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ABSTRACT

The number of vulnerabilities increases rapidly in recent years, due to advances in vulnerability discovery solutions. It enables a thorough analysis on the vulnerability distribution and provides support for correlation analysis and prediction of vulnerabilities. Previous research either focuses on analyzing bugs rather than vulnerabilities, or only studies general vulnerability distribution among projects rather than the distribution within each project. In this paper, we collected a large vulnerability dataset, consisting of all known vulnerabilities associated with five representative open source projects, by utilizing automated crawlers and spending months of manual efforts. We then analyzed the vulnerability distribution within each project over four dimensions, including files, functions, vulnerability types and responsible developers. Based on the results analysis, we presented 12 practical insights on the distribution of vulnerabilities. Finally, we applied such insights on several vulnerability discovery solutions (including static analysis and dynamic fuzzing), and helped them find 10 zero-day vulnerabilities in target projects, showing that our insights are useful.

CCS CONCEPTS

- Security and privacy → Software security engineering; • General and reference → Empirical studies.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Software vulnerability is one of the major threats to cyber security. For example, vulnerabilities like HeartBleed [57], SandWorm [58] and DebtCow [56] have posed great risks on millions of users. Due to recent advances of modern vulnerability hunters (e.g., AFL [8], AFLGO [12], Steelix [33], CollAFL [19]), vulnerabilities are being reported at a striking speed. The number of exposed vulnerabilities recorded by National Vulnerability Database (NVD) [40] already exceeds forty thousands, let alone the vulnerabilities which remain unknown to the public. This large volume enables a thorough analysis of vulnerability distribution, and provides support for correlation analysis of vulnerabilities, which in turn helps finding new vulnerabilities.

For instance, as shown in Figure 1, we found 5 new vulnerabilities (marked as NVx) when studying some existing vulnerabilities (marked as MSxx) in Microsoft Windows Journal. We figure out that, all these new vulnerabilities are close to existing vulnerabilities (marked as MSxx) in the call graph. Some of them even reside in the same functions as existing vulnerabilities, or have similar code snippets. It therefore implies that, vulnerabilities in a project could have locality in space (e.g., function locations) and patterns (e.g., code structures), and such locality could be utilized to locate new vulnerabilities around known vulnerabilities in the project. Motivated by this example, we intend to analyze the vulnerability...
Vulnerability locality in individual projects.

Prior works [10, 14, 17, 24, 25, 52] have studied a large number of bugs and provided insights for better understanding the distribution and root causes of bugs. These insights are further utilized to detect more related bugs [9, 53, 54]. However, these approaches and insights of bugs cannot be well shifted to vulnerabilities, since vulnerabilities exhibit many different characteristics from bugs. For instance, vulnerabilities are much more rare than bugs. Another line of works [15, 29, 39, 51] concentrate on utilizing individual features of vulnerabilities, e.g., function calls and code complexity, to predict new vulnerabilities. Some other works [18, 26, 41, 47, 62] focus on studying the life-cycle of vulnerabilities and how to fix them. The work [32] studied the vulnerability distribution across projects. However, existing works did not study the vulnerability distribution within projects, and thus are not able to analyze vulnerability locality in individual projects.

To study vulnerability distribution within projects, there are several challenges to address. First, there are no qualified datasets available for a large scale analysis. Existing vulnerability datasets focus on covering diversified projects, but not all vulnerabilities for a given set of projects. Second, a large scale data analysis is time-consuming and in general challenging.

In this work, we make a first attempt to study the distribution of and correlation between vulnerabilities within projects on a large scale. We select 5 typical open-source projects Linux-kernel, FFmpeg, ImageMagick, OpenSSL and php-src as the analysis objects. For each project, we collected all its associated vulnerabilities by aggregating multiple data sources, including NVD entries, BugZilla reports, security bulletins and GitHub commits. We then attempt to answer the following questions:

RQ1: Vulnerability Distribution. How are vulnerabilities distributed? Can it be used for hunting new vulnerabilities?

RQ2: Vulnerability Dependency. Why are vulnerabilities often-times found within a short code range? Is there any dependency between vulnerabilities?

RQ3: Vulnerability Recurrence. Why do vulnerabilities repeatedly occur in the same function? Is it a general case?

To this end, we analyze the collected vulnerability dataset as follows. We first associate each vulnerability with its responsible code commit, then localize the vulnerable code snippets related to each vulnerability, and then build the call-graph for the vulnerable code snippets. Further, based on the extracted information, we analyze the vulnerability distribution over space, type, and responsible developers, as well as the dependency between vulnerabilities in the call graph and the vulnerability recurrence phenomena.

We find that, the vulnerability distribution follows the Pareto law [45] on the dimension of space (file, not function), type and responsible developers. Moreover, most (more than 60%) vulnerable functions have at least one vulnerable neighbor function located in a 2-jump range in the call-graph. In other words, most vulnerable functions do not exist alone. We also find that, incomplete or wrong patches for vulnerabilities are the most common reasons for the existence of high-frequency vulnerable functions, whereas the patching workflow ROIPO (Report One issue and Patch One position based on the reference PoC) is another important reason.

In summary, we make the following contributions.

• Large-scale vulnerability dataset. Aiming at studying the vulnerability distribution within projects, we spent 5 person months efforts to build a largest-to-date vulnerability dataset regarding a set of open source projects. We share this dataset to the public\footnote{https://github.com/twelveand0/CarrotsBlender}, to facilitate other researches.

• Thorough empirical study. Different from the prior work, our study unveils the characteristics of vulnerability distribution over several dimensions including file, function, type and responsible developers. Moreover, we also investigate the correlation of vulnerabilities so as to uncover the causes of their presence.

