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ABSTRACT
Automatic Program Repair (APR) is a practical research topic that studies techniques to automatically repair programs to fix bugs. Most existing APR techniques are designed for imperative programming languages, such as C and Java, and rely on analyzing correct and incorrect executions of programs to identify and repair suspicious statements.

We introduce a new APR approach for software specifications written in the Alloy declarative language, where specifications are not “executed”, but rather converted into logical formulas and analyzed using backend constraint solvers, to find specification instances and counterexamples to assertions. We present ATR, a technique that takes as input an Alloy specification with some violated assertion and returns a repaired specification that satisfies the assertion. The key ideas are (i) analyzing the differences between counterexamples that do not satisfy the assertion and instances that do satisfy the assertion to guide the repair and (ii) generating repair candidates from specific templates and pruning the space of repair candidates using the counterexamples and satisfying instances. Experimental results using existing large Alloy benchmarks show that ATR is effective in generating difficult repairs. ATR repairs 66.3% of 1974 fault specifications, including specification repairs that cannot be handled by existing Alloy repair techniques. ATR and all benchmarks are open-source and available in the following Github repository: https://github.com/guolong-zheng/atmprep.
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• Software and its engineering → Software defect analysis;
• Error handling and recovery.
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1 INTRODUCTION
Declarative specification languages have been used for diverse software engineering problems. In particular, the Alloy specification language [27], which relies on relational algebra and first-order logic, has been applied to a wide range of software engineering tasks, including software verification [8, 19–21, 44, 50, 55, 60, 70–72], test case generation [32, 45, 49, 58, 63], software design [10–12, 28, 34, 68], network security [43, 52, 61], security analysis of emerging platforms, such as IoT and Android platforms [3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 13, 50, 51, 56, 59, 62], among others. Moreover, the use of Alloy for software specification is tightly integrated with the Alloy Analyzer, allowing users to automatically check that the given specification satisfies some desirable properties. This, in turn, makes the problem of testing and verifying Alloy specifications much easier and directly integrated into the Alloy environment.

Despite the power of the Alloy Analyzer, Alloy users, just like Java or C developers, can introduce subtle bugs when writing specifications. While the Alloy Analyzer can help to automatically check properties and generate counterexamples showing assertion violations, the actual debugging tasks of evaluating and fixing the issues remain challenging and manual, especially for specifications that model large systems and complicated behaviors.

Compared to the rich literature and techniques in automatic program repair (APR) for imperative languages, there are much fewer APR techniques for Alloy. ARepair [74], arguably the first APR work for Alloy, mimics APR techniques that fix bugs witnessed by failing test cases and thus assumes the availability of tests as an oracle for correctness. While tests are common for programming languages, they are not often used in Alloy specification settings,
where users write assertions to describe expectations and employ the Alloy Analyzer to check them. In addition, just like in “imperative” APR approaches, ARepair suffers from the overfitting problem when tests are inadequate (i.e., the generated repair passes the tests, but is incorrect in general).

In contrast, the recent BeAFix [25] technique directly uses assertions as correctness oracles and reduces the overfitting problem. However, this approach can be slow as it exhaustively enumerates the possible candidate repairs up to a certain bound and checks if any of them successfully satisfies the failing assertions. Indeed, as shown in this work, BeAFix fails to generate complex repairs for many Alloy specifications as those would require trying a prohibitively large number of repair candidates.

In this work, we introduce ATR, a new APR technique and tool that fixes Alloy specifications failing given assertions. Given an Alloy specification and a property that is not satisfied by the specification, ATR first uses an existing Alloy fault localization tool as a blackbox to identify suspicious expressions causing the violation. ATR next queries the underlying Alloy Analyzer for a counterexample, an instance of the specification that does not satisfy the property, and then uses a partial max satisfiability (PMAXSAT) solver [16] to find an instance that does satisfy the property and is as close as possible to the counterexample. ATR then generates repairing expressions from predefined templates and uses the counterexamples and satisfying instances to prune candidate repairs.

Thus, unlike ARepair relies on tests, ATR is similar to BeAFix and uses well-established and widely-used assertions, naturally compatible with the specification practices in Alloy. The main novelty of ATR is that it generates repairs using templates and exploits the differences between counterexamples and satisfying instances of the specification to guide the repair process. These instances are generated by constraint solvers, which are the main underlying technologies in Alloy, and their differences significantly help ATR prune the search space and synthesize much richer and more accurate repairs.

We evaluate ATR on two benchmarks, developed by other research groups, consisting of 1974 buggy specifications from ARepair [73] and Alloy4Fun [42]. The experimental results corroborate that ATR is able to consistently repair faulty Alloy specification with 66.3% repair rate, compared to 9.8% repair rate of ARepair and 50.9% of BeAFix. The average run time to fix each specification is 364.4 seconds, compared to 1569.8 seconds of BeAFix and 91.9 seconds of ARepair (though ARepair also generates many overfitting repairs). The experiments show that ATR can repair nontrivial bugs effectively and in many cases can even synthesize new expressions to complete empty predicates. The repairs generated by ATR are similar to manual repairs, i.e., with short syntax edit distance.

To summarize, our contributions are two-fold. First, we present a novel APR technique for declarative specifications in the Alloy language. The insight underlying our approach is using templates and the counterexamples and closely related satisfying instances to guide and reduce the space of the repair search. Second, we develop a fully automated APR tool called ATR that effectively realizes our APR approach. We evaluate ATR using a large list of buggy Alloy specifications found in prior work and show the effectiveness of ATR on these benchmarks. We make ATR and all experimental results open-source and publicly available on Github: https://github.com/guolong-zheng/atmprep.

