarity of DL framework API pairs and automatically generates test cases with oracles for APIs that are similar to the problematic APIs in existing bug reports. CITADEL respectively covers 1,436 PyTorch and 5,380 TensorFlow APIs and effectively detects 79 and 80 API bugs, among which 58 and 68 are new, and 36 and 58 have been confirmed, many of which, e.g., the 11 performance bugs cannot be detected by existing tools. Moreover, a remarkable 35.40% of the test cases generated by CITADEL can trigger bugs, which significantly transcends the ratios of 0.74%, 1.23%, and 3.90% exhibited by the state-of-the-art methods, DocTer, DeepREL, and TitanFuzz.

I. INTRODUCTION

With the development of Deep Learning (DL) techniques, DL-powered systems are playing an increasingly significant role in software development. For example, Microsoft has developed a new search engine powered by DL techniques to enhance the search results [1]. Moreover, the global AI software market is expected to increase from \$138 billion in 2022 to \$1,094 billion by 2032 [2]. As the backbone of DL-powered systems, DL frameworks (e.g., TensorFlow and PyTorch) empower developers by offering API functions to create, train, optimize, and deploy DL-powered systems. These frameworks support diverse domains, providing societal benefits in areas like image recognition [3], self-driving [4], and natural language processing [5]. Similar to traditional software systems, DL frameworks can also have bugs, which can lead to erroneous outputs, increased system overhead, and even crashes for DL-powered systems, thereby jeopardizing user property and personal safety [6], and contributing to

energy inefficiency and environmental issues [7], [8], [9]. Consequently, there's a pressing need for tools capable of identifying bugs in DL frameworks.

There are two primary approaches to testing DL frameworks: model-level testing [10], [11], [12], [13] and API-level testing [14], [15]. Model-level testing mutates existing DL models to generate more diverse DL models and employs differential testing methods to compare model execution results across different frameworks for bug detection. In contrast, API-level testing approaches generate test code directly for DL framework API functions, exposing bugs through fuzzing techniques. For example, DocTer [16] conducts fuzzing for DL frameworks by extracting input constraints from API documentation and using these constraints to guide test case generation. DeepREL [15] identifies relational API functions of DL frameworks and 'borrows' test inputs from invoked API functions to test other relational API functions.

Despite these advancements, existing DL testing tools have notable limitations. Firstly, existing testing tools have limited coverage on bug types. For example, they fail to detect performance bugs that can significantly impact DL model training and inference speed and degrade responsiveness, resulting in energy waste and environmental concerns [7], [8], [9], [17], especially for large DL models like GPT-3 [18]. The performance bug shown in Fig. 2 causes the time overhead to increase to 2.33 times its original value and a substantial carbon footprint. However, current testing methods cannot detect such performance bugs in DL API functions. Secondly, existing bug-finding tools exhibit inefficiencies in generating test cases that trigger bugs. These tools often leverage random walks or heuristic algorithms to generate test cases and models. However, due to the huge search space of the arguments and the inputs of API functions, such approaches often generate numerous test cases but only a small fraction of them trigger actual bugs. For example, DeepREL generates an excess of 330,000 test cases, yet only 1.23% of them have the potential to trigger bugs. Requiring hundreds of test cases to detect a single bug makes current DL framework testing tools very inefficient in detecting bugs.

To devise an efficient test method capable of identifying various types of bugs, we thoroughly analyze the API functions of PyTorch and TensorFlow and study their reported issues on GitHub. The API functions of these frameworks naturally fall into distinct groups, where API functions within each

group execute similar operators and algorithms, exhibiting a tendency for similar bugs. Considering the convolutional operators `torch.nn.Conv1d`, `torch.nn.Conv2d`, and `torch.nn.Conv3d`, each is designed for inputs of different dimensions. Despite their differences, these operators share commonalities such as call lists (e.g., `aten::convolution` in the source code) and the use of the `cudaLaunchKernel` function for GPU computations. Notably, reported issues [19], [20] emphasize that when a bug arises in one convolution operator, others within the same group are prone to similar problems.

Building upon this observation, we propose CITADEL, a method that accelerates the finding of bugs in terms of efficiency and effectiveness. Orthogonal to existing tools, CITADEL aims to uncover new bugs that are similar to reported ones that have known test oracle, regardless of bug types. It leverages reported bugs on one API function to create test cases for its analogous API functions, effectively addressing the aforementioned limitations observed in existing work. Compared with existing tools which can only detect status bugs and value bugs, CITADEL has better bug type coverage and effectiveness. It has the capability to detect bugs regardless of their types, such as performance bugs caused by errors in the underlying implementation or optimization, including unexpected time or memory overhead. Moreover, CITADEL is more effective and efficient in test case generation. It adopts the code that has triggered a bug on a problematic API function to create test cases for its analogous API functions. Essentially, it leverages prior knowledge rather than heuristics to explore potential API bugs in the new context, significantly improving the chances of finding bugs. To be specific, CITADEL first collects existing bug reports and identifies problematic APIs. Then it utilizes both static and dynamic analyses on DL framework source code and unit test cases for the identification of analogous API functions. In this process, it extracts context information (e.g., APIs’ call stacks) to gauge the similarity between API functions, a concept referred to as *context similarity* in CITADEL. For a collected problematic API, CITADEL modifies the bug-triggering code from its bug report to generate new test cases for its analogous API functions. Throughout this process, CITADEL addresses two potential differences between the API functions: differences in arguments and dimensions, if they exist. Finally, CITADEL executes the generated test cases, employing the buggy behavior of the problematic API function as a test oracle to effectively identify potential new bugs in the target API function.

Our evaluation demonstrates that CITADEL effectively covers 1,436 PyTorch and 5,380 TensorFlow API functions, marking a 34.08% and 182.86% increase in covered API functions respectively compared to DeepREL. Moreover, CITADEL has identified a total of 79 API bugs in PyTorch and 80 in TensorFlow, including 58 and 68 newly discovered issues, of which 36 and 58 have been confirmed. Furthermore, a noteworthy 35.40% of the test cases synthesized by CITADEL expose bugs, significantly surpassing the 0.74%, 1.23%, and 3.90% bug-triggering capacity exhibited by the test cases generated by DocTer, DeepREL, and TitanFuzz respectively.

Our contributions are:

- We propose *context similarity* as a measurement for functional similarity among DL framework API functions.
- We develop a novel test case generation method for DL frameworks that leverages the knowledge from confirmed API bugs to synthesize new test cases and uncover new bugs in analogous API functions, regardless of bug types.
- We develop a prototype CITADEL based on the proposed idea. The experiment results on PyTorch and Tensorflow show that CITADEL respectively detects 79 and 80 API bugs, and 36 and 58 of them have been confirmed or fixed by developers after reporting. 35.40% of test cases generated by CITADEL can be used to trigger bugs.

II. BACKGROUND & RELATED WORK

A. DL Framework API Functions and Models

DL Framework APIs. Like traditional software programs, DL frameworks use various API functions to call source code functions and perform operations. Taking PyTorch [21] as an example, its API functions include performing basic matrix operations (e.g., `torch.mul` for multiply operation), calculating loss functions (e.g., `torch.nn.MSELoss` for measuring mean squared error), and building models layers (e.g., `torch.nn.Conv2d` for convolution layers). When calling an API function, users first need to assign values for its required and optional arguments, where the values of required arguments are mandatory to provide and the optional arguments have their default values in APIs. Then, the API function runs the underlying source code that performs corresponding calculations and operations on the hardware (e.g., CPU and GPU) and obtains tensors, Boolean values, etc. as the result.

