Usage and Effectiveness of Static Analysis in Open-Source Embedded Software: CodeQL Finds Hundreds of Defects

Mingjie Shen
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN, USA
shen497@purdue.edu

Brian A Yuan
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN, USA
bayuan@purdue.edu

Akul Abhilash Pillai
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN, USA
pillai23@purdue.edu

Xinyu Zhang
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN, USA
zhan5085@purdue.edu

James C. Davis
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN, USA
davisjam@purdue.edu

Aravind Machiry
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN, USA
amachiry@purdue.edu

ABSTRACT

Embedded software is deployed in billions of devices worldwide, including in safety-sensitive systems like medical devices and autonomous vehicles. Defects in embedded software can have severe consequences. Many embedded software products incorporate Open-Source Embedded Software (EMBOSS), so it is important for EMBOSS engineers to use appropriate mechanisms to avoid defects. While static analysis is a common defense against such vulnerabilities, its current use and potential benefits in EMBOSS remain unexplored.

To fill this knowledge gap, we conducted the first large-scale empirical study of Static Application Security Testing (SAST) in EMBOSS repositories. First, we collect a corpus of 258 of the most popular EMBOSS projects, including real-time operating systems, network stacks, and applications. We then measure their *use* of SAST tools via program analysis and a survey (N=25) of their developers. Advanced SAST are rarely used — only 3% of projects go beyond trivial compiler analyses. Developers cite reasons such as the perception of ineffectiveness and false positives for this limited adoption. Motivated by this, we assess the actual effectiveness of SAST in this context. We applied the state-of-the-art CodeQL SAST tool and measured its ease of use and effectiveness. We identified that engineering effort is required to configure CodeQL on EMBOSS repositories. We manually created Continuous Integration (CI) pipelines (or workflows) to run CodeQL and analyzed the results. Across the 258 projects, CodeQL reports 709 defects with a false positive rate of 34%. There were 535 (75%) likely security vulnerabilities, including in major projects maintained by organizations such as Microsoft and Amazon. EMBOSS engineers have confirmed 376 (53%) of these defects, mainly by accepting our pull requests. Two CVEs were issued. Based on these results, we proposed pull requests to include our workflows as part of EMBOSS CI pipeline, 37 (71% of active repos) of these are already merged. We also explore the use of Large Language Models (LLMs) to automatically create CodeQL scan workflows and report our findings. In summary, we urge EMBOSS engineers to adopt the current generation of SAST tools, which offer low false positive rates and are effective at finding security-relevant defects.

1 INTRODUCTION

Societies rely on embedded systems and IoT devices in our transportation [13], traffic management [107], resource distribution [95, 102], homes [16], and in many other ways [12]. The Embedded Software (EmS) that enables these devices must be free of vulnerabilities. Such vulnerabilities have far-reaching consequences [23, 29, 85, 91, 116] due to the pervasive and interconnected nature of embedded devices. Additionally, Open-source Software (OSS) plays an important role in EmS development [20, 47, 78]. For instance, FreeRTOS [18] and Zephyr [109], two of the most popular and industry-endorsed Real Time Operating Systems (RTOSes), are open-source. It is thus imperative to ensure that suitable vulnerability detection techniques are used to secure Open-Source Embedded Software (EMBOSS).

Static analysis vulnerability detection techniques, *i.e.,* Static Application Security Testing (SAST) tools, are easier to employ than dynamic analysis methods in detecting vulnerabilities within EMBOSS. Dynamic analysis (*e.g.,* fuzzing [82]) suffers from the diversity of hardware platforms [89, 115], input mechanisms, and the lack of support for sanitizers [9, 118]. In contrast, SAST tools can be easily used in the software engineering pipeline by integrating into Continuous Integration (CI) Workflows, *e.g.,* GitHub Workflows [69]. As we show in §3, many critical OSS use SAST tools in their CI Workflows. Furthermore, the latest State of The Practice (SoTP) tools, such as CodeQL [25] are shown to be effective and can find serious security vulnerabilities in complex codebases [52]. Additionally, Chelf *et al.* [36] showed that embedded software can greatly benefit from using SAST tools. However, the use and effectiveness of SAST tools in EMBOSS is unknown.