2 OVERVIEW

Fig. 1 gives the overview of ATR, which takes as input a specification that violates an asserted property. ATR first invokes a fault localization tool to obtain a list of suspicious expressions. ATR next generates pairs of counterexamples and satisfying instances of the specification concerning the asserted property. To have a more accurate comparison among these instances, ATR uses a PMAXSAT solver to generate satisfying instances that are as similar as possible to the counterexamples.

From the generated instances, ATR then generates a set of boolean templates using atoms, signatures, and fields and prunes these templates based on their results evaluated from the counterexample and satisfying instances. From the remaining templates, ATR generalizes them to Alloy expressions and combines the expressions using logic operators.

Finally, ATR patches the suspicious statements with the generated expressions and checks if Alloy can find counterexamples for the assertion in the modified specification. If Alloy finds no counterexample, then ATR has found a fix. Otherwise, ATR uses the new counterexamples to generate satisfying instances and repeats the repair process.

2.1 Background

**Alloy.** An Alloy [26] specification captures a formal software model using the following main elements: (1) *signs* (signatures) are used to define basic data domains, which may be structured using *fields*, defining relationships between *signs*; (2) *facts* introduce always-hold constraints (model assumptions) written in Alloy’s logic (first-order logic with relational operators, including closures); *fun* (functions) are named parameterized Alloy expressions, and *preds* (predicates) are named parameterized Alloy formulas, which can be used to define model operations and properties, as well as for defining facts; and (3) *check* and *run* commands invoke an automated analyzer for checking *asserts* (assertions, Alloy formulas) and running *preds*, respectively.
Alloy’s automated analysis is provided by the Alloy Analyzer, which translates Alloy specifications into propositional formulas and uses underlying SAT solvers to find counterexamples violating the asserted properties (when invoked with `check`), and specification instances satisfying predicates (when invoked with `run`). Intuitively, given a specification $M$ and an assertion $p$, Alloy Analyzer will search for counterexamples by solving a propositional formula for the constraints of $M \land \neg p$; in contrast, when $p$ is a predicate, Alloy Analyzer will search for instances satisfying $p$ by solving $M \land p$. Alloy’s analysis is bounded-exhaustive, i.e., given a specification $p$, Analyzer will search for instances satisfying (resp. satisfying instance) for $p$.

Fault Localization. One of the main components of an APR technique is fault localization, which identifies suspicious statements in the program where the error occurs. An effective fault localization algorithm can significantly reduce the search space and guide the repair process to the relevant code region.

The current implementation of ATR uses the FLACK fault localization tool for Alloy [77]. FLACK takes as input an Alloy specification violating some assertion and returns a list of suspicious expressions likely contributing to the violation. Because ATR treats fault localization tool as a blackbox, it can use other Alloy fault localization tools such as AlloyFL [75].

Partial Maximum Satisfiability. To synthesize and prune relevant candidate repairs, ATR searches for an instance that satisfies the given specification but is closely similar to the counterexample. To do this, we reduce this task to a PMAXSAT (partial maximum satisfiability) problem [39] and solve it using Pardinius [16].

The PMAXSAT problem is defined as follows: given a set of hard clauses and a set of soft clauses, find a solution that satisfies all the hard clauses and as many soft clauses as possible. ATR encodes the specification $M$ and the property $p$ as the hard constraints and the counterexample as the soft constraints, and finds an instance that satisfies $p$ and is as similar to the counterexample as possible.

2.2 Illustrative Example

Fig. 2 shows an Alloy specification for a room access control problem. First, we define several classes or types (`sig’s`): Room has one subclass SecureLab; Person has two non-overlapping subclasses Employee and Researcher sharing a common field `owns` that represents a set of keys owned by a person; and Key has a field `opened_by` representing exactly one Room opened by the key. We also define a couple of facts capturing additional constraints. The first specifies that there are at least one employee and one researcher, at least one key to open SecureLab, and some employee owns more than one key.

The second specifies that every room can be opened by some key, and each employee owns some key and this key can not open SecureLab. Next, we have a predicate CanEnter, a boolean function checking that a person can enter a room only if they own a key to that room. Finally, to ensure the secure access of SecureLab, we use the assert `is_secured` to check that only researchers can enter the secure lab.

![Figure 2: A buggy Alloy specification.](image-url)

To check the assertion, we run the Alloy Analyzer on this specification with the check command as shown on line 28. The Analyzer disproves the assertion by generating a counterexample, shown in Fig. 3, which describes a scenario in which an employee owns a key that opens SecureLab. Thus, the specification contains a bug violating the asserted property. Our goal is then to use ATR to fix the bug.

Fault Localization. Similar to most APR approaches, ATR first identifies where the bug occurs. By using the Alloy fault localization tool FLACK [77], we find that the fault is likely caused by the fact on line 18. This fact specifies that every employee owns some key that can not open SecureLab. However, this fact misses a constraint that an employee can not own keys that can open the secure lab.

To repair this “under-constraint” defect, ATR needs to synthesize this new constraint and add it to the expression on line 18. We note that none of the existing Alloy repair techniques can fix this specification violation. For example, both ARepair [74] and BeAFix [25] tools indicate that they fail to repair the violation.

Counterexample and Satisfying Instances. ATR exploits the rich details captured by instances generated by the Alloy Analyzer. To synthesize a repair for the suspicious expression returned by fault localization, ATR analyses the differences between instances that do not satisfy the assertion (i.e., counterexamples) and those that do satisfy the assertion (i.e., satisfying instances) to reduce the search space.