DL Models. A DL model is a parameterized function $F_\theta : X \mapsto Y$, where $x \in X$ is an m -dimensional input and $y \in Y$ is the corresponding output label. Typically, a DL model is composed of several connected layers, and an n -layered model can be represented as $F_\theta = l_1 \circ l_2 \circ \dots \circ l_n$, where l represents a layer and θ is the model weight. Each layer l_i in the model can be constructed by several DL framework API functions.

B. DL Framework Testing

DL framework testing methods construct test cases (e.g., models) to explore potential behaviors of DL frameworks and discover bugs. Depending on the generated test cases, existing DL framework testing methods can be mainly divided into model-level testing and API-level testing [14], [15].

Model-level testing. These testing methods usually build a large number of models and apply mutation strategies on models to explore the potential bugs of the APIs and layers in the model. To construct effective test oracles, prior work performs differential testing by building and testing the same model on multiple DL frameworks [11], [10], [13], [12]. CRADLE is one of the first to use this method to test DL framework bugs. Based on Keras [22] which can build and train models on different DL frameworks as backends, it conducts differential testing on three frameworks (i.e., TensorFlow, CNTK, and Theano) and finds 12 bugs. On the basis

of CRADLE, Audee [11] further tests 25 APIs of four DL frameworks including PyTorch and TensorFlow, and detects 26 unique bugs. Additionally, Muffin [13] creatively designs the data tracking method to apply differential testing on the training phase of models and finally discovers 39 new bugs.

API-level testing. Different from the model-level methods, the API-level framework testing methods do not depend on the implementations of multiple frameworks and have the capability to test more API functions. API-level testing usually extracts API constraints of inputs and arguments based on the documentation or test code and generates test cases based on fuzzing technique [16], [23], [15], [14], [24], [25], [26]. DocTer [16] is a representative method, which analyzes the API document syntax and extracts input constraints. It can generate test cases for three different DL frameworks and find 94 bugs on these frameworks. EAGLE [27] proposes that some APIs have functional equivalence. It designs 16 new DL equivalence rules and detects 25 inconsistencies and bugs on TensorFlow and PyTorch. In addition, DeepREL [15] designs two elaborated equivalence and matches API pairs based on these equivalence relations. It considers the output values and status of APIs in a pair as test oracles for each other and detects both crash and inconsistency bugs for over 1,000 PyTorch API functions. TitanFuzz [28] leverages large language models (LLMs) to generate and mutate test code and detect numerical inconsistencies and crashes.

DL framework bugs. DL framework bugs can be mainly divided into three types through symptoms, i.e., status, value, and performance bugs [29]. Status bugs affect the execution status of DL API and model, including crashes, segmentation faults, exceptions, etc. Value bugs that are caused by numerical errors in the computation of DL operators include inconsistent outputs and NaN (Not A Number) outputs. Existing framework testing tools focus on the above two types of bugs [11], [15], [16]. Performance bugs refer to those caused by errors in the underlying implementation or optimization, including unexpected time or memory overhead.

C. Code Similarity Measurement

Code similarity measurement aims to evaluate the similarity of multiple code blocks and find out the potential code clone, plagiarism, and refactoring. Existing static approaches proposed methods based on the metrics, texts, and tokens [30], [31], [32], [33], [34], [35], [36]. Researchers also measure code similarity based on Abstract Syntax Trees (ASTs) and graphs (e.g., control flow graphs (CFG)) [37], [38], [39], [40]. In addition, some research proposes the functional similarity between programs from the perspectives of input and output [41], [42], abstract memory state [43], function calls [44], etc. Inspired by existing work, CITADEL defines and calculates a context similarity to match DL framework APIs that share similar functionality, implementations, and execution contexts.

III. MOTIVATION

State-of-the-art DL framework testing tools [16], [15], [13] have two major limitations.




Fig. 1: Overarching Design of CITADEL

- **Existing approaches have limited coverage on bug types. They focus on status and value bugs, lacking the capability of detecting others, e.g., performance bugs.** Existing methods typically utilize the output results of the same or equivalent API function on different frameworks/devices to construct pseudo test oracles to identify status bugs (e.g., crashes) and value bugs (e.g., NaN outputs) [27], [13], [15], [11], [10], [28]. However, they cannot construct test oracles to detect performance bugs due to the difficulty of obtaining test oracles. Consequently, the detection of performance bugs still heavily relies on manual identification by developers.
- **Existing methods need to generate numerous test cases to trigger a bug, resulting in inefficient testing.** To uncover bugs within DL frameworks, existing work usually leverages random walks or heuristic algorithms to generate test cases and models, exploring potential API behaviors [16], [15], [11], [13]. On the one hand, considering the vast search space of the arguments and inputs of API functions, the random method has a low probability of generating a test case that reveals a bug. On the other hand, the heuristic algorithm (e.g., Genetic Algorithm) typically requires the construction of large populations and multiple generations of mutation to search for bugs, rendering them impractical. Moreover, whether the evaluation of the heuristic algorithm can effectively guide the testing is questionable. Consequently, existing work typically needs to generate hundreds of test cases to uncover a bug, resulting in inefficient testing on the DL framework.

IV. DESIGN

We observe that DL framework API functions naturally fall into groups, and API functions in a group (e.g., Conv1d, Conv2d, and Conv3d in PyTorch) execute similar operators and algorithms and have similar functionality and implementations, despite potential differences in their arguments (e.g., different dimensions). Moreover, through sampling and analysis of over 300 real bug reports and corresponding patches from DL frameworks, we find that API functions within the same groups are susceptible to similar bugs due to the same erroneous implementation of underlying functions [19], [45], [46]. As such, CITADEL is a similarity-based testing method.

Fig. 1 shows the overview of CITADEL. The inputs to CITADEL are GitHub repositories and the signature similarity between DL APIs [15]. Specifically, in this paper, CITADEL




Fig. 2: Performance Bug on LazyConvTranspose2d

tests the PyTorch and TensorFlow repositories, which are among the most popular DL frameworks, boasting 76K and 181K stars on GitHub, respectively. CITADEL first gathers the source code, unit test cases for APIs, and issue list from the repository of the framework under test and then samples the buggy code of confirmed bugs from the issue list (§IV-A and §IV-B). Next, CITADEL extracts the context information, which consists of analogous function groups identified by the static analyzer (§IV-C) and API call stacks collected by the dynamic profiler (§IV-D). The static analyzer analyzes the DL framework’s source code and categorizes analogous functions into groups based on their argument and callee similarity. The dynamic profiler generates unit test cases for DL APIs and records their call stacks during execution. CITADEL proposes *context similarity* that leverages the call stack to measure the code similarity of API pairs. Leveraging the context and the signature similarities, the API matcher (§IV-E) matches analogous API pairs. Additionally, the matcher verifies the arguments of API pairs and discards pairs with unsolvable argument mismatches. For a problematic API (i.e., source API) and its analogous API (i.e., target API), the test case generator utilizes the reproducible buggy code of the source API, which is collected in the buggy code list, to synthesize new test cases for the target API (§IV-F). The test case evaluator then executes new test cases and leverages the buggy behavior exhibited by the source API to identify new bugs in the target API, including status, value, and performance bugs (§IV-G). Finally, the system reports the newly detected bugs to the user. **CITADEL in an example.** CITADEL detects a total of 159 API bugs, including 111 status bugs, 35 value bugs, and 13 performance bugs. Moreover, 35.40% of test cases generated by CITADEL can trigger bugs, and this ratio is only 0.74% and 1.23% in DocTer, DeepREL, respectively.