• Practical insights. We present several practical insights based on the analysis results. In particular, we find that most vulnerabilities do not exist alone. We also find that, imperfect vulnerability patches and the patching workflow ROIPO are general phenomena, causing vulnerabilities repeatedly occur in some functions. We also propose a solution to mitigate the ROIPO issue.

• New discoveries. Based on the concluded insights, we propose a solution to use them to guide vulnerability discovery, and have applied them to several vulnerability discovery solutions including static analysis and dynamic fuzzing, and help them successfully find 10 zero-day vulnerabilities in target projects.

2 APPROACH

Figure 2 presents the overview of the approach we used in this empirical study. First, we select several popular open source projects that represent varying functionalities. Then, we aggregate multiple vulnerability data sources, including NVD/CVE and BugZilla, to collect all description information of vulnerabilities associated with target projects. We also crawl all code commits of target projects from GitHub, to support detailed vulnerability analysis.

Further, we analyze the relationship between NVD/CVE vulnerability entries and GitHub commits, to recognize the commits related to each vulnerability. Then, we localize the vulnerable code snippets and construct their call graphs. At last, we perform multiple analyses on these vulnerabilities and conclude many take-home messages for future research. Moreover, we develop proof of concepts based on these findings to evaluate their practicality.

2.1 Target Selection

We select 5 popular open-source projects, written in C/C++ language, as our analysis object: FFmpeg [2], ImageMagick [3], OpenSSL [6], PHP-SRC [7] and Linux kernel [5]. On one hand, these...
The crawler leverages GitHub developer APIs \[20\] and downloads vulnerability entries with associated CVE IDs from NVD/CVE database. After applying this rule, we get a total of 3,806 CVE entries as shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th># Stars/Forks</th>
<th># Commits</th>
<th># CVE with CVE</th>
<th># CVE w/o CVE</th>
<th>Total CVE</th>
<th># Vulnerabilities in our dataset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFmpeg</td>
<td>36,206/5,911</td>
<td>93,265</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImageMagick</td>
<td>3,481/541</td>
<td>15,202</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>1,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenSSL</td>
<td>10,993/4,807</td>
<td>29,444</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHP-SRC</td>
<td>24,471/6,622</td>
<td>111,821</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>1,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linux</td>
<td>79,149/27,578</td>
<td>841,891</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>4,952</td>
<td>5,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,085,623</td>
<td>3,806</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>4,952</td>
<td>5,430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We scrape all commits from the selected Github projects with an implemented web crawler in 8,000+ LOC of Python. The crawler leverages GitHub developer APIs \[20\] and downloads changed code, issues, pull requests, and responsible developers for each commit. To reduce the data volume, we set up a crawl rule that filters out the commits without making any semantic-aware change. More specifically, the changes to configuration files, code comments and spacing are not substantially related to vulnerabilities, and thereby not embodied in our dataset. After applying this rule, we get a total of 1,085,623 commits as shown in Table 1.

Vulnerability entries. It is not always about security when a developer makes a commit to the project. Functionality update, performance optimization, and software refactoring are all possible reasons. As such, we have to first identify vulnerability-related commits before the evaluation. To this end, we resort to NVD \[40\] and CVE \[34\] which maintain a large corpus of vulnerabilities, and recognize the real vulnerability-related commits. Not all CVE entries useful in this task, so we restrict the entries by specifying the vendors and products. For example, FFmpeg vulnerabilities can be distilled by searching the entries with the product "FFmpeg" and vendor "FFmpeg". In this way, 3,806 CVE entries are obtained.

### 2.3 Human-involved Analysis

There are several tasks requiring professionals’ involvement as indicated in Figure 2. In this study, we recruited 3 security experts, all of whom have more than 5-year experience in vulnerability research. In total, they have found dozens of unknown vulnerabilities in both close/open-source software, and more than 30 vulnerabilities have been assigned with CVE identifiers. One of them was even listed in the 2016 MSRC Top 100 Security Researchers.

**Cooperation.** To ensure the correctness of the manual analysis results, we employ a customized peer review process. At first, each task is analyzed by two experts. The task finished if they could reach an agreement. Otherwise, the third expert is involved to resolve the divergence. If she/he agrees with either one of the previous two experts, then we follow the simple majority rule to yield the final analysis result. In the worst case, three experts report three different results, then we follow a conservative principle to resolve the issue. More specifically, three experts will discuss together and yield a conservative result. Take the CVE labelling task as an example, given a CVE vulnerability, if three experts report three different results, we employ a customized peer review process. At first, each task is analyzed by two experts. The task finished if they could reach an agreement. Otherwise, the third expert is involved to resolve the divergence. If she/he agrees with either one of the previous two experts, then we follow the simple majority rule to yield the final analysis result. In the worst case, three experts report three different results, then we follow a conservative principle to resolve the issue. More specifically, three experts will discuss together and yield a conservative result. Take the CVE labelling task as an example, given a CVE vulnerability, if three experts report three different results, then we follow a conservative principle to resolve the issue. More specifically, three experts will discuss together and yield a conservative result.

### 2.4 Data Processing

As Figure 2 shows, we process the collected data in three steps: association analysis, vulnerability localization and VCG (Vulnerability Call Graph) construction. They are detailed as follows.

#### 2.4.1 Association Analysis

We first try to associate CVE entries with responsible commits. If one commit is found contributing to a CVE entry, we regard it as a vulnerability-related commit. Note that, CVE entries in the NVD/CVE database often have references to external links, including links of responsible commits in the database.
We totally find 1,462 such commits, and associate them with whether the commits are of the same content but appear in different vulnerable project’s GitHub repository. With this guidance, we implement a tool to parse these references and extract related GitHub commit links, and automatically build the connections to commits for most CVE entries. For the remaining CVE entries, we spend three person months to manually investigate their corresponding commits, by reviewing the detailed vulnerability descriptions from multiple sources, including reports from Google OSS-Fuzz, RedHat BugZilla, and a wide range of security analysis blogs.