The Alloy Analyzer has already provided the needed counterexample violating the assertion, e.g., Fig. 3. However, we still need a satisfying instance. One way to find such an instance is creating a predicate `pred is_secured` with similar contents as those from assert `is_secured` and asking the Alloy Analyzer to find an instance, such as the one given in Fig. 4, that satisfies the predicate.
We hypothesize that the differences between the counterexample and satisfying instances can help debug the issue. However, in this case, the counterexample in Fig. 3 and the satisfying instance in Fig. 4 are too different to be useful. For example, Researcher\(^0\) owns a Key\(^1\) that opens Room in the satisfying instance but does not own any key in the counterexample. However, this difference is unrelated to the defect. Indeed, satisfying instances randomly generated from the Alloy Analyzer often give many irrelevant differences to the counterexamples.

We need counterexamples and satisfying instances that have as few differences as possible. To obtain this, we treat the problem as a PMAXSAT problem, in which we set the counterexample as soft constraints and the Alloy specification and the predicate as hard constraints, and then use a PMAXSAT solver to find an instance that satisfies all the hard constraints (i.e., satisfying the specification) and as many soft constraints as possible (i.e., similar to the counterexample).

In this example, using the Pardinus \cite{16} PMAXSAT solver, ATR obtains the satisfying instance in Fig. 5 that is very similar to the counterexample in Fig. 3. The only difference here is that Employee does not own Key\(^1\) that opens the secure lab. This difference is precisely the property causing the counterexample to violate the assertion.

**Candidate Repairs.** Unlike a traditional program (e.g., C), composed of multiple simple statements, Alloy has fewer but more complicated expressions. Thus, the search space is more extensive as we need to consider candidate fixes for the entire expression on line 18 and its subexpressions.

ATR uses the details from the counterexample and instances to generate relevant expressions to repair the buggy one on line 18. Moreover, to further reduce the search space, we generate new expressions under a specific grammar (template) consisting of commonly used Alloy binary and unary boolean and relational operators (given in Fig. 6 and described in \S 3.3).

Here, ATR uses seven atoms \texttt{Employee0, Researcher0, Key0, Key1, Room0, Room1} and \texttt{SecureLab}, which are atoms shared between the counterexample and the satisfying instance; five sigs \texttt{Employee, Researcher, Key, Room and SecureLab}; and two fields \texttt{owns} and \texttt{opened\_by}, that are collected from all defined sigs and fields in the specificaiton. From these, ATR uses the relational operators in line 2 in Fig. 6 to generate relational terms such as \texttt{Key0\_opened\_by, Employee \_owns, Room\_owns, and combines them with boolean operators in line 7 to form expressions such as \texttt{no Key0\_opened\_by, some Employee\_owns, Key1\_in Researcher\_owns.}

Note that the generated expressions (e.g., \texttt{Key1\_in Employee\_owns}) contains atoms (e.g., \texttt{Key1}) that are specific to the generated instances and are not valid Alloy expressions. Thus, when patching repairs, ATR generalizes these to live variables or relation terms in the specification scope (e.g., \texttt{Key1 becomes k or Ke}).

**Pruning.** Depending on the differences and the defect, we could generate many possible repair candidates. However, we can prune candidate expressions that give the same results when evaluating against the counterexample and satisfying instances. This is because while the counterexample and satisfying instances are similar by design, they inherently have different semantics (one does and the other does not satisfy the instance) and must give opposite results.

For example, the candidate expression \texttt{no Key0\_opened\_by} is pruned because it evaluates to False for both instances in Figs. 3 and 5. In contrast, \texttt{Key1\_in Employee\_owns} is kept as it evaluates to False in the satisfying instance and True in the counterexample. In our experience, this step helps reduce the search space significantly.

**Synthesizing Repairs.** ATR replaces the buggy expression with each candidate and checks that the Alloy analyzer cannot find any counterexample for the new specification (i.e., the specification does not violate the assertion). Note that ATR also requires the Alloy analyzer to find some satisfying instance for the new specification (otherwise this means the specification is too strong and not satisfiable). If the Alloy Analyzer found a satisfying instance and no counterexample, we consider the new specification as a valid fix. Otherwise, ATR repeats the process with the old and new counterexamples.

Note that if the original specification has other predicates and assertions other than the violated assertion, then the new specification, which fixes the violation, also preserves similar behaviors for those predicates and assertions as to the original one. This is similar to the positive and negative tests in traditional APR, where a repair candidate has to pass both the existing positive tests and the negative ones.

For this example, ATR finds the following repair:

```
all e : Employee | some k : Key | k in e.owns and
Securelab != k.opened_by and
e in e.owns.opened_by.Securelab // added constraint
```
Table 1: Mutation Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MO</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UOM</td>
<td>Unary Operator Modification</td>
<td>(a \mapsto \neg a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOD</td>
<td>Unary Operator Deletion</td>
<td>(a \mapsto a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOA</td>
<td>Unary Operator Addition</td>
<td>(a \mapsto \neg a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOM</td>
<td>Binary Operator Modification</td>
<td>(a + b \mapsto a - b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOD</td>
<td>Binary Operand Deletion</td>
<td>(a + b \mapsto b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOS</td>
<td>Binary Operand Swap</td>
<td>(a \mapsto b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOM</td>
<td>List Operator Modification</td>
<td>(a &amp;&amp; b \mapsto \neg a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOD</td>
<td>List Operator Deletion</td>
<td>(a \mapsto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

which adds a new constraint requiring the keys to open the secure lab are not owned by any employee.