Here we provide a real-world performance bug¹ found by CITADEL as an example (Lines 1-4 in Fig. 2(a)) to show how it works. One bug on Conv2d (Fig. 2(b)) is reported saying that the ‘groups’ argument in this function fails to speed up the training and inference. Grouped convolution aims to

¹<https://github.com/pytorch/pytorch/issues/95604>




Fig. 3: A Demo of Sampling Buggy Cases

employ multiple kernels and produce multiple channel outputs to increase the network efficiency [47], [48]. Therefore, the group convolution is anticipated to bring a lower time overhead compared to executing these convolution layers independently. CITADEL analyzes the context information (e.g., call stacks) of DL API functions to construct pairs of analogous API functions that share context similarity. One such pair consists of Conv2d and LazyConvTranspose2d. Then, CITADEL generates test cases for LazyConvTranspose2d based on the reproducible code of the problematic API Conv2d. For each analogous API pair, CITADEL analyzes the arguments of the two API functions to identify differences and makes adjustments to the buggy code accordingly to construct a test case for the target, ensuring the generated test case is executable. In this instance, CITADEL remove ‘in_channels’ to resolve the difference between APIs’ arguments, which is highlighted by green (①). The new test case reveals that LazyConvTranspose2d with ‘group’ argument also exhibits a higher time overhead than executing these layers individually, which is the same anomalous behavior as the reported bug in Conv2d (②). Specifically, as shown in Fig. 2(a), when we set the ‘out_channels’ to 512 and ‘groups’ to 4 in LazyConvTranspose2d layer and construct *model_1* with eight such group convolution layers, the actual time cost of training *model_1* is 46.75 s, which is markedly higher than the time cost of executing these layers individually (20.09 s).

A. Web Crawler

Web crawler collects source code implementing DL framework functions (i.e., PyTorch and TensorFlow functions), the latest tens of thousands of GitHub bug issues (both open and closed) in order of opening time, and unit test cases in the DL framework repository.

B. Buggy Case Sampler

Buggy case sampler aims to extract problematic APIs and their reproducible buggy cases from the collected issues. PyTorch and TensorFlow provide well-structured issue templates for bug reporting [49], [50]. These templates request minimal and complete code examples to reproduce the bug and the anomalous behaviors. Taking the Conv2d bug in Fig. 2 as an example, its report contains executable code to call the buggy convolution layers (Lines 11-12 in Fig. 2). Additionally, its code calculates the expected time overhead of the group

convolution and contrasts it with the actual time cost to directly demonstrate the buggy behavior (Lines 13-14).

Fig. 3 shows a real report from the TensorFlow repository, consisting of the title, status, bug description, test code, and a timeline. To extract the buggy code, the sampler first judges whether one issue includes test code (①) and discards those lacking test code. It then checks the issue labels (②) and only keeps the ones that are bugs. Finally, the sampler examines the issue timeline (③) and discards closed issues lacking associated commits or pull requests. Such issues often arise from users’ misconceptions of expected behaviors and are promptly addressed by developers. After extracting buggy code, the sampler identifies the problematic API from the title and bug description and verifies it in the test code.

C. Static Analyzer

DL APIs call a variety of source code functions to perform operations and computations during runtime. Source code functions with similar functionality and implementations may have similar errors, leading to bugs in the DL APIs that call them. The static analyzer aims to find and group these analogous functions in the source code. Given two functions F_1 and F_2 called by DL APIs, the static analyzer evaluates the static similarity $Sim_{ST}(F_1, F_2)$ from input and output arguments similarity Sim_{io} and callees similarity Sim_{call} .

$$Sim_{ST}(F_1, F_2) = Sim_{io}(F_1, F_2) + Sim_{call}(F_1, F_2)$$

Input and output arguments play a crucial role in determining functional similarity in code blocks [51], [42]. For a function F_1 within the source code, the static analyzer captures its input and output arguments and formalizes them as a set $IO_{F_1} = \{a_1^1, a_2^1, \dots, a_n^1\}$, where a_i^1 represents an input or output argument of F_1 . To evaluate the similarity of two sets, we use the Jaccard similarity coefficient [52], a widely utilized statistical measure [53], [54]. The Jaccard similarity coefficient $J(A, B)$ for two given sets A and B is defined as follows:

$$J(A, B) = \frac{|A \cap B|}{|A \cup B|}$$

Then $Sim_{io}(F_1, F_2)$ can be calculated as:

$$Sim_{io}(F_1, F_2) = J(IO_{F_1}, IO_{F_2}) = \frac{|IO_{F_1} \cap IO_{F_2}|}{|IO_{F_1} \cup IO_{F_2}|}$$

Callees, which represent the dependencies of functions, also serve as indicators of functional similarity between code blocks [55]. Similar to input and output arguments, the static analyzer collects and formalizes callees of F_1 as a set $Call_{F_1} = \{f_1^1, f_2^1, \dots, f_n^1\}$, where f_i^1 denotes a callee of F_1 . CITADEL also computes $Sim_{call}(F_1, F_2)$ through Jaccard similarity coefficient.

We calculate the Sim_{ST} between source code functions. If the static similarity of two functions exceeds the threshold α , the two functions are deemed similar, otherwise, they are considered dissimilar. Analogous function groups are passed to the API matcher as part of context information. Fig. 4 illustrates how CITADEL extract context information and matches




Fig. 4: Matching APIs Pairs with Context Information

Conv2d and LazyConvTranspose2d in the Fig. 2 as analogous APIs, and the dashed box shows how the static analyzer calculates the similarity between two source code functions `aten::conv2d` and `aten::conv_transpose2d`. Red marks input and output arguments and blue highlights callees. Given that these two functions share identical input and output arguments and call the same functions, they have high static similarity and are thus classified into one group of analogous functions.

D. Dynamic Profiler

The dynamic profiler is developed to execute unit test cases for APIs and record call stacks as part of context information. The unit test cases consist of the test cases collected from DL framework repositories and the test cases generated by existing test case generation tools [16], [15]. These cases are intended to examine the expected behaviors of APIs during runtime and explore the analogous behaviors and edge cases. The solid box in Fig. 4 illustrates part of call stacks collected by the profiler for the APIs Conv2d and LazyConvTranspose2d.

We measure the context similarity $Sim_{CTX}(A_S, A_T)$ for any API pair (A_S, A_T) in CITADEL, leveraging the dynamic information. Context similarity denotes the degree of similarity between the execution contexts of two APIs, aiming to match APIs with similar functionality. The greater the similarity between the execution contexts of two APIs, the higher the probability that they have similar underlying implementations and perform similar operators, and they are also more susceptible to similar bugs. $Sim_{CTX}(A_S, A_T)$ is defined as follows:

$$Sim_{CTX}(A_S, A_T) = J(CTX_S, CTX_T)$$

where CTX_S and CTX_T represent the context information of A_S and A_T . Context information consists of 1) groups of analogous functions within the DL framework’s source code and 2) the call stacks of DL APIs during execution. These data are gathered independently by the static analyzer and dynamic profiler in CITADEL. J indicates the metric to calculate the similarity between CTX_S and CTX_T . In this paper, we use Jaccard similarity coefficient [52] as J to calculate Sim_{CTX} .

E. API matcher

The API matcher first receives context information from the static analyzer and dynamic profiler (i.e., analogous function groups and API call stacks) and matches API pairs based on context similarity and signature similarity. Subsequently, it checks the arguments of analogous APIs and discards the

API pairs with unsolvable argument mismatches which renders the buggy code unusable in test case generation. For instance, Conv2d and LPPool2d each have required arguments that are not included in the other, making CITADEL unable to generate a test case for one based on the code of the other, as shown in Fig. 5 (④). Consequently, this API pair is considered to have encountered an argument mismatch and is discarded.