Data quality. To make the vulnerability dataset error-free and precise, we exert the following efforts: 1) Redundancy removal. If one vulnerability is associated with multiple commits, we check whether the commits are of the same content but appear in different branches. If so, we just retain the newest commit. 2) Type correction. Each vulnerability in the dataset is classified into a CWE category. However, existing classification results are oftentimes wrong or imprecise (cf. Section 3.2). We therefore manually correct the category of each vulnerability, following the CWE-1000 classification criteria. Take vulnerability CVE-2016-2549 in project Linux-kernel as an example, it is labeled with CWE-20 (Improper Input Validation) and associated with the commit 2ba1fe7 in NVD. However, after reviewing the CVE description, RedHat BugZilla comments, messages of the responsible commit and the corresponding patch, we determined that it is actually a deadlock problem, and reach a consensus of labeling it as CWE-833 (Deadlock).

As depicted in Table 1, there are in total 3,806 vulnerabilities recorded in the CVE/NVD database for the selected projects. After the automated and manual association analysis, 2,476 CVE entries are successfully associated with their responsible commits. Note that, during manual analysis, we also find a large number of commits where the automated and manual association analysis, 2,476 CVE entries are successfully associated with their responsible commits. Note that, during manual analysis, we also find a large number of commits that are created for fixing security bugs not listed in CVE/NVD. We totally find 1,462 such commits, and associate them with unlisted vulnerabilities, and put into our dataset as well.

In total, we obtain a cross-verified vulnerability database, including 3,938 vulnerability entries. Each entry has been associated with responsible commits and related metadata information, including locations, the commit date and responsible developers of vulnerabilities.

### Vulnerability Localization

After identifying the vulnerability-related commits, we seek to localize vulnerable code in a fine-grained granularity. By virtue of the unified diff format [27], the changes in commit mainly occur in two programming constructs—function, and data structure. For a change falling into a function, we need to recover previous vulnerable code. This is fulfilled with the built-in command “git reset”, resetting the current HEAD to its parent commit. Additionally, we handle the following exceptions during analysis: 1) If a commit does not delete any lines and only has additions, we first identify the key vulnerability variable(s) influenced by the added code chunk and then determine the locations of variable definition or reference as vulnerable points. 2) If a commit adds a new function, this function is not treated as vulnerable.

### VCG Construction

We aim to explore whether these vulnerabilities have semantic relations in between. Here we use vulnerability call graph to represent these relations.

**Definition 1.** A vulnerability call graph is a tuple \((F, V, \delta)\) such that \(F\) is a non-empty finite set of functions, \(V\) is a non-empty finite sets of vulnerable functions where \(V \subseteq F\), and \(\delta \subseteq F \times F\) is the function call.

We conduct a lightweight static analysis on top of DOXYGEN [55] to construct the call graph of these vulnerable functions. This tool is context insensitive and cannot handle dynamic dispatch, a trade-off between computation costs and gains. In the course of graph construction, we address two challenging problems: same function declarations in different files by assigning a unique identifier to each function, and polymorphic functions by taking into account fully qualified function names. It is worth mentioning that since some vulnerable functions are removed from the branch over time, they would not be present in the constructed call graph.

### RQ1. Vulnerability Distribution

In this section, we conduct an analysis to reveal the vulnerability distribution in multiple dimensions, particularly spatial distribution, type distribution, and developer distribution.

#### Spatial Distribution

The study of vulnerability’s spatio-temporal distribution can facilitate the prediction of where and when vulnerabilities are prone to occur. In this section, we take into account the collected vulnerabilities as well as their locations and occurring dates, and tease apart the characteristics, respectively.

The spatial characteristics are measured in two granularity levels: file and function. We sort the vulnerable files in terms of the number of contained vulnerabilities in descending order, and compute the cumulative probabilities for vulnerabilities as shown in Figure 3a. For ImageMagick, the top 30% of vulnerable files account for about 80% of vulnerabilities, while for Linux, 60% of vulnerabilities are discovered in the top 30% of vulnerable files.

This phenomenon raises a question whether it is because the top 30% of files account for the larger portion of code. Therefore, to measure the code complexity, we employ four metrics widely used in fault prediction [16, 50, 61]: non-blank lines of code (LoC), cyclomatic, maximum level of indentation of blocks within a region (MaxIndent) and the number of magic numbers. We extract the files

![Image](image-url)
consisting of vulnerabilities, and compute the four metrics. If one file has more than one vulnerability, we average the metric values for this file in terms of the number of vulnerabilities. From Figure 4a and Figure 3a, the vulnerability number and code complexity have a linear relation where the vulnerability number is monotonically increasing along with the increase of code complexity. Based on the above investigation, we draw the following finding.

**Finding 1.** A small number (30%) of vulnerable files account for most (66%) of vulnerabilities. However, these files only contribute 40% of code size and complexities. Therefore, a higher complexity of code cannot necessarily induce more vulnerabilities, and complexity metrics in defect prediction cease to being effective for vulnerabilities.

Same with the analysis of vulnerable files, we observe that these vulnerabilities do not obviously conform to the same phenomenon with regard to vulnerable functions, that is, top 30% vulnerable functions only contribute 50% of all vulnerabilities. Figure 3b shows that the vulnerability number and function number exhibit a linear relation. In addition, Figure 4a depicts that the complexity for each function is relatively even with others. As a result, we conclude the spatial distribution with regard to vulnerable functions as follows.

**Finding 2.** With the consideration of vulnerable functions, top 30% vulnerable functions account for 50% vulnerabilities, not as obviously as vulnerable files do.

### 3.2 Type Distribution

The type of vulnerabilities is labelled by NVD, following the CWE [35] classification system. As Section 2, we have scraped all meta information of vulnerabilities including type. However, by manually reviewing this information, we find that:

**Finding 3.** There are 9.6% erroneous, 10.9% imprecise and 7.2% missing problems in type labelling of our investigated vulnerabilities, which have been reported to NVD.