**Complex Repairs and Program Synthesis.** For demonstration purposes, the above repair is relatively simple and thus allows ATR to generate the repair in the first iteration. However, for more complicated cases, ATR might need multiple iterations to find the fix. For example, the specification classroom_inv13_32.als in our experiment requires two iterations to generate the expression Tutors.Person in Teacher & Person.Tutors in Student to fix the bug no Student.Tutors.

Note that ATR can also be used as a synthesis tool that generates missing expressions in an Alloy specification. This is useful because many Alloy violations are due to missing information or facts. For example, the bst (binary search tree) example in our benchmark has an empty predicate, and ATR was able to synthesize the expression no n.left || no n.right to it (in 2 iterations) and thus completes the specification.

3 THE ATR APPROACH

In § 2 we give an overview of ATR in Fig. 1 and show how ATR works using a concrete example. In this section we describe the main ideas and designs of ATR.

3.1 Preprocess with Mutation

There are many bugs that can be repaired by simple mutations, for example, in addr.als of AREpair benchmark, the buggy expression all b : Book | n : Name | lone b.n.listed can be repaired by simply changing lone to some. To rapidly repair those simple bugs and generate initial counterexamples, ATR mutates the buggy expressions before starting template-based searching.

ATR uses eight mutation operations defined in Table 1: UOM (Unary Operator Modification) that changes a unary operator; UOD (Unary Operator Deletion) that deletes a unary operator; UOA (Unary Operator Addition) that adds a unary operator; BOM (Binary Operator Modification) that changes a binary operator; BOD (Binary Operand Deletion) that deletes a binary operand; BOS (Binary Operand Swap) that swaps the position of two operands if the binary operator is asymmetric; LOM (List Operator Modification) that changes a list operator; and LOD (List Operator Deletion) that deletes a list operand.

Given an expression, ATR applies mutation operators multiple times up to a certain bound, e.g., a \(\in\) b becomes \(b \in \neg a\) using 3 mutations: BOS, UOD, and UOA.

For each mutant, ATR checks if the Alloy analyzer generates any counterexamples. If no counterexample is generated, ATR considers this mutant as a repair and returns; otherwise, ATR checks if previous counterexamples are also counterexamples for the mutant. If all previous counterexamples satisfy the mutant, i.e., not counterexamples of the mutant, ATR considers the mutant a different mutant and asks the Alloy analyzer to generate a counterexample and adds it to the initial counterexample suite; otherwise, ATR considers the mutant the same as previous mutants and continues.

3.2 Instance Generation

Given a counterexample and an assertion, ATR generates one single instance that satisfies the asserted property with minimal differences from the counterexample. The reason for this is that while every counterexample and every satisfying instance will be different, we want pairs with the fewest differences possible so that we can analyze them effectively.

Thus, to obtain the desired satisfying instance that is as close to the counterexample as possible, ATR treats this problem as a PMAXSAT problem as described in § 2.1. More specifically, ATR converts the assertion to a predicate, and sets the predicate with the Alloy specification as the hard constraints, and the counterexample as the soft constraints. In this work, ATR uses the Pardinus [16] solver to solve the PMAXSAT problem and returns an instance that satisfies the predicate and has minimum differences with the counterexample.

As demonstrated in § 2.2, the reason to generate instances with minimal differences is to narrow the search space for candidate repair. While we can use the Alloy Analyzer to generate a satisfying instance, such randomly generated instances are quite different from the counterexample (cf. Fig. 3 and Fig. 4). More specifically, such randomly generated instances often contain properties that are irrelevant to the defect, hindering the discovery of properties related to the defect. Besides, the names of atoms in the Alloy analyzer are also randomly assigned, which may lead to mismatching between shared atoms and misleading the search process.

For example, considering the counterexample in Fig. 3 and the random Alloy generated instance in Fig. 4, the difference shows that Researcher0 owns Key1 that opens Room, which does not affect the satisfiability of the counterexample and the satisfying instance, and it may lead to over-constraint repairs that preventing Researcher1 to own Key to Room. With the PMAXSAT generated instance in Fig. 5, those unrelated differences are pruned out, and ATR can easily identify the crucial difference that Employee should not own key to SecureLab.

3.3 Generating and Pruning Templates

ATR generates repair candidates by enumerating candidate templates using the grammar given in Fig. 6. There are three different templates: relational templates (or terms) that connect variables using relational operators, shown in lines 5–7; boolean templates that connect relational expressions using boolean operators, shown in lines 1–3; and logic templates that connect templates using logic operators, as shown in lines 9–11.

Given a pair of counterexample and satisfying instances, ATR first generates all possible relational terms using shared atoms,
sigs, and fields up to a certain bound by the number of relational operators. For example, Employee.owns.Key1 is generated using sig Employ, field owns and atom Key1, with a bound of three operators: two dot join (.) operators and one transitive closure * operator.

Next, ATR generates boolean expressions by filling the holes in the boolean templates with the generated relational expressions. For example, given two terms Employee.owns and Key, for a symmetric template _ in _, two expressions are generated: Employee.owns in Key and Key in Employee.owns. For a symmetric template _ = _, only one expression is generated: Employee.owns = Key.

Pruning. When filling the holes, instead of using concrete relational terms, ATR uses values to fill the holes in the templates. Given an instance, many terms evaluate to same value and are semantically equivalent in that context. For example, key.opened_by and room are considered equivalent in Fig. 3 because they both evaluate to value Room + secure_lab.