Matching. For an API A_S , the call stacks obtained from the dynamic profiler include a set of source code functions it calls during execution. The static analyzer indicates that some of these functions share similar functionality and implementations to other source code functions. The API matcher integrates these two parts of context information to obtain the execution context CTX_S of the API:

$$CTX_S = \{f'_1, f'_2, \dots, f'_m\} \cup \{f_1^S, f_2^S, \dots, f_n^S\}$$

where f'_i indicates the source code functions in the groups matched in the static analyzer and f_j^S represents the remaining functions. Similarly, we denote the execution context of another API A_T as CTX_T . When calculating the $Sim_{CTX}(A_S, A_T)$, if both APIs call source code functions from the same group, these functions will be treated as one function because of their similar functionality and implementations. The context similarity between A_S and A_T can be calculated by the Jaccard similarity coefficient:

$$Sim_{CTX}(A_S, A_T) = \frac{|CTX_S \cap CTX_T|}{|CTX_S \cup CTX_T|}$$

CITADEL uses the threshold β to evaluate the context similarity between A_S and A_T and considers the two APIs are similar when $Sim_{CTX}(A_S, A_T)$ exceeds β . §V-D explains the selection of the default value of β in detail, and the experiment results in §V-C demonstrate the effectiveness of the context-similar API pairs in detecting real-world bugs.

Fig. 4 illustrates the process of matching Conv2d and LazyConvTranspose2d mentioned in our motivaiton example via context information. Based on the records of the dynamic profiler (depicted in the solid box), both APIs call `aten::convolution`. For `aten::conv2d` and `aten::conv_transpose2d` which are separately called by Conv2d and LazyConvTranspose2d, they have been divided into one analogous function group by the static analyzer and are considered as the same function when calculating Sim_{CTX} . Since both APIs call almost the same source code functions, their Jaccard similarity coefficients are greater than β , and we match them as a context-similar API pair. In addition to context-similar API pairs, we supplement analogous API pairs matched by the signature similarity calculated by DeepREL [15]. Based on their experimental results, we select the top 20 API functions with the highest signature similarity to the target as its analogous API functions.

Filtering. API matcher checks arguments of matched API functions to avoid the argument mismatch problems in the test case generator. For the source API A_S , its arguments P_S can be represented as: $P_S = P_S^r \cup P_S^o$, where P_S^r refers to required arguments and P_S^o refers to optional arguments.




Fig. 5: Verifying API Pairs and Generating Cases

CITADEL discards the API pair (A_S, A_T) , iff A_S and A_T each contain required arguments p_i^r and p_j^r that are not included in the other's arguments set, which means that the test case of either API cannot provide values of required arguments to the other API and generate new test cases.

The discarded API pairs satisfy the following:

$$(\exists p_i^r \in P_S^r, p_i^r \notin P_T) \wedge (\exists p_j^r \in P_T^r, p_j^r \notin P_S)$$

Fig. 5 shows an example of validating API arguments, where the source API A_S is `torch.nn.Conv2d`(①). Its required argument set P_S^r includes 'in_channels', 'out_channels', and 'kernel_size', and the optional argument set P_S^o contains 'stride', whose default value is 1, etc. One of its analogous APIs, `torch.nn.Conv3d`, has the same argument set, allowing the two APIs to generate test cases for each other in the generator and pass the verification(③). `torch.nn.Lazyconv2d` has required arguments 'out_channels' and 'kernel_size'. The test code of Conv2d can be modified by removing the first argument to generate test cases for the target API `LazyConv2d`, which also passes the verification(②). Unfortunately, `torch.nn.LPPool2d` has a required argument 'norm_type' that are not present in Conv2d, and LPPool2d lacks required arguments 'in_channels' and 'out_channels' (④). Due to the lack of values of required arguments (i.e., 'in_channels', 'out_channels', and 'norm_type'), CITADEL cannot generate new test cases for either API based on the test cases of the other, therefore CITADEL discards the API pair that consists of LPPool2d and Conv2d.

F. Test Case Generator

Given a verified API pair of A_S and A_T , the test case generator synthesizes new test cases C_T for the target API based on the collected buggy code C_S of the problematic API A_S (i.e., source API). As shown in the case of Fig. 2, the generator can adaptively adjust the code of C_T to resolve two kinds of differences (if any) between APIs, namely argument difference and dimension difference, thereby ensuring that the newly generated test cases are executable.

Argument Difference. When the argument set of the source API A_S includes arguments not present in the target API A_T (e.g., Conv2d and LazyConv2d in Fig. 5), an argument

difference arises. To solve this problem, the test case generator modifies the test case C_T by removing irrelevant arguments to make it executable for A_T . The dashed box in Fig. 5 provides an example of resolving arguments difference (②). The argument set of the source API `Conv2d` contains the first argument ‘in_channels’ that the target API `LazyConv2d` does not have. Therefore, the generator discards the value ‘512’ corresponding to the first argument and keeps only the values ‘2048’ and ‘1’ corresponding to other arguments (marked by green). Additionally, Fig. 2 provides another example that removes the argument ‘in_channel=512’ in generating test cases for `LazyConvTranspose2d`.

Dimension Difference. As mentioned previously, the DL framework provides a series of APIs for inputs of varying dimensions (e.g. `Conv2d` and `Conv3d`), typically sharing similar implementations and susceptibility to similar bugs [19]. However, the existing methods encounter challenges in constructing test cases for these APIs due to the different dimensions of their arguments [15]. To resolve the dimension difference, the test case generator first obtains the API signatures through open-source libraries (e.g., the ‘inspect’ library in Python) and identifies the dimension-related arguments from signatures. It then dynamically adjusts the test code by increasing or decreasing the dimensions of argument values based on the dimension information of the API signatures of the source and target APIs, and generates test cases for those APIs. Fig. 5 shows an example of resolving dimension difference and generating available test cases for `Conv3d` (③). The API signature shows that the ‘input’ of `Conv3d` and `Conv2d` is dimension-related, and the ‘input’ of `Conv2d` is a 4-dimensional tuple, and the ‘input’ of `Conv3d` should be a 5-dimensional tuple. The generator recognizes such a dimension difference and expands the 4-dimension tuple received by `Conv2d` to a 5-dimension tuple to adjust the input dimensions (marked in green) and generates executable test cases for `Conv3d`.

CITADEL adaptively generates test cases for various target APIs based on the bug detected in the source API `Conv2d` and finally identifies status bugs on `Conv3d` and `LazyConv2d`, which has been reported to the developers².

G. Test Case Evaluator

Existing work usually considers the results of another API as a pseudo test oracle and checks whether two API functions produce equal results to detect potential bugs [15], [11], [10]. However, they cannot detect performance bugs due to the difficulty of obtaining test oracles for the runtime overhead of APIs. To effectively identify API bugs regardless of bug types, the evaluator considers the buggy behavior of the source test case C_S as the test oracle and observes whether the new test case C_T has the same buggy behavior. Specifically, the evaluator identifies three types of bugs on A_T as follows.

- *Status bug* arises when C_T throws the identical exception as the source case C_S . The evaluator collects exception details,

and if C_T throws the same exception as the original buggy case C_S , it is considered that A_T has a status bug.

- *Value bug* arises when C_T generates the same specific numerical errors (e.g., NaN) as C_S . The evaluator logs the outputs of test cases, and if C_T produces anomalous values matching those described in the bug report of A_S , A_T is deemed to have a value bug.