The three problems are detailed as follows.

(1) **Erroneous:** Some CVE entries are assigned with wrong CWEs. For example, by examining the description and code of CVE-2009-2767 [36], it is sort of CWE-476 (Null Pointer Dereference). However, it is wrongly classified into CWE-119.

(2) **Imprecise:** There exist some CVE entries that are assigned with imprecise CWEs, i.e., CWEs cannot describe their detailed classification. For example, CVE-2010-4250 [37] is bundled with CWE-399 (Resource Management Errors). However, with our analysis, it can be further classified into a child category CWE-401 (Memory Leak), which is more precise.

(3) **Missing:** Some CVE entries do not connect to any CWEs, such as CVE-2015-3636 [38].

We overcome the above problems by relying on a rigorous review and remediation by our professionals. For each project, we sort the types as per the number of contained vulnerabilities in descending order and calculate the cumulative percentage of vulnerabilities along with type. Figure 5a shows that 20% of types contain 70% of vulnerabilities. Besides, we list the top 3 types of each project as shown in Table 2. From this table, the 5 projects vary from the most 3 types. For FFmpeg, integer overflow (CWE-190) and numeric errors (CWE-189) are widely present. That is because FFmpeg is a multimedia encoding/decoding library, which originally involves a large number of arithmetic operations. For Linux, CWE-264 is among the top 3 types. It implies that privileges, permissions and access controls are the most important functionalities offered by an operating system kernel. Massive amounts of code are implemented to protect the system’s resources and, however, induce a considerable number of vulnerabilities.

**Finding 4.** For one C/C++ investigated project, 70% of vulnerabilities fall into 20% of types; the top 3 types account for nearly 50% of vulnerabilities averagely. Moreover, the most likely vulnerability types existing in one project largely depend on the project’s core functionalities and programming languages.

#### 3.2.1 Changes of Top Types over time

How do the types with the most vulnerabilities change over time? We evaluate this temporal effect by counting the detected vulnerabilities of the top 3 types over years and present the change curve in Figure 5b. From the figure, we conclude that:
To this end, we compute the proportion of vulnerabilities likely to be introduced by a certain developer.

Finding 7. Of them belong to the top 3 types. We conclude: peg. Further, we find that they are of various types, and over 60% developers who introduce at least 10 vulnerabilities in project FFmpeg merely take up a small portion. There are 21 vulnerabilities by a developer, shown in Figure 7a and 7b. For FFmpeg, 10% of projects to which the developer contributes. In the meantime, we can try to discover new vulnerabilities of the same type in other projects. If so, security analysts can try to fix these vulnerabilities or at least to mitigate their effects. Moreover, we can see that about 20% of all functions can be sliced into small clusters. In particular, we define:

Definition 2. A $k$-cluster $C$ is a slice from the entire call graph $G$, for all vulnerable functions $v_1, v_2 \in V$, $d(v_1, v_2) = \arg\min_n |\{f_1, ..., f_n\}| - 1$

where $f_1 \in F, f_n = v_n, f_0 = v_1,$ and $(f_i, f_{i+1}) \in \delta$ or $(f_i, f_i) \in \delta$. The minimal value for $n$ is 2, which means the two vulnerable functions have a direct call relationship in the call graph. If the distance is 2, there must be an intermediate function connecting the two vulnerable ones. We compute the distance by: first converting the directed vulnerability call graph into an undirected graph by eliminating the arrows of calls; then computing the shortest path for these two vulnerable functions in the graph.

In light of the distance between vulnerabilities, we can slice one call graph into small clusters. For example, Jia et al. [28] found two new Microsoft Word vulnerabilities when generating the PoC of CVE-2014-1761. The illustrative example in Figure 1 also shows that this phenomenon is not just by accident. To explain why vulnerabilities often appear in near distance, we measure their distances and build the semantic relations between vulnerabilities.

### 3.3 Developer Distribution

**Vulnerability developer:** In this paper, we regard non-blank and non-comment lines deleted in a vulnerability-related commit as the vulnerable code, and for the commits that only insert lines of code, corresponding code will be marked manually. Developers creating such code are thereby responsible for the introduction of vulnerabilities.

In this section, we make use of command "git blame" to identify the developer(s) for each vulnerability. For each developer, we count the number of vulnerable lines introduced or contributed by him/her. We sort the developers in a project as per the number of their introduced vulnerable lines in descending order.

From Figure 6, we can see all vulnerabilities of a project are introduced by less than 10% of its developers. It means that most of the developers seldom introduce any vulnerabilities. The code proportions contributed by vulnerability developers vary from 60% to nearly 100%. In other words, for a certain project, there exist such developers that contribute little proportion of code lines but introduce more vulnerabilities.

Finding 6. Almost all of the vulnerabilities are introduced by less than 10% of developers for a project. Such 10% developers contribute from 60% to nearly 100% code, which varies cross projects depending on the number of their developers.

#### 3.3.1 Developers’ Type Preference

Are developers prone to introducing vulnerabilities of the same type? If so, security analysts can try to discover new vulnerabilities of the same type in other projects to which the developer contributes. In the meantime, we can identify the inexperienced developers of secure programming. To this end, we compute the proportion of vulnerabilities with the top 1 type and the top 50% of types to all vulnerabilities introduced by a developer, shown in Figure 7a and 7b. For FFmpeg, 10% of developers introduce only one type of vulnerabilities, and the introduced vulnerabilities merely take up a small portion. There are 21 developers who introduce at least 10 vulnerabilities in project FFmpeg. Further, we find that they are of various types, and over 60% of them belong to the top 3 types. We conclude:

Finding 7. Although we cannot speculate the type preferences of the developers who introduce < 10 vulnerabilities, it does exist in the remaining more productive developers. Therefore, this offers a guidance for prioritized code review in terms of the types of vulnerabilities likely to be introduced by a certain developer.