If a term evaluates to the same value in the counterexample and satisfying instance, we use that value to represent the term; otherwise, we use the term. For example, some Key.opened_by and some Room become some Room + secure_lab because Key.opened_by and Room both evaluate to Room + secure.lab. Whereas some owns cannot be represented by value as owns evaluates to Key + Key in the counterexample and Key in the satisfying instance.

The similarity introduced by the PMAXSAT helps to reduce the number of different values significantly. For the instances in Fig. 3 and Fig. 5, there are 2855 relational terms, but only 136 different values and 23 different terms, which reduces the search space of each hole from 2855 to 159.

ATR then prunes the generated expressions based on the counterexample and the satisfying instance. ATR evaluates each expression in the context of the counterexample and the satisfying instance and keeps the ones with different evaluation results, i.e., True in the counterexample and False in the satisfying instance, and vice versa. If we can trust the counterexample and the satisfying instance, i.e., the satisfying instance is the expected instance, we can select the expressions evaluating False in the counterexample and True in the satisfying instance. However, the satisfying instances are generated from a "Faulty" specification and may not be an expected instance; we thus need to consider more situations.

Those different expressions are potential properties that differentiate between P and ~P and can help repair the defects. While the expressions with the same evaluation results are pruned out, as they are most likely implied by the bug-free part of the specification, and may not relate to the defect.

### 3.4 Synthesizing Repairs

The boolean expressions contain atoms that are bounded to the specific pair of counterexample and satisfying instance. ATR generalizes those boolean expressions to valid Alloy expressions by replacing the atoms with live variables at the buggy location. At the buggy line 18 in Fig. 2, we collect 2 live variables of type Key and Key, and Key in Employee.owns can generalize to k in Employee.owns or Key in Employee.owns.

ATR then combines the boolean expressions using logic operators to generate complete expressions. For example, the expression k in Employee.owns => some owns is generated by connecting k in Employee.owns and some owns with implies.

ATR patch the buggy specification with these expressions in three ways. For example, given the buggy expression:
\[
\text{all e : Employee | some k : Key | k in e.owns and SecureLab != k.opened_by}
\]

and the synthesized expression opened_by. SecureLab in e.owns, ATR generates the following patches:
1. Connecting with the buggy expression using logic operator.
   \[
   \text{all e : Employee | some k : Key | k in e.owns and SecureLab != k.opened_by implies}
   \]
   \[
   \text{opened_by. SecureLab in e.owns}
   \]
2. Replacing part of the buggy expression.
   \[
   \text{all e : Employee | some k : Key | k in e.owns and SecureLab in e.owns}
   \]
3. Replacing the whole buggy expression.
   \[
   \text{all e : Employee | some k : Key | opened_by. SecureLab in e.owns}
   \]

To ensure the repair is as similar as the original expression and to avoid overconstraint as much as possible, ATR applies these patches in the following order: first try (1), then (2), and finally (3).

Finally, for each new specification, ATR checks if the Alloy analyzer generates any counterexamples and any satisfying instance. If no counterexample is generated, ATR considers that the repair is done and returns; otherwise, ATR generates its corresponding satisfying instance and checks if the pair already exists, if so, the patched expression has no impact on the defect, thus is abandoned and the corresponding expression is removed in the next iteration; otherwise, the patch is saved, and ATR repeats the process with this patched version and the new pair of a counterexample and a satisfying instance.

### 4 EVALUATION

ATR is implemented in Java. It builds on top of Alloy 4.1 and uses the Pardinus [16] PMAXSAT solver. The tool takes as input an Alloy specification that fails an assertion and returns a specification satisfying that assertion while preserving other behaviors of the original specification (i.e., satisfying other existing assertions and predicates in the specification).

To evaluate ATR, we consider three research questions:
1. RQ1: Can ATR repair Alloy bugs effectively?
2. RQ2: What are some interesting characteristics of ATR repairs?
(3) RQ3: How does ATR compare to other Alloy repair techniques?

To investigate these questions, we evaluate ATR using two different benchmarks shown in Tab. 2. The first one is from the Alloy4Fun project [42] and consists of 1936 buggy specifications collected from student submissions for six Alloy problems (classroom models class registrations, cv models work and source distribution problem, graphs models different graph properties, such as acyclic and complete, lts models a labeled transition system, production models an automated production line, and trash models a file system trash can).

The second benchmark is from the ARepair project [73] and consists of 38 buggy specifications collected from 12 Alloy problems: six from the Alloy Analyzer (addr models an address book, cd models object and class hierarchy, ctree models undirected trees, farmer models the chicken crossing problem, bempl and other model the security lab access problem, and grade is a gradebook specification) and the rest from graduate student homework (arr models sorted arrays, balancedBST models balanced binary search tree, dll doubly linked lists, fsm models finite state machines, and student models sorted linked lists).

The specifications are relatively small, i.e., tens or hundreds lines of code. However, they contain real bugs written by humans and consist of a wide variety of defects, from simple ones that can be repaired by modifying a single operator to complicated ones that require synthesizing new expressions and replacing the whole predicate body. Moreover, the correct versions of these specifications are provided with the benchmarks and used as ground truths to check our results.

For our experiments, we use ATR’s default setting. We set 5 as the maximum depth of relational expressions, i.e., generated relational expressions contain at most 5 relational operators. We set 3 as the maximum depth of logic structures, i.e., generated expressions contain at most 3 logic operators. For each specification, we use a 1-hour timeout, as used in BeAFix [25].