- *Performance bug* arises from an underlying implementation or optimization error, leading to an unexpectedly high overhead on APIs. To detect performance bugs, CITADEL calculates the expected overhead by leveraging the bug report of A_S and records the actual runtime overhead. If C_T exhibits unexpected overhead identical to that described in the bug report of the problematic API A_S , A_T is considered to have a performance bug. Take the case in Fig. 2 as an example, the bug report of `Conv2d` indicates that the performance bug causes the group convolution to exhibit a greater time cost than implementing these convolutional layers individually, which was confirmed by the developers. Leveraging such an anomalous behavior as the test oracle, CITADEL reveals that `LazyConvTranspose2d` also experiences a higher time overhead under the group setting than implementing `LazyConvTranspose2d` layers individually, thereby identifying the performance bug.

V. EVALUATION

In this section, we aim to answer the following research questions.

RQ1: How effective and efficient is CITADEL in detecting real-world bugs?

RQ2: How effective is CITADEL in terms of API coverage?

RQ3: What is the impact of different configurable parameters in CITADEL?

A. Setup

Baseline and Metric: We use three state-of-the-art open-sourced testing tools for comparison, namely DocTer [16], DeepREL [15] and TitanFuzz [28]. For the data not shown in their paper (e.g., the number of cases generated by a complete execution), we obtain it by running their open-source code. CITADEL mainly compared with baselines from three metrics:

- *Number of covered APIs.* API coverage is an important metric of test adequacy. Following the prior work [15], we report the number of covered APIs in each method.

- *Ratio of test cases that can trigger bugs.* This metric is calculated by dividing the number of cases that can trigger or expose bugs by the total number of generated cases, which can reflect the efficiency of a test approach in generating test cases and detecting bugs. Note that if we can confirm that multiple test cases trigger the same bug or anomalous behavior on one API, it will be counted as one case, since generating a large number of duplicate cases does not reflect the effectiveness of case generation and bug detection.

- *Average time to detect bugs.* Following the prior work [56], [57], we use the metric of average time to detect bugs to compare the bug detection efficiency of each method. Specifically, we record the time taken by each method to conduct

²<https://github.com/pytorch/pytorch/issues/83328#issuecomment-1445337447>

TABLE I: Summary of Detected Bugs on PyTorch and TensorFlow

| Framework | #Total | | | | #Rejected | | | | #New | | | | #Confirmed | | | |
|------------|--------|-----|----|----|-----------|----|----|----|------|----|----|----|------------|----|----|----|
| | T. | S. | V. | P. | T. | S. | V. | P. | T. | S. | V. | P. | T. | S. | V. | P. |
| PyTorch | 79 | 54 | 15 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 58 | 36 | 12 | 10 | 36 | 21 | 7 | 8 |
| TensorFlow | 80 | 57 | 20 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 45 | 20 | 3 | 58 | 38 | 17 | 3 |
| Total | 159 | 111 | 35 | 13 | 9 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 126 | 81 | 32 | 13 | 94 | 59 | 24 | 11 |

a complete test and subsequently divide it by the number of detected bugs reported in their respective papers.

Collected Issues and Context Information. CITADEL respectively collects and extracts 258 and 288 buggy cases from PyTorch and TensorFlow repositories. In addition, the threshold α is set to 0.50, which is determined based on the classification results of Sim_{ST} values using the K-means method. The static analyzer respectively selects 2,362 PyTorch functions and 10,469 TensorFlow functions that share the similarity with at least one other function from the source code and divides them into 3,711 groups. The dynamic profiler constructs test cases for 999 PyTorch APIs and 2,076 TensorFlow APIs and records their call stacks.

Software and Hardware: If not specified, all experiments are conducted on a server with Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 6226R 2.90GHz 16-core processors, 130 GB of RAM and an NVIDIA 3090 GPU running Ubuntu 22.04 as the operating system.

B. Effectiveness and Efficiency in Detecting Bugs

Experiment Design: To evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of CITADEL in detecting real-world bugs, we conduct experiments on the PyTorch and TensorFlow frameworks and report the detected API bugs to developers for confirmation. Our experiment counts the number of API bugs detected by CITADEL, that is, when calling an API with certain inputs triggers one bug, CITADEL will consider that an API bug is detected. In addition, bugs with the same unexpected behavior will only be counted once on an API. During this process, we record the states of reports, such as confirmed or rejected (if considered false positive), and the bug types. Furthermore, to demonstrate the efficiency of CITADEL in generating cases that trigger bugs, we execute the complete procedure of CITADEL and three baselines to record the total number of generated test cases and the number of test cases that can trigger bugs and the time cost of testing, as described in §V-A. As the baselines may not save some test cases or inputs, to ensure that we do not mistakenly count such excluded test cases, we directly record the total number of generated test files as the total amount of test cases.

Results: Table I summarizes the three types of bugs detected by CITADEL: ‘S.’, ‘V.’, and ‘P.’ (i.e., status, value, and performance bugs), and ‘T.’ shows the total number of three types of bugs. The first column of Table I displays the DL framework and the following columns indicate the number of all detected bugs (#Total), rejected bugs or false positives (#Rejected), new bugs (#New), and new bugs that have been confirmed (#Confirmed). In addition, Table II presents a comparison between CITADEL and baselines in the three metrics in §V-A. The first column shows four test approaches in comparison and

TABLE II: Comparison of CITADEL and Baselines Results

| Approach | Framework | API Coverage | | Case Generation | | | Average Time To Detect Bugs (min) |
|-----------|------------|--------------|--------|-----------------|---------|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| | | #API | #Pairs | #Valid | #Total | Ratio (%) | |
| DocTer | PyTorch | 498 | \ | 45 | 17,227 | 0.26 | 107.16 |
| | TensorFlow | 911 | \ | 206 | 16,632 | 1.24 | 25.98 |
| | Total | 1,409 | \ | 251 | 33,859 | 0.74 | 41.98 |
| DeepREL | PyTorch | 1,071 | 4,290 | 2,001 | 77,662 | 2.58 | 40.63 |
| | TensorFlow | 1,902 | 8,808 | *2,052 | 252,533 | 0.81 | 64.71 |
| | Total | 2,973 | 13,098 | 4,053 | 330,195 | 1.23 | 58.62 |
| TitanFuzz | PyTorch | 1,329 | \ | 2,406 | 158,185 | 1.52 | 43.05 |
| | TensorFlow | 2,215 | \ | 11,235 | 191,862 | 5.86 | 101.96 |
| | Total | 3,544 | \ | 13,641 | 350,047 | 3.90 | 68.43 |
| CITADEL | PyTorch | 1,436 | 8,079 | 82 | 196 | 41.84 | 4.89 |
| | TensorFlow | 5,380 | 28,268 | 61 | 208 | 29.33 | 6.11 |
| | Total | 6,816 | 36,347 | 143 | 404 | 35.40 | 5.52 |

the second column displays the DL framework. The columns ‘#API’ and ‘#Pairs’ show the number of covered APIs and matched API pairs in each approach. The column ‘#Valid’ shows the number of generated cases that can trigger bugs and the column ‘#Total’ denotes the overall number of generated cases in one complete execution. The column ‘Ratio’ displays the ratio of the number of cases that triggered bugs to the total number of generated test cases.