To fill this gap, we perform the first systematic study on the use of SAST tools to detect security vulnerabilities in EMBOSS. We conduct this problem from two perspectives: the current prevalance of SAST in EMBOSS, and the potential effectiveness of applying SAST on EMBOSS. We curated a corpus of 258 popular EMBOSS projects from GitHub for study. To understand the current prevalence of SAST in EMBOSS, we combined automated analysis of CI Workflows from the corpus, and a survey of the project developers. To assess potential effectiveness, we conducted a preliminary analysis and found that the CodeQL was the most effective available SAST. We applied CodeQL to our project corpus and describe the defects found, variation by project type, the false positive rate, and developers' responses to our defect reports and patch proposals.

Our primary findings are that (1) major EMBOSS projects do not use effective SAST; and (2) the state-of-the-art CodeQL SAST finds hundreds of defects in major EMBOSS projects. Only 10

(4%) projects use explicit SAST tools as part of their CI Workflows. Their developers are aware of SAST tools, but do not use them on EMBOSS projects. To measure the potential benefit of SAST, we created CI Workflows enabling the execution of CodeQL on EMBOSS repositories. We executed our CI Workflows and found a total of 709 defects, with 535 (75%) being security vulnerabilities, demonstrating that EMBOSS projects can benefit from SAST tools. On a per-report basis, CodeQL exhibits a false positive rate of 34%, but this is due to a few outlier rules and projects. For most studied repositories, the false positive rate was low. We reported 586 of defects we found. Developers have already confirmed 376 (53%) of these defects, mainly by accepting our patches. We also raised pull requests to 129 EMBOSS, integrating our manually created Workflows (enabling running CodeQL) into their CI pipeline, out of which 37 (71% (Active) and 29% (Total)) are already accepted. We also explored LLMs to automatically extract the build setup, and report on various shortcomings.

Our contributions are:

- **(Study)** We performed the first study to understand the prevalence, challenges, and effectiveness of using SAST tools in EMBOSS through a combination of manual analysis and developer studies.
- **(EMBOSS Dataset)** We curated and categorized a list of 258 EMBOSS projects and created exemplary GitHub Workflows – encapsulating all the necessary compilation steps – enabling easy execution of compilation-based SAST tools. This is the first large-scale embedded software dataset with the necessary compilation infrastructure [1].
- **(Impact)** Using the created Workflows, we executed CodeQL on our EMBOSS dataset. We identified a total of 709 defects (535 (75%) security vulnerabilities) across all projects, including projects maintained by reputed groups such as Apache, Microsoft, and Amazon. We have reported 586 of these defects and raised pull requests to patch them. The developers have already confirmed 376 (53%) of these defects, mainly by accepting our pull requests. We have also raised pull requests to 129 EMBOSS to integrate our manually created CodeQL Workflows to their CI pipelines, out of which 37 are already accepted.
- **(Insights)** We identified shortcomings of LLMs in automating the creation of SAST Workflows – providing insights and scope for future research.

Significance for cybersecurity: Many researchers and industry leaders have called for the greater use of static analysis tools to catch cybersecurity vulnerabilities earlier. This study provides empirical evidence that open-source embedded software developers are currently ignoring these calls. This study also measures the cost-benefit tradeoff of applying SAST, detailing the number and kind of defects found, as well as the false positive rate.

2 BACKGROUND

Here we define open-source embedded software (EMBOSS) and dynamic and static application security testing (SAST).

[1]Available as open-source at https://anonymous.4open.science/r/scanner-workflows-73F4

2.1 Open-Source Embedded Software (EMBOSS)

2.1.1 Definition of embedded software and EMBOSS. Embedded software is designed to run on embedded systems, ranging from industrial controllers [28] to resource-constrained microcontroller-based IoT devices [16].

Open-source Software (OSS) is an essential part of the software supply chain of embedded software applications. A considerable proportion of software products incorporate open-source software in order to reduce development time and cost, and to create more competitive products [20]. Some inherent advantages of open-source software, such as long-term sustainability and accessibility to source code for debugging purposes, have been acknowledged and appreciated in the embedded software industry [77, 78]. Application developers re-use many kinds of EMBOSS, but a particularly common dependency is on a specialized Real Time Operating Systems (RTOSes) designed for reduced-resource environments (*e.g.,* real-time scheduling, low power consumption, low memory overhead). According to `osrtos.com`, there are 31 different RTOSes [2], with the majority (26) of them being open-source. Examples of RTOSes include RIOT, Contiki, FreeRTOS, and Azure RTOS.