All these parameters can be modified by the user, and we choose this configuration based on experience.

All experiments reported here were run on a 2.4GHz Intel Xeon CPU with 16GB of RAM with Ubuntu 16.04. ATR and all benchmarks are open-source and available in the following Github repository: https://github.com/guolong-zheng/atmprep.

4.1 RQ1: Performance of ATR

Tab. 2 presents our results. Columns Models and #specs show the model groups and the number of buggy specifications in the groups. Column #repair shows the total number of correctly repaired specifications. Column #dist shows the average syntactic distance between the repaired expression and the manual repaired expression. Column overfit shows the number of fixes that are overfitting (satisfies the given requirements but incorrect in general). Finally, column time shows the average time in seconds, which includes both fault localization and repair time. Note that the average fault localization time is negligible, i.e., less than 1 second.

### Table 2: ATR’s Results on the ARepair and Alloy4Fun benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>#specs</th>
<th>#repair</th>
<th>dist</th>
<th>overfit</th>
<th>time(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARepair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>601.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cv</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>376.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graphs</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>156.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lts</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>487.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>332.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trash</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>254.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>1286</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>368.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARepair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balancedBST</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>584.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bempl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>922.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ctree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dll</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1615.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farmer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fsm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>443.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>829.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1308</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>364.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Successes. ATR was able to repair 1308/1974 (66.3%) specifications using an average time of 364.4s. For the Alloy4Fun benchmark, ATR repairs 1286/1936 (66.4%) specifications using 368.3s on average. For the ARepair benchmark, ATR repairs 22/38 (57.9%) specifications using 829.2s on average.

ATR can repair various kinds of bugs, from simple ones that can be repaired by a single mutation to complicated ones that require multiple templates. For example, in addr_1.als, ATR uses just one unary operator modification mutation to change the buggy expression all b:Book | all n:b.entry | lone b.listed[n] to all b:Book | all n:b.entry | some b.listed[n] to satisfies the assertion that all entries have at least one listed item. For the more complicated specification classroom_inv13_14.als, ATR changes the buggy expression all t:Teacher, s:Student | t->s in Tutors (all teacher tutors all student) to Tutors.Present in Teacher & Person.Tutors in Student (a person tutors must be a teacher and a person tutored must be a student) using the binary template __ in __ twice and the logic template __ & __ once.

ATR can also repair defects that cannot be repaired by BeAFix and ARepair. For example, in classroom_inv2_61, the user expects that each teacher teaches some groups in some class. BeAFix and ARepair both report no repair found for the buggy expression all t:Teacher | some g:Group | t.Tutors in g, (Class.Groups), which specifies that each teacher tutors some students without constraints over the teach relation. ATR generates the following fix:

all t:Teacher | some (t.Teaches).Groups

which specifies that each teacher teaches some groups and therefore satisfies the user’s intention.
**Fails.** ATR was not able to repair 666/1974 (33.7%) specifications. This is due to the inaccuracy of fault localization and the complexity of the bugs (responsible for 556 fails).

First, inaccurate results from FLACK cause ATR to fail to fix 110 specifications. Just like most APR approaches, ATR might not be effective if its fault localization tool does not give accurate results. For example, in student19.als, FLACK ranks the buggy expression at 8th place of the ranking list, and ATR times out for this specification. If we manually specify the buggy location for ATR, it finds the correct fix that is the same as the ground truth using 37 seconds. Thus, a more accurate underlying fault localization tool will significantly improve the ATR’s performance.

Second, ATR failed to fix 556 specifications due to the complexity of the required repairs. One common failure we observe is that many repairs require introducing new variables. For example, in cv_inv1_13.als, the ground truth fix for the buggy expression

\[
\text{some User visible is all u:User | u.visible in u.profile, which introduces and uses a new qualifier "u". ATR does not consider templates that introduce such arbitrary qualifiers and therefore cannot find such repairs. We can extend ATR for this, e.g., by introducing a new template all u:User | u.visible in u.profile, which introduces and uses a new qualifier "u". ATR does not consider templates that introduce such arbitrary qualifiers and therefore cannot find such repairs.}
\]

Thus, this template alone has \(1.7e^2\) possible candidates.

**4.2 RQ2: Repair Analysis**

**Similarity to ground truths.** ATR’s 1308 repairs are similar to the ground truth specifications. On average they are 5 syntactic edits from the ground truths, i.e., specifications generated by ATR can be transformed to the ground truths with 5 edits, including deleting, adding, and replacing nodes on the AST’s. For example, in 1ts_inv5_16.als, ATR transforms the buggy expression

\[
\text{all s1,s2:State | s1.trans = s2.trans to all s1,s2:State | State.trans.State = s2.trans.State using one binary boolean template } \{ ? = \text{true} \} \text{ which is 1 edits away from the manual fix all s1,s2:State | State.trans.State = s2.trans.State, i.e., replacing s1 by State.}
\]

We manually analyze the buggy and ATR’s patched expressions and find that the ATR’s patches do not depend on the syntactic complexity of the buggy expression or the similarity between the buggy expression and the ground truth. Instead, they mainly depend on the syntactic complexity of the correct expression, i.e., the number of operators and variables involved in the expression. Thus, ATR is able to generate fixes even if the buggy expressions are largely different from the correct ones. For example, in Trash_inv7_52.als, the user writes ~link.1ink in ide to specify that no file links to Trash, which underconstrains and allows a Trash file links to itself. ATR generates the fix Trash in (File ~ File.1ink) which specifies that Trash are files that no file links to and is semantically equivalent to the ground truth.