Analysis of Effectiveness: The results in Table I illustrate the effectiveness of CITADEL in detecting various types of real-world bugs. CITADEL generates test cases based on a total of 172 real bugs collected from GitHub repositories and successfully detects 159 API bugs on PyTorch and TensorFlow, out of which only 9 were false positives (FPs) or rejected by developers. FPs arise from CITADEL misinterpreting expected abnormal behavior (e.g., NaN) on API function as bugs. The following ‘False Positive Case’ provides a detailed analysis of an FP case. Of the remaining 150 bugs, 24 have been reported in existing issues, while 126 are new bugs, with 94 of these being confirmed by developers. Excluding FPs, CITADEL detected 103 status bugs, 34 value bugs, and 13 performance bugs. Compared to other types of bugs, the occurrence of performance bugs is relatively rare. Our manual analysis of the PyTorch and TensorFlow repositories reveals that the reported performance bugs are infrequent. Take the PyTorch framework as an example, only approximately 300 issues are labeled as ‘performance’ out of over 10,000 open issues. Moreover, the limited number of issues with reproducible code poses a challenge for CITADEL to gather a significant amount of code related to performance bugs in DL framework repositories. Finally, 8/172 real bugs that CITADEL collects to generate test cases for the matched API pairs are related to performance. Based on these collected performance bugs, CITADEL detects and reports 13 new performance bugs, and 11 of them have been confirmed. Notice that API bugs may have the same root cause, and one effective patch may fix multiple API bugs [58]. CITADEL is not designed for faulty localization and program repair, and such topics are out of scope.

Analysis of Efficiency: The results in Table II demonstrate the efficiency of CITADEL in generating test cases to trigger




Fig. 6: Comparison of Average Time to Detect Bugs **Fig. 7:** Comparison of Number of Covered APIs

bugs. In the complete execution of baselines, DocTer generates 33,859 test files on PyTorch and TensorFlow in a complete execution, and only 251 of them (0.74% of the total) are valid cases. The testing process on two frameworks lasts over 99 hours, and the average time to detect bugs of DocTer is 41.98 min. On the PyTorch framework, DeepREL spends over 27 hours generating a total of 77,662 test files and marks 2,001 of them as ‘can trigger bugs’, and the valid test case ratio is 2.58%. DeepREL does not provide the test cases that can trigger bugs or the number of them on TensorFlow. Therefore, we count the number of candidate bugs it detects (the upper bound of possible bug cases) in Table II (marked *). DeepREL spends over 150 hours testing two frameworks, and at most 1.23% of all 330,195 generated test files can trigger bugs. The average time to detect bugs of DeepREL is 58.62 min. TitanFuzz spends over 72 hours generating 350,047 cases on two DL frameworks, 3.90% of which can catch valuable buggy behaviors or trigger bugs. The average time of TitanFuzz to detect bugs is 68.43 minutes. By contrast, CITADEL average spends 5.52 min to detect one bug, which is only 13.15%, 9.42%, and 8.07% of the average time cost of DocTer, DeepREL, and TitanFuzz, respectively. CITADEL is over 10x more time efficient than DeepREL and TitanFuzz in detecting bugs. Fig. 6 visually compares the average time to detect bugs for each method. In testing, CITADEL generates a total of 404 test files based on 172 collected bugs within 15 hours, and 143 of them can be used to discover bugs and the ratio reaches 35.40%. Note that quite a part of generated test files can be used to detect bugs for multiple analogous API functions at the same time, which improves the efficiency of CITADEL in generating test cases and detecting bugs. In addition, our experiments show that the time from when CITADEL starts testing to when it triggers the first bug is within 3 minutes, while baselines usually tend to take 8 minutes or more. CITADEL, therefore, outranks both baselines in generating and utilizing test cases to detect bugs efficiently.

Bug Case: In TensorFlow 2.13.0 release, CITADEL detects a series of status bugs on the MaxPooling APIs [59]. When the ‘pool_size’ argument receives a very large value (e.g., 1e+38), TensorFlow will crash without any exception on the GPU device. To detect the status bugs on the family of MaxPooling APIs, CITADEL first matches a series of pooling APIs, e.g., tensorflow.keras.layers.MaxPooling1/2D with the source API tensorflow.compat.v1.layers.MaxPooling1D. Subsequently,




Fig. 8: Crash on MaxPooling2D

CITADEL identifies the dimension-related arguments based on their API signatures, including ‘pool_size’ and ‘stride’. These arguments receive an integer in MaxPooling1D and a tuple of two integers in MaxPooling2D. To address the dimension difference, CITADEL dynamically adjusts the dimensions of the values based on the test code of the source API MaxPooling1D, marked in green in Fig. 8, and synthesize new test cases for analogous APIs (①). The new test case on MaxPooling2D has crashed, exhibiting the same anomalous behavior as observed in MaxPooling1D (②). Finally, CITADEL identifies the new status bug on MaxPooling2D. The newly discovered bug has been reported and confirmed by developers.

False Positive Case: CITADEL still has false positive (FP) cases even though the FP rate is only 5.66%. Our analysis shows that in these cases, CITADEL misjudges some APIs’ abnormal behaviors (e.g., producing ‘NaN’) as bugs. For most API functions, such abnormal behaviors are dangerous and are always caused by bugs, but for several API functions, they are expected output for developers, leading to FPs in CITADEL. Here, we present an example. CITADEL encounters a false positive when detecting a bug on the torch.logdet API. During testing, CITADEL matches torch.logdet with torch.det and then constructs test cases for the target API logdet based on a buggy code of the source API det. When executing the test cases, CITADEL finds that both APIs have abnormal and dangerous output value ‘NaN’ (i.e., not a number) which could further affect subsequent calculations and raise dangerous behaviors [60]. However, developers suggest that the abnormal ‘NaN’ output on logdet is due to the calculation characteristics of this API. When the input matrix is close to being non-invertible (e.g., very small singular values), then these APIs may return incorrect results [61]. FP cases show the limitations of CITADEL in identifying bugs on APIs that are allowed to exhibit abnormal behaviors. How to identify and filter these expected behaviors to reduce FPs will be our future direction.

C. Effectiveness in API Coverage

Experiment Design and Results: To evaluate the effectiveness of CITADEL in covering DL framework APIs in tests, following the prior work [15], [14], we collect data on the number of verified pairs by the API matcher and the total number of covered APIs in CITADEL. Furthermore, we execute each baseline method three times and record the maximum number of covered APIs and API pairs for comparison. The column ‘API Coverage’ of Table II compares the number of covered APIs and API pairs among the four approaches




Fig. 9: Comparison of API Coverage and Matched API Pairs

as recorded during runtime. In addition, Fig. 9 uses Venn diagrams to present the comparison of the number of covered APIs and matched API pairs between CITADEL and the baselines. Since we could not find specifics on the APIs and pairs covered by DeepREL in its repository, we use the data collected from its full execution.

Analysis: The experiment results illustrate the effectiveness of CITADEL in achieving a higher coverage of APIs during testing. CITADEL covers a total of 1,436 PyTorch APIs and 5,380 TensorFlow APIs, which is 365 more PyTorch APIs and 3,478 more TensorFlow APIs than DeepREL and significantly more than 498 PyTorch APIs and 911 TensorFlow APIs covered by DocTer. In comparison to TitanFuzz, CITADEL extends its coverage by 3,272 additional API functions. Fig. 7 intuitively shows the advantage of CITADEL in covering more APIs. Furthermore, as depicted in Fig. 9(a), CITADEL covers 3,081 unique API functions not supported by baselines, which helps to identify 26 bugs, including 21 status bugs, 2 value bugs, and 3 performance bugs. In addition, as demonstrated in Fig. 9(b), CITADEL identifies 5,741 previously unmatched pairs on PyTorch and 22,891 pairs on TensorFlow. The newly covered API pairs enable CITADEL to successfully detect 53 API bugs on PyTorch and TensorFlow, comprising 45 status bugs, 3 value bugs, and 5 performance bugs, which demonstrates the effectiveness of the newly covered APIs and API pairs of CITADEL in detecting bugs. For example, CITADEL newly matches the API pair of `Conv2d` and `LazyConvTranspose2d` via the context similarity and identifies the performance bug in Fig. 2. The pair of `tensorflow.compat.v1.layers.MaxPooling1D` and `tensorflow.keras.layers.MaxPooling2D` in the case study of §V-B is also newly covered in CITADEL.