### 4 RQ2: VULNERABILITY DEPENDENCY

Security researchers often find 0-day vulnerabilities in close proximity to 1-day vulnerabilities. For example, Jia et al. [28] found two new Microsoft Word vulnerabilities when generating the PoC of CVE-2014-1761. The illustrative example in Figure 1 also shows that this phenomenon is not just by accident. To explain why vulnerabilities often appear in near distance, we measure their distances and build the semantic relations between vulnerabilities.

#### 4.1 Vulnerability Distance

We have constructed vulnerability call graphs for each project and group vulnerabilities together in Section 2. Given one vulnerability call graph $G (F, V, \delta)$ (as Definition 1) and two vulnerable functions $v_1$ and $v_2$, where $v_1, v_2 \in V$, the distance between $v_1$ and $v_2$ is computed by:

$$d(v_1, v_2) = \arg\min_n |\{f_1, ..., f_n\}| - 1$$

where $f_1 \in F, f_n = v_n, f_0 = v_1,$ and $(f_i, f_{i+1}) \in \delta$ or $(f_i, f_i) \in \delta$. The minimal value for $n$ is 2, which means the two vulnerable functions have a direct call relationship in the call graph. If the distance is 2, there must be an intermediate function connecting the two vulnerable ones. We compute the distance by: first converting the directed vulnerability call graph into an undirected graph by eliminating the arrows of calls; then computing the shortest path for these two vulnerable functions in the graph.

In light of the distance between vulnerabilities, we can slice one call graph into small clusters. In particular, we define:

Definition 2. A $k$-cluster $C$ is a slice from the entire call graph $G$, for all vulnerable functions $v_1, v_2 \in V$, $d(v_1, v_2) \leq k$, and for every vulnerable function $v' \in G/C, d(v_1, v') > k$.

We slice the VCG of a project into a number of 1-clusters and 2-clusters, respectively. Then we count the number of vulnerabilities in these clusters to check the percentage of vulnerabilities they contribute. We plot Figure 8a and 8b to demonstrate the contribution rates of 1-cluster and 2-cluster, respectively. In Figure 8a, only FFmpeg and ImageMagick have the phenomenon that 30% largest 1-clusters account for more than 60% vulnerabilities.

But for the other 3 projects, such clustering phenomenon is not obvious. Moreover, we can see that about 20% of all functions can be sliced into 1-clusters for a project. As for 2-cluster, the largest 2-cluster in the projects consists of 80% - 100% of the vulnerabilities. Based on the analysis, we conclude:

Finding 8. The locations where vulnerabilities emerge are very concentrated. For each investigated project, more than 80% of vulnerable functions assemble in one single 2-cluster.

#### 4.2 Patterns of Dependency

In the previous section, we obtain a primary 2-cluster for each project. The primary 2-cluster contains 80% - 99% of vulnerable functions, however, it accounts for about 50% of all functions of a project. In order to further study the relations, we formulate four patterns of dependency relations:

- **Common Parent:** two vulnerable functions have a common predecessor node (function) in the call graph. The predecessor function can be either vulnerable or non-vulnerable.

### Table 2: The most 3 vulnerability types in each project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>1st Type</th>
<th>2nd Type</th>
<th>3rd Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFmpeg</td>
<td>CWE-190</td>
<td>CWE-119</td>
<td>CWE-189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImageMagick</td>
<td>CWE-401</td>
<td>CWE-119</td>
<td>CWE-457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenSSL</td>
<td>CWE-310</td>
<td>CWE-119</td>
<td>CWE-399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHP-SRC</td>
<td>CWE-119</td>
<td>CWE-416</td>
<td>CWE-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linux</td>
<td>CWE-457</td>
<td>CWE-264</td>
<td>CWE-119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 6: Alberg diagrams showing the percentage of LOCs over the percentage of all developers for the projects. Red line represents vulnerable lines introduced by developers.

Figure 7: Developer distribution diagram

Figure 8: Alberg diagrams showing the percentage of vulnerabilities over the percentage of k-clusters for each project

- **Common Child**: two vulnerable functions have a common successor node (function) in the call graph. Here we consider the pattern only when the successor is also vulnerable.
- **One Jump Call**: one vulnerable function calls an intermediate non-vulnerable function which has a direct call to the other vulnerable function.
- **Direct Call**: one vulnerable function has a direct call to the other.

One vulnerability-related commit may alter multiple functions so that these functions are all tainted with the vulnerability.

**Finding 9.** More than 60% vulnerable functions of a project have at least one basic call-relation to another vulnerable function with different vulnerabilities.

As shown in Figure 10, for each project, we count the number of vulnerable function pairs according to each basic dependency relation. Further, we calculate the intersection of four relation sets in which an element is a vulnerable function pair. For example, in FFmpeg, there are 233 vulnerable function pairs that have common parent relation; among these, three pairs also have common child relation, another three pairs have direct call relation, two pairs have one jump relation, one pair has direct call and one jump relation at the same time. Besides, we count the total number of vulnerable functions in the union of four dependency relation sets. For example, 72% vulnerable functions have at least one basic call relation with another vulnerable function and they have different vulnerabilities.

In all, for more than 60% vulnerable functions, there exists another vulnerable function in the call graph between which the distance is no more than 2. It inspires that one is likely to discover new vulnerabilities in a function that has the above types of dependency relations with the already-known vulnerable functions.

### 4.3 Semantics of Dependency

In this section, we intend to identify what code structure and relations exist between vulnerable code blocks.

#### 4.3.1 Manual Analysis.

Given a vulnerable function pair \((v_1, v_2)\) complying with one of the four aforementioned dependency patterns, three experts spent six person months to conduct a rigorous and manual code review procedure, in order to determine the correlations between vulnerable code in \(v_1\) and that in \(v_2\).