For mutation-based techniques, this fix requires at least five mutation operations. Both ARepair and BeAFix fail to find this fix within their time limits. ATR uses templates to replace the buggy expression, and is able to find this fix quickly using 75s (in the first iteration).

**A Synthesis Tool.** In addition to being an APR tool, ATR can also be used as a stand-alone synthesis tool that infers missing expressions in an Alloy specification. This is useful because many Alloy problems are due to missing information or facts (many of the bugs in the benchmarks we used are incomplete specifications).

For example, the bst specification in ARepair benchmark contains an empty predicate:

\[
\text{pred HasATMostOneChild( n : Node ) ()}
\]

which violates an assertion specifying that a node has at most a child node. For this bug, ATR synthesizes the expression

\[
\text{if n.left || n.right specifying that a node n has either no left child or no right child in the predicate and thus completes the specification.}
\]

The dll specification in ARepair benchmark also has an empty predicate

\[
\text{ConsistentPreEndNot, which trying to specify that in a doubly linked list, the next node’s previous node is itself. ATR completed the specification by synthesizing and inserting the expression}
\]

\[
\text{next = ~pre, which specifies that relation next is equivalent to the inverse of relation pre.}
\]

**Pruning.** The ability to scale a large search space of candidate repairs is crucial for any APR and synthesis approaches. ATR employs several tactics to prune repairs such as analyzing counterexamples and satisfying instances and only generating repairs under certain templates as described in § 3.

To show how pruning helps ATR, we ran ATR on the same benchmark with pruning disabled. Unsurprisingly, we found that ATR’s performance significantly degrades, in both increasing running time and producing much fewer fixes, when we do not use pruning. More specifically, ATR with pruning repairs 629 more specifications and saves about 15 mins of runtime on average. In short, we found that pruning is effective (in fact, required) in reducing the search space and helps ATR find correct fixes quickly and in general repair more specifications in the given time limit.

**Overfitting.** Overfitting is a major issue in APR where the fixes pass the given “oracles” (e.g., tests), but are incorrect in general. Assertions typically are an ideal oracle because they can capture a large set of tests. Nonetheless, if the assertions are not sufficiently strong, APR tools including both BeAFix and ATR can still generate overfitting fixes.

ATR produces overfitting fixes for 8/38 ARepair specifications and zero Alloy4Fun specifications. For ATR, these fixes are “correct” where the Alloy analyzer finds no counterexamples and some satisfying instances. However, they are incorrect in general as the patched specifications are not semantically equivalent to the ground truth specifications.

We found that ATR’s overfitting fixes are mostly caused by inaccurate fault localization, where the bug happens in a predicate, but the fault localization tool reports expressions in a fact. For example, the assertion in balancedBST3_2.als specifies that for a balanced tree, the height of a node’s left subtree and the height of its right subtree differs at most one. The buggy expression occurs in the predicate balanced, but the FLACK localization tool reports a spurious location in one of the facts. Surprisingly, ATR still can generate a repair candidate that satisfies the assertion (i.e., passes the oracles). Nonetheless, the generated fix, which forces that all nodes...
must have exactly one parent, is too strong and is thus incorrect in general. If we provide ATR with the correct buggy location in balancedBST3_2.als, it generates a correct fix that is semantically equivalent to the ground truth.

Note that other Alloy repair tools such as ARepair and BeAFix can also face overfitting issues. As described next in § 4.3, ARepair is more prone to overfitting as it relies on tests. BeAFix does not generate overfitting fixes because it requires the user to provide suspicious locations. If we provide BeAFix with the same inaccurate fault localization information, it would also generate an overfitting repair for the balancedBST2_3.als specification.

4.3 RQ3: Comparing Alloy Repair tools
We compare ATR with ARepair [74] and BeAFix [25], the two state of the art Alloy repair tools we are aware of. Similar to ATR, ARepair uses assertions and thus we reuse the same assertions from BeAFix’s experiments [25]. ARepair uses Alloy unit tests instead of assertions as oracles, and we use AUnit [69] to automatically generate such tests to represent assertions (the same way ARepair uses to repair assertion violations [74]). To better evaluate the automatic repair ability, we did not consider additional tests that the ARepair authors manually added. Consequently, our experimental results might be different from those reported in [74]. We use the best performance setting of ARepair as reported in [74]. We set a 1-hour timeout for all tools, the same time limitation used in the experiment of both ARepair and BeAFix.

Tab. 3 presents the results. Column correct shows that total number of correct repaired specifications. Column overfit shows the total number of overfitting patches. Column time shows the average time in seconds.

In summary, for 1974 specifications, ARepair generates patches for 1694/1974 (86.8%) specifications using an average time of 91.9 seconds. However, 1500 (88.5%) of 1694 generated patches are overfitting fixes. As observed in [25], the overfitting is caused by the limitation of using test suites as oracles and can be improved by providing ARepair with stronger test suites.

BeAFix generates fixes for 1005/1974 (50.9%) specifications with no overfitting using an average time of 1569.8 seconds. ATR generates correct fixes for 1300/1974 (67.1%) specifications and 8 overfitting patches using an average time of 364.4 seconds. Note that BeAFix requires the user to specify suspicious statements to repair, and if such information is inaccurate, BeAFix also generates overfitting repairs as discussed in § 4.2.