D. Impacts of Configurable Parameter

Experiment Design and Results: CITADEL leverages a built-in threshold β to determine whether two API functions share context similarity. To figure out the impacts of the threshold β and select its default value in CITADEL, we conduct experiments with different β values from 0.1 to 0.9 in increments of 0.1. Fig. 10 shows the results of these experiments on PyTorch and TensorFlow respectively. The X-axis represents the threshold values. As shown in the legend, the orange and red lines separately indicate the number of API functions covered by context similarity and the number of detected bugs. The blue line illustrates the ratio of the number of target APIs that successfully trigger bugs to the total number of target APIs matched by context similarity (for convenience, we refer to it




Fig. 10: Impacts of Different β Values on PyTorch and TensorFlow

as *effective target API ratio*). A higher effective target API ratio means that API pairs matched by context similarity are more effective in detecting bugs. Numbers in different colors on the Y-axis show the values of corresponding lines.

Analysis: Fig. 10 illustrates the impact of different values of β on the detection results of CITADEL on different frameworks. Since modifying β has similar effects on the testing results of different frameworks, we focus our detailed analysis on the impact of β on PyTorch in this section.

When β is set to 0.6 to 0.8, CITADEL can achieve good detection results. A higher β value leads to more stringent evaluations of API pairs sharing context similarity, resulting in a reduction in the number of covered API functions, as shown in Fig. 10(a). Increasing the threshold value from 0.7 to 0.9 results in a sharp decline in the number of covered API functions from 638 to 465. Simultaneously, the bug detection ability of CITADEL also declines significantly. When β is 0.4, CITADEL can detect 53 bugs through context-similar API pairs, and this number decreases to only 24 when β increases to 0.9. However, the increase in the β can improve the effectiveness of matched context-similar API functions in triggering bugs. When the β increases from 0.4 to 0.9, the effective target API ratio on PyTorch rises from 16.19% to 64.86%. Finally, we set the default value of β to 0.6 on PyTorch and 0.8 on TensorFlow in CITADEL as a trade-off to maximize its API coverage, effectiveness in bug detection, and effective target API ratio.

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper presents CITADEL, an automated bug-finding method for DL frameworks that can find new bugs that are similar to known bugs, regardless of bug types. For a problematic DL framework API and its associated bugs, it matches analogous APIs from the perspectives of context similarity and signature similarity and then synthesizes test cases for these analogous APIs. Then, CITADEL leverages the behavior of the confirmed bug on the problematic API as the test oracle to evaluate the generated test cases and identify new bugs on analogous APIs. Our evaluation on PyTorch and TensorFlow frameworks shows that CITADEL can effectively detect three types of bugs, namely, status, value, and performance bugs.

REFERENCES

- [1] “Reinventing search with a new ai-powered microsoft bing and edge, your copilot for the web,” 2023, <https://blogs.microsoft.com/blog/2023/02/07/reinventing-search-with-a-new-ai-powered-microsoft-bing-and-edge-your-copilot-for-the-web>.
- [2] “Artificial intelligence (ai) software market - global industry analysis, size, share, growth, trends, regional outlook, and forecast 2023-2032,” 2022, <https://www.precedenceresearch.com/artificial-intelligence-software-market>.
- [3] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, “Deep residual learning for image recognition,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [4] S. Grigorescu, B. Trasnea, T. Cocias, and G. Macesanu, “A survey of deep learning techniques for autonomous driving,” *Journal of Field Robotics*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 362–386, 2020.
- [5] H. Li, “Deep learning for natural language processing: advantages and challenges,” *National Science Review*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 24–26, 2018.
- [6] S. Blanco, “Report: Tesla autopilot involved in 736 crashes since 2019,” 2023, <https://www.caranddriver.com/news/a44185487/report-tesla-autopilot-crashes-since-2019/>.
- [7] A. Nistor, P.-C. Chang, C. Radoi, and S. Lu, “Caramel: Detecting and fixing performance problems that have non-intrusive fixes,” in *2015 IEEE/ACM 37th IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering*, vol. 1. IEEE, 2015, pp. 902–912.
- [8] G. Jin, L. Song, X. Shi, J. Scherpelz, and S. Lu, “Understanding and detecting real-world performance bugs,” *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, vol. 47, no. 6, pp. 77–88, 2012.
- [9] A. Lacoste, A. Luccioni, V. Schmidt, and T. Dandres, “Quantifying the carbon emissions of machine learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.09700*, 2019.
- [10] H. V. Pham, T. Lutellier, W. Qi, and L. Tan, “Cradle: cross-backend validation to detect and localize bugs in deep learning libraries,” in *2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1027–1038.
- [11] Q. Guo, X. Xie, Y. Li, X. Zhang, Y. Liu, X. Li, and C. Shen, “Audee: Automated testing for deep learning frameworks,” in *Proceedings of the 35th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, 2020, pp. 486–498.
- [12] Z. Wang, M. Yan, J. Chen, S. Liu, and D. Zhang, “Deep learning library testing via effective model generation,” in *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2020, pp. 788–799.
- [13] J. Gu, X. Luo, Y. Zhou, and X. Wang, “Muffin: Testing deep learning libraries via neural architecture fuzzing,” in *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*, 2022, pp. 1418–1430.
- [14] A. Wei, Y. Deng, C. Yang, and L. Zhang, “Free lunch for testing: Fuzzing deep-learning libraries from open source,” in *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*, 2022, pp. 995–1007.
- [15] Y. Deng, C. Yang, A. Wei, and L. Zhang, “Fuzzing deep-learning libraries via automated relational api inference,” in *Proceedings of the 30th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2022, pp. 44–56.
- [16] D. Xie, Y. Li, M. Kim, H. V. Pham, L. Tan, X. Zhang, and M. W. Godfrey, “Docter: documentation-guided fuzzing for testing deep learning api functions,” in *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*, 2022, pp. 176–188.
- [17] R. E. Bryant, O. David Richard, and O. David Richard, *Computer systems: a programmer's perspective*. Prentice Hall Upper Saddle River, 2003, vol. 2.
- [18] D. Patterson, J. Gonzalez, Q. Le, C. Liang, L.-M. Munguia, D. Rothchild, D. So, M. Texier, and J. Dean, “Carbon emissions and large neural network training,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.10350*, 2021.
- [19] “torch.nn.functional.conv1d/2d/3d crash with floating point exception,” 2022, <https://github.com/pytorch/pytorch/issues/85111>.
- [20] “Training grouped conv2d is slow,” 2022, <https://github.com/pytorch/pytorch/issues/70954>.
- [21] A. Paszke, S. Gross, F. Massa, A. Lerer, J. Bradbury, G. Chanan, T. Killeen, Z. Lin, N. Gimelshein, L. Antiga et al., “Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library,” in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2019, pp. 8026–8037.
- [22] N. Ketkar and N. Ketkar, “Introduction to keras,” *Deep learning with python: a hands-on introduction*, pp. 97–111, 2017.
- [23] X. Zhang, N. Sun, C. Fang, J. Liu, J. Liu, D. Chai, J. Wang, and Z. Chen, “Predoo: precision testing of deep learning operators,” in *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*, 2021, pp. 400–412.
- [24] N. Christou, D. Jin, V. Atlidakis, B. Ray, and V. P. Kemerlis, “{IvySyn}: Automated vulnerability discovery in deep learning frameworks,” in *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*, 2023, pp. 2383–2400.
- [25] H. J. Kang, P. Rattanukul, S. A. Haryono, T. G. Nguyen, C. Ragkhitwet-sagul, C. Pasareanu, and D. Lo, “Skipfuzz: Active learning-based input selection for fuzzing deep learning libraries,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.04038*, 2022.
- [26] C. Yang, Y. Deng, J. Yao, Y. Tu, H. Li, and L. Zhang, “Fuzzing automatic differentiation in deep-learning libraries,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04351*, 2023.
- [27] J. Wang, T. Lutellier, S. Qian, H. V. Pham, and L. Tan, “Eagle: creating equivalent graphs to test deep learning libraries,” in *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*, 2022, pp. 798–810.
- [28] Y. Deng, C. S. Xia, H. Peng, C. Yang, and L. Zhang, “Large language models are zero-shot fuzzers: Fuzzing deep-learning libraries via large language models,” in *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*, 2023, pp. 423–435.
- [29] J. Chen, Y. Liang, Q. Shen, J. Jiang, and S. Li, “Toward understanding deep learning framework bugs,” *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, 2022.
- [30] K. J. Ottenstein, “An algorithmic approach to the detection and prevention of plagiarism,” *ACM Sigcse Bulletin*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 30–41, 1976.
- [31] J. A. Faidhi and S. K. Robinson, “An empirical approach for detecting program similarity and plagiarism within a university programming environment,” *Computers & Education*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 11–19, 1987.
- [32] C. K. Roy and J. R. Cordy, “Nicad: Accurate detection of near-miss intentional clones using flexible pretty-printing and code normalization,” in *2008 16th IEEE international conference on program comprehension*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 172–181.
- [33] L. Luo, J. Ming, D. Wu, P. Liu, and S. Zhu, “Semantics-based obfuscation-resilient binary code similarity comparison with applications to software plagiarism detection,” in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSOFT international symposium on foundations of software engineering*, 2014, pp. 389–400.
- [34] H. Sajani, V. Saini, J. Svajlenko, C. K. Roy, and C. V. Lopes, “Sourcecerc: Scaling code clone detection to big-code,” in *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Software Engineering*, 2016, pp. 1157–1168.
- [35] Z. Đurić and D. Gašević, “A source code similarity system for plagiarism detection,” *The Computer Journal*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 70–86, 2013.
- [36] W. Wang, Z. Deng, Y. Xue, and Y. Xu, “Ccstokener: Fast yet accurate code clone detection with semantic token,” *Journal of Systems and Software*, p. 111618, 2023.
- [37] J. Zhang, X. Wang, H. Zhang, H. Sun, K. Wang, and X. Liu, “A novel neural source code representation based on abstract syntax tree,” in *2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 783–794.
- [38] L. Jiang, Z. Su, and E. Chiu, “Context-based detection of clone-related bugs,” in *Proceedings of the the 6th joint meeting of the European software engineering conference and the ACM SIGSOFT symposium on The foundations of software engineering*, 2007, pp. 55–64.
- [39] J. Crussell, C. Gibler, and H. Chen, “Attack of the clones: Detecting cloned applications on android markets,” in *Computer Security—ESORICS 2012: 17th European Symposium on Research in Computer Security, Pisa, Italy, September 10-12, 2012. Proceedings 17*. Springer, 2012, pp. 37–54.
- [40] D.-K. Chae, J. Ha, S.-W. Kim, B. Kang, and E. G. Im, “Software plagiarism detection: a graph-based approach,” in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM international conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, 2013, pp. 1577–1580.
- [41] R. Elva and G. T. Leavens, “Semantic clone detection using method ioe-behavior,” in *2012 6th International Workshop on Software Clones (IWSC)*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 80–81.
- [42] F.-H. Su, J. Bell, G. Kaiser, and S. Sethumadhavan, “Identifying functionally similar code in complex codebases,” in *2016 IEEE 24th*