For example, in Figure 9, CVE-2013-0863 resides in the function `old_codec47` and CVE-2013-0877 occurs in `old_codec37`. Both vulnerable functions are called by a common parent. By reviewing the code at call sites, we determine that there are four types of relations between them: (1) these vulnerable functions are in two parallel switch-case statements to decode different video types; (2) both vulnerabilities are caused by the same missing check on the third parameter of function `rle_decode`, i.e., they have similar operations; (3) both vulnerability are related to the same key variable `decode_size`, which holds some values read from input; and (4) they both deal with multimedia files of `SANM` format.

#### 4.3.2 Semantic Relations.

Finally, we identify 10 types of semantic relations between vulnerable code as follows.

- **R1**: two vulnerable functions are parallel from the view of control flow. In particular, two functions may be called from different cases inside a switch statement, such as CVE-2013-0845 (FFmpeg: 0ceca26) and CVE-2012-2775 (ffmpeg: 9d3032b).
- **R2**: vulnerable code in two functions executes similar or same operations. e.g., CVE-2013-0863 and CVE-2013-0877.
- **R3**: vulnerability-related code in two functions has similar or same code structure in syntax, such as OSS-Fuzz issue NO.1903 [23] (FFmpeg: 58f8cd4) and NO.1506 [22] (FFmpeg: 5ac17f1).
Figure 9: Example: Cross-function Semantic Relation Manual Analysis.

Figure 10: Venn diagrams showing the statistics of dependency patterns. An element is a pair of vulnerable functions that follows some Call-Relation Unit.

- **R4**: the variables involved in vulnerabilities have data flow relation in between. e.g., OSS-Fuzz issue NO.7420 (FFmpeg: dce80a4) and NO.4415 (FFmpeg: 1b8017b).
- **R5**: both the functions involve the same variable(s). e.g., CVE-2015-6818 and CVE-2017-7863.
- **R6**: the variables involved by vulnerabilities have control flow relation in between. e.g., OSS-Fuzz issue 2873 (FFmpeg: 6f03fb8) and 3444 (FFmpeg: dcf9bae).
- **R7**: vulnerability-related code in two functions are under the same macro condition. For example, OSS-Fuzz issue 1471 (FFmpeg: 3a0ff78) and 1878 (FFmpeg: 69c85d).
- **R8**: two functions are used to deal with the same data formats. e.g., CVE-2013-0863 vs. CVE-2013-0877.
- **R9**: two functions are patched in one commit. e.g., OSS-Fuzz issue 5894 (FFmpeg: 647f4a9).
- **R10**: two functions are called in the same case of a switch. e.g., OSS-Fuzz issue 3444 (3a0ff78) and 2581 (2886142).

Figure 11 shows an illustrative example about these semantic relations in a 2-cluster from project FFmpeg. Function aac_decode_frame_int has R1 relation with function decode_ics. The code shows the vulnerability of aac_decode_frame_int occurs within a case block of a switch statement, while function decode_ics is called from another case block. So the two vulnerabilities are parallel in the view of control flow. Both the vulnerabilities "OSS-Fuzz issue 1471" in subband_scale and "OSS-Fuzz issue 1878" in noise_scale are caused by an overflow left-shift offset, inducing integer overflow. So these two functions have R2 relation. At the same time, related code blocks of these two vulnerabilities are similar in syntax, indicating R3 relation. Besides, subband_scale and noise_scale are both called in function decode_spectrum_and_dequant, and the vulnerability-related variable in subband_scale has a data flow to the vulnerability-related variable in noise_scale, which denotes R4 relation. There is no data flow between function apply_dependent_coupling_fixed and apply_independent_coupling_fixed. But two vulnerabilities "OSS-Fuzz issue 1851" and "issue 1762" in these functions manipulate the same variable of the parameter object, so they have R5 relation.

Because the analysis is time-consuming and labor-intensive, we just took FFmpeg as an example and sampled 324 vulnerable function pairs with these semantic relations. According to the results summarized in Table 3, most (70.5%) of vulnerable function pairs...
worth mentioning that the time interval can be 0. This is because

Table 3: Inter-function semantic relations underlying the
different projects from project FFmpeg. Notedly, a pair of vul-
nerable functions may possess multiple relations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th># Common Parent</th>
<th># Common Child</th>
<th># Direct Call</th>
<th># One Jump</th>
<th># Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 241 19 40 24

5 RQ3: VULNERABILITY RECURRENTNESS

It is observed that some functions are constantly found with new vulnerabilities and hence have undergone several security
fixings. We call them high-frequency vulnerable functions and
in this section, we compute their statistics, measure the duration
between two disclosed vulnerabilities, and demystify the primary
reasons of this recurrence phenomenon.

5.1 High-frequency Vulnerable Functions

For all target projects, on average 25.5% of functions have been
discovered with at least 2 vulnerabilities.

Statistics. For each project, we compute the proportion of such
time intervals when two successive vulnerabilities are discov-
ered in one function

Table 4: Statistics of high-frequency vulnerable functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>% of high-frequency functions</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Min.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFmpeg</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImageMagick</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenSSL</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHP-SRC</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linux</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 25.5 3.00 2.2 14.2 2

Table 5: Statistics of time interval when two successive vul-
erabilities are discovered in a same function.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Avg. (day)</th>
<th>Median (day)</th>
<th>Max. (day)</th>
<th>Min. (day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFmpeg</td>
<td>254.95</td>
<td>271.46</td>
<td>3329.48</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImageMagick</td>
<td>796.57</td>
<td>457.29</td>
<td>4661.33</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenSSL</td>
<td>1024.16</td>
<td>671.57</td>
<td>4612.09</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHP-SRC</td>
<td>496.87</td>
<td>189.62</td>
<td>4005.45</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linux</td>
<td>786.57</td>
<td>457.29</td>
<td>4661.33</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 514.95 271.46 3329.48 0.0

Figure 12: Vulnerability recurrence example in PHP-SRC

5.2 Primary Reasons

What’s the reason behind the recurrence phenomenon and what
are the semantic relations between vulnerabilities within the same
function? To answer these questions, we manually analyze 1,095
vulnerabilities occurred in 348 high-frequency vulnerable functions from project FFmpeg, OpenSSL and ImageMagick.