ATR shows the best repair rate, 67.1% against 9.8% of ARepair and 50.9% of BeAFix. Manually checking the repaired cases for all tools, we find that ARepair and BeAFix complement ATR, i.e., there are cases ARepair and BeAFix can repair but not ATR, and vice versa. For example, ARepair and BeAFix correctly repair arr1.als and fsm1.als, that could not be repaired by ATR. 3 In contrast, ATR repairs lts_inv1.14.als and graphs_oriented_9.als that could not be repaired by ARepair and BeAFix. Thus, the mutation-based approaches ARepair and BeAFix complement our template-based ATR approach.

4.4 Threats to Validity
The main threat to external validity is the generalizability of the benchmarks used in the evaluation, i.e., the Alloy specifications and bugs in the benchmarks may not represent general cases. The two benchmarks used in our evaluation have been used to evaluate other Alloy repair tools. All the bugs in both benchmarks are not synthetic but introduced by humans in real-life usage. The benchmarks are admittedly consisting of small Alloy specifications, and may not capture the complexity of large specifications. However, they do involve some complex kernels characteristic of larger realistic Alloy specifications.

ATR builds on top of multiple off-the-shelf tools, e.g., Alloy and its underlying SAT4J solver, and the Pardinus solver. These tools also include some degree of randomness. We run our experiment several times and notice negligible impacts of the solver’s nondeterminism.

5 RELATED WORK
Program Repair and Synthesis. APR techniques have steadily gained research interests and produced many novel repair techniques. Constraint-based repair approaches, e.g., Angelix [47], AFix [29], SEMFix [53], FoRenSic [15], StarFix [76], Gopinath et al. [22], Jobstmann et al. [30], generate constraints and solve them for patches that are correct by construction (i.e., guaranteed to adhere to a specification or pass a test suite). In contrast, generate-and-validate repair approaches, e.g., GenProg [38], Pachikha [17], PAR [33], Debroy and Wong [18], Prophet [41], find multiple repair candidates (e.g., using stochastic search or invariant inferences) and verify them against given specifications. Learning-based repair approaches, e.g., Fixminer [35], DLFix [40], DeepDelta [48], iFixR [36], learns fixes from repair examples.

Some program synthesis and repair researches, e.g., [5, 37, 47, 53, 54, 66, 67], integrate existing tools, e.g., test-input generation or symbolic execution, to synthesize desired programs. Such integrations are common in modern synthesis techniques, which generalize program repair by searching for code to fulfill given specifications, including the multi-disciplinary ExCAPE project [1] and the SyGuS competition [2], and have produced many practical and useful tools such as Sketch that generates low-level bit-stream programs [65], Autograde that provides feedback on programming homework [64], and FlashFill that constructs Excel macros [23, 24].

PMASSAT has been utilized by many researches to locate bugs and generate patches for imperative programs. For example, Axg-Faults [57] uses PMASSAT to locate faults by finding the minimal set of suspicous specifications, DirectFix [46] applies PMASSAT to find the simplest patch with minimal changes, TINTIN [14] uses PMASSAT for regression aware localization and repair, and ConBugAssist [31] uses PMASSAT and model checking to diagnose concurrency bugs. These techniques focus on imperative programs and formulate statements and control flows into PMASSAT formulas, which are not applicable in the context of a declarative language like Alloy. ATR is different from them in that it uses PMASSAT to generate “tests” and uses the “tests” to prune the search space.

Alloy Repair. Comparing to APR and synthesis approaches for imperative programs, there are few works for APR techniques for Alloy. ARepair [74] is the first APR approach for Alloy and generates fixes for Alloy specification violating tests. This work
we can generate Alloy expressions that fix an assertion violation. However, ARepair suffers from overfitting due to using tests as oracle, from which the generated repairs pass all tests but cannot generalize to unseen tests.

BeAFix [25] mitigates the overfitting problem by repairing Alloy based on assertions, which are more natural than tests in Alloy development and represent large sets of tests. BeAFix does not perform fault localization and instead relies on the user providing suspicious statements. However, ARepair suffers from overfitting due to using tests as oracle, from which the generated repairs pass all tests but cannot generalize to unseen tests.

Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th># Cases</th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>overfit</th>
<th>time(s)</th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>overfit</th>
<th>time(s)</th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>overfit</th>
<th>time(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>classroom</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2221.7</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>601.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cv</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>376.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graphs</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>673.1</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>156.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ils</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3013</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>487.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>311.4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>332.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trash</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>368.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Summary | 1936    | 158    | 1492    | 31.5    | 981     | 0       | 1788.3  | 1286    | 0       | 368.3   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th># Cases</th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>overfit</th>
<th>time(s)</th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>overfit</th>
<th>time(s)</th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>overfit</th>
<th>time(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>addr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balancedBST</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>268.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2400.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>584.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bempl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ctree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dll</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1615.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farmer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fsm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1800.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>248.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1185.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>443.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>152.2</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1351.2</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>829.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1569.8</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>364.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 CONCLUSION

We introduce a new automatic program repair technique for declarative specifications written in the Alloy language. Our insight is that we can generate Alloy expressions that fix an assertion violation by analyzing and comparing the counterexamples and satisfying instances from the Alloy Analyzer. We present ATR, a tool that implements these ideas to generate candidate repair expressions in specification. ATR uses a PMAXSAT solver to find satisfying instances similar to counterexamples generated by the Alloy Analyzer, analyzes satisfying instances and counterexamples to prune candidate repair templates. Preliminary results on a large set Alloy benchmarks show that ATR is effective in repairing complex Alloy bugs that existing Alloy APR techniques cannot.
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