- international conference on program comprehension (icpc)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–10.
- [43] H. Kim, Y. Jung, S. Kim, and K. Yi, “Mecc: memory comparison-based clone detector,” in *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Software Engineering*, 2011, pp. 301–310.
- [44] C. McMillan, M. Grechanik, and D. Poshyvanyk, “Detecting similar software applications,” in *2012 34th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 364–374.
- [45] “Fix 64bit indexing in vol2col,” 2022, <https://github.com/pytorch/pytorch/pull/87527>.
- [46] “Workaround for cufft bug,” 2021, <https://github.com/pytorch/pytorch/pull/63327>.
- [47] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. E. Hinton, “Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 60, no. 6, pp. 84–90, 2017.
- [48] J. Gong, H. Li, Q. Li, and L. Meng, “A deep analysis of grouped convolution schemes for improving deep learning performance.” in *ATAIT*, 2021, pp. 45–52.
- [49] “Pytorch issue template,” 2023, https://github.com/pytorch/pytorch/blob/main/.github/ISSUE_TEMPLATE/bug-report.yml.
- [50] “Tensorflow issue template,” 2023, https://github.com/tensorflow/tensorflow/blob/master/.github/ISSUE_TEMPLATE/tensorflow_issue_template.yaml.
- [51] M. Alkhalaf, A. Aydın, and T. Bultan, “Semantic differential repair for input validation and sanitization,” in *Proceedings of the 2014 International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. ACM, 2014, pp. 225–236.
- [52] A. H. Murphy, “The finley affair: A signal event in the history of forecast verification,” *Weather and forecasting*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 3–20, 1996.
- [53] J. Svajlenko and C. K. Roy, “Fast and flexible large-scale clone detection with cloneworks.” in *ICSE (Companion Volume)*, 2017, pp. 27–30.
- [54] C. Ragkhitwetsagul, J. Krinke, and B. Marnette, “A picture is worth a thousand words: Code clone detection based on image similarity,” in *2018 IEEE 12th International workshop on software clones (IWSC)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 44–50.
- [55] M. Novak, M. Joy, and D. Kermek, “Source-code similarity detection and detection tools used in academia: a systematic review,” *ACM Transactions on Computing Education (TOCE)*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 1–37, 2019.
- [56] R. L. Cheu, D. Srinivasan, and E. T. Teh, “Support vector machine models for freeway incident detection,” in *Proceedings of the 2003 IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 1. IEEE, 2003, pp. 238–243.
- [57] N. Zhao, J. Chen, Z. Yu, H. Wang, J. Li, B. Qiu, H. Xu, W. Zhang, K. Sui, and D. Pei, “Identifying bad software changes via multimodal anomaly detection for online service systems,” in *Proceedings of the 29th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2021, pp. 527–539.
- [58] “Commit 32fbeb1 introduced 7-10x slowdown for th.inverse on large batch matrices,” 2022, <https://github.com/pytorch/pytorch/issues/80735>.
- [59] “Process aborted when running tf.keras.layers.maxpooling1d on gpu with large pool size,” 2023, <https://github.com/tensorflow/tensorflow/issues/61778>.
- [60] A. Odena, C. Olsson, D. Andersen, and I. Goodfellow, “Tensorfuzz: Debugging neural networks with coverage-guided fuzzing,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2019, pp. 4901–4911.
- [61] “Extremal values in linalg,” 2023, https://pytorch.org/docs/master/notes/numerical_accuracy.html.