5.2.1 Manual Analysis. Three analysts were designated to identify
the causes of the recurrent phenomenon and the intra-function rela-
tions between vulnerabilities. Taking Figure 12 as an example, two
vulnerabilities were found in one function _xml_characterDataHandler.
The first vulnerability (CVE-2013-4113), which causes heap
corruption, was patched with a sanity check in Line 1087. However,
this sanity check has been proved incomplete, since a heap buffer
over-read could happen if the integer variable parser->_level is zero or less. By using a customized code change tracker based on

Figure 12: Vulnerability recurrence example in PHP-SRC

5.2.2 Semantic Relations. We spend 3 person months identifying the
following semantic relations between vulnerabilities within the same
function:

• R1: Incomplete fix or fix introduction. Another vulnerability
occurs because the fix to the former vulnerability is incomplete or

are due to processing the same file format (i.e., R8). For Common-
Parent relation, 26.6% of function pairs have Parallel Control Flow
relation, while pairs with the other three relations rarely have R2
relation. For vulnerabilities from Common-Parent and Common-
Child pairs, R2 is the most common. While for vulnerabilities from
Direct-Call and One-Jump pairs, R6 is the most common.
it introduces new risks, e.g., CVE-2016-6307 (OPENSSL: ACACBFA) vs. CVE-2016-6309 (OPENSSL: 4B390B6).

- **R2: Same or Similar Vulnerability Pattern.** Two vulnerabilities have similar or same vulnerability pattern. e.g., both CVE-2015-6835 (PHP-SRC: DF48FB28) and CVE-2016-6290 (PHP-SRC: 8763C60) are induced because of improper exception handler.

- **R3: Same or Similar Code Structure.** The code blocks where vulnerabilities exist are same or similar in syntax. e.g., CVE-2014-3515 (PHP-SRC: 88223C5) vs. CVE-2016-7417 (PHP-SRC: ECH7F38).

- **R4: Involved Same Variable.** Two vulnerabilities are directly or indirectly related with the same variable. For example, CVE-2019-9022 (PHP-SRC: 5D3DFAB) vs. CVE-2014-4049 (PHP-SRC: 934D784).

- **R5: Parallel Control Flow.** Related code is located in parallel branches, such as different switch-cases. e.g., CVE-2012-0852 (FFmpeg: 6087000) vs. CVE-2013-0844 (FFmpeg: F18C873).

Table 6 lists the number of detected relations existing between vulnerabilities in the four projects. Based on the result, we find:

**Finding 11.** Incomplete fix and fix introduction are the major reason why vulnerabilities repeatedly occur in the same function. It implies that some developers likely fail to fix all existing vulnerabilities or make new ones stemming from the patching code.

This problem happens many times as observed in our dataset, for instance CVE-2016-6307 (OPENSSL: ACACBFA) vs. CVE-2016-6309 (OPENSSL: 4B390B6) and CVE-2013-4113 (PHP-SRC: 7D163E8) vs. CVE-2016-4539 (PHP-SRC: DCCDA88). It raises an alarm for the developers that they need to pay more attention to the security of patches, avoiding introducing additional vulnerabilities. In the meantime, this finding can motivate researchers to analyze and evaluate the security of patches, just as UC-Klee [43].

We also observe that **R2** occurs with the second most frequency. This can explain why works like SPAIN [59] can be effective in detecting similar vulnerabilities to some extent. Different from SPAIN, which focuses on discovering inter-function similar vulnerabilities, we observe that there exist many similar vulnerabilities within one function. This conclusion has at least two benefits: on one hand, it stresses the importance of research on similar or cloned vulnerabilities [31]. On the other hand, it can be used by security researchers to quickly detect other vulnerabilities in a cost-effective way.

Moreover, we observe that **R3** occurs in all of the projects. If two blocks of code are of a high similarity, they can be easily matched by code clone techniques intuitively. However, according to our investigation, developers prefer not to perform such a code search and merely fix the reported vulnerabilities. More specifically, when a developer tries to fix a reported vulnerability, she/he only locates the root causes perhaps with PoCs and then makes all the necessary changes to code to eliminate the reported vulnerabilities. But the developer fails to audit other similar or cloned code that may contain similar vulnerabilities.

It sheds light on the necessity of a robust vulnerability response process, from where software engineering practitioners can research to improve the process, figure out more vulnerability detection solutions and empirically study the features of vulnerabilities.

**Finding 12.** There exists a ‘Report One and Patch One’ (ROPO) problem commonly in vulnerability fixing. It reveals one weakness of the vulnerabilities.

### Table 6: Intra-function semantic relations of vulnerabilities within one function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>FFmpeg</th>
<th>ImageMagick</th>
<th>OpenSSL</th>
<th>PHP-SRC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 13: Illustrative graph for new vulnerability detection](image)

**Figure 13:** Illustrative graph for new vulnerability detection vulnerability fixing process, and inspires many future research directions such as the enhancement of patching process and efficient detection of similar or cloned vulnerabilities.

### 6 APPLICATION OF FINDINGS

Our findings have a great potential for hunting new vulnerabilities. To evaluate their efficacy, we implement two proof-of-concepts that integrate the above findings.