2.1.2 Measuring project importance. A common way to measure the importance of an open-source project is the Open Source Security Foundation (OSSF) criticality score [24]. This score is used by security analysts to triage security vulnerabilities when studying a large number projects [41, 79]. A project's importance is scored on a [0,1] scale based on attributes including its popularity, dependents, and level of activity. Ranges correspond to qualitative labels: 0.0-0.2 is considered low criticality, 0.2-0.4 is medium, 0.4-0.6 is high, 0.6-0.9 is critical, and above 0.9 is extremely critical. For examples, the RTOS contiki-os has a criticality score of 0.51 (high), the RTOS Zephyr's score is 0.81 (critical), and the Node.js runtime's score is 0.99 (extremely critical).

2.2 Static Application Security Testing (SAST)

2.2.1 SAST vs. DAST in embedded software. In software security analysis, both static (SAST) and dynamic (DAST) application security testing are necessary.

In the context of embedded systems, dynamic analysis (*e.g.,* Fuzzing) is more costly and sometimes infeasible when compared to static analysis. Embedded software is coupled to hardware [89], *e.g.,* using hardware-specific interfaces and custom instruction sets. Executing it on custom hardware needs an emulator (support may be lacking [46]) or physical boards (resulting in unscalable testing). Static Application Security Testing (SAST) tools do not require execution, making them attractive to use on embedded software.

2.2.2 Landscape of SAST tools. There are many open-source and commercial SAST tools. The open-source tools vary in the underlying techniques and corresponding guarantees. There are high-assurance tools, such as IKOS [31], that use abstract interpretation and provide soundness guarantees. However, these tools must be properly configured with suitable abstract domains to avoid false positives — a cumbersome process requiring a formal background. On the other hand, there are best-effort pattern-based tools, such as `cppcheck` [86] and `flawfinder` [113], which can be readily used but do

not provide any guarantees. Several works [34, 51, 76, 88] evaluate these tools on non-embedded software and show that they vary in precision, recall, and usability. There are also many commercial SAST tools. Coverity is considered state-of-the-art and allows developers to customize the tool to reduce false positives [62], but its license forbids evaluation in research papers. Other notable tools include Fortify [96], Checkmarx [35], and Veracode [112].

CodeQL is a state-of-the-art [74] open-source SAST tool. CodeQL was released in 2016 by GitHub and is maintained by Microsoft. CodeQL represents code as a relational database and uses relational queries to find defects in the given codebase. It has several static analysis capabilities, such as control flow analysis, data flow analysis, and taint tracking to detect security issues [25]. Furthermore, CodeQL has built-in queries for common security issues (*i.e.,* Common Weakness Enumerations (CWEs)). Security analysts and developers have used CodeQL to find thousands of security vulnerabilities in large and well-tested codebases including the Linux kernel [4, 5, 52]. Since CodeQL is free to use on open-source codebases and its queries are open-source, it is a popular SAST tool within the open-source community.

2.2.3 How SAST is Applied in Modern OSS. Continuous Integration (CI) pipelines [61] have become ubiquitous in the modern software development lifecycle. They automate various software development processes, such as building, testing, and deploying code. By this means, software development has shifted towards the continuous (or near-continuous [22]) integration of changes, allowing deployment at more rapid intervals [48]. SAST and DAST tools are often applied as part of a CI pipeline [27, 83, 84], reflecting the "shift left" trend to assess security throughout the engineering process rather than at fixed intervals.

On GitHub, the popular open-source software platform, there are several options for CI frameworks [43], including TravisCI [110], CircleCI [38], and GitHub Actions [33]. The most common of these is the GitHub CI because of its close integration with GitHub's platform [59]. The GitHub CI is structured as a set of *Workflows* associated with events. Each event is comprised of one or more *Actions*. Appendix F provides more detail about GitHub Workflows.

3 MOTIVATION