**Guided Code Review.** We take ImageMagick as an example. According to Finding 5, the type CWE-401 (Memory Leak) consists of the largest number of vulnerabilities, and it sustainedly contributes the majority of vulnerabilities. Hence we prioritize our efforts to explore new Memory Leak vulnerabilities. Further, according to our observation, most of Memory Leak vulnerabilities in ImageMagick are caused by missing the memory freeing operation in exception handlers. We implement a prototype to search similar patterns. Finding 8 implies that most of vulnerable functions are adjacent with each other in the vulnerability call graph. So we prioritize our review targets to such functions that have dependency relations (e.g., Common Parent) with known vulnerable functions. Figure 13 illustrates just the case. Function DecodeImage has Common Parent, Common Child and One Jump relation with other vulnerable functions. Using these findings, we successfully found a new Memory Leak vulnerability (CVE-2019-7175 [1]) in DecodeImage. Moreover, we found another 4 new vulnerabilities (CVE-2019-7395, CVE-2019-7396, CVE-2019-7397, CVE-2019-7398) in a similar way.

**Directed Fuzzing.** We observed that the k-cluster phenomenon is very common in vulnerability distribution as stated in Finding 8. We enhance the AFL by directing the seed selection and prioritizing mutation strategy. Testing on FFmpeg, we first get the largest 2-cluster and then use this information to select better seeds. In addition, we modify the priority strategy and assign the functions in the 2-cluster the with higher priorities. Finally, we discovered five new

In all, we have undertaken responsible disclosure, reported 10 vulnerabilities to the related vendors and finally got 9 new CVE numbers from these target projects. These two proof of concepts above show that our findings can facilitate the vulnerability detection to a large extent.

7 RELATED WORK

Vulnerability Analysis. Shahzad et al. [48] characterized vulnerabilities in a wide range of aspects including the phases when the vulnerabilities were introduced, how they evolved over the years, and functionalities of vulnerabilities. Ruohonen conducted a release-based time series analysis for Python vulnerabilities [44], and found the appearance probabilities of vulnerabilities in different versions obeyed the Markov property. Kim and Lee [30] analyzed the cloned vulnerabilities and summarized the corresponding root causes as well as their life cycle features. By examining the response from 21 software vendors to 241 vulnerabilities, Arora et al. [11] studied the influential factors to the timeliness of security patches and unveiled the relationship between competition and software quality. Li and Paxson investigated over 4,000 security patches for 3,000+ vulnerabilities and unveiled the patching characteristics with regard to the development life cycle [32]. Apart from vulnerability distribution, our study focuses on unveiling the semantic relations between vulnerabilities. The analysis results can explain why vulnerabilities occur and further assist in vulnerability detection. Gkortzis et al. [21] framed a vulnerability dataset from open-source systems, and proposed several metrics to characterize these vulnerabilities. Besides vulnerability code and associated properties, our dataset is also populated with many mature yet handy features including vulnerability introducer and call relations.

Vulnerability Prediction. Shin and Williams [49] unveiled that the fault prediction model and the vulnerability prediction model (VPM) provided similar prediction performance [51]. Zimmermann et al. [63] found that software measures could only achieve a high precision rate but low recall rate in vulnerability prediction. Doyle and Walden [13] observed a trend of decreasing vulnerability density over time. Morrison et al. [39] concluded that VPMs must be refined to achieve actionable performance. Scandariato et al. [46] applied text mining source code to predict vulnerable software components. Perl et al. built a mapping from the CVEs and vulnerability-contributing commits and developed an SVM-based classifier to identify potential vulnerabilities in a large code base [42]. Our study concludes many significant findings and insights that can aid both static- and dynamic-analysis based vulnerability prediction (cf. Section 6).

8 DISCUSSION

Threats to validity. Data quality of vulnerabilities. Vulnerability entries in NVD/CVE repos contain many human-crafted pieces of information such as vulnerability type, description, and references to vulnerable code. Therefore, errors and inaccuracies inevitably flow in and degrade the quality of data. Our manual auditing cannot ensure a complete solution for solving this; We determine the position of vulnerabilities by checking what code is deleted in a commit or influenced by the added code. However, it is non-trivial to identify the exact scope of vulnerable code, and any inaccurate labeling can have a negative impact on the analysis results. Additionally, we did not consider the changes to a pure data structure or variable, which take less than 1% in our dataset. Instead, we concentrate on the changes that alter actionable code.

Generalization limits. Although our analysis is built on a large number (3,938) of vulnerabilities from five popular projects with varying functionalities, we cannot make our findings as a general claim. On one hand, our target projects are limited to C/C++ projects. The findings may not apply for projects written in other languages. For example, buffer overflow (CWE-119) is never a security issue in Java projects. On the other hand, we only analyzed 5 projects due to the overwhelming manual work. It could be insufficient to make a general claim from only 5 projects’ observations. In all, while there is an indication that these findings may persist across C/C++ projects, further studies on larger project populations written in various languages are required to draw a general claim.

Future research direction. Our study as well as our findings can inspire several future research directions. For example, the semantic relations between vulnerabilities can facilitate the understanding of their root causes; the dependency patterns which reveal the call relation and distance can power static analysis techniques of more efficiency; the ROPO problem in Finding 12 motivates researchers to re-inspect the patching process, keep more attention on the security of patches, and work out a better solution.

9 CONCLUSION

We conduct a large-scale empirical study of security vulnerabilities, evaluating 3,938 vulnerabilities from 5 popular projects. First the vulnerabilities are attributed with descriptive information (e.g., type, involved developer), and blamed code. Then we leverage a lightweight static analysis to build the calling connections between vulnerabilities and extracted code semantics to represent them. We have extensively characterized vulnerabilities from three aspects: distribution, dependency and recurrence, and distilled 12 findings that are beneficial for the future research. Guided by our findings, we developed proof-of-concepts and successfully discovered 10 zero-day vulnerabilities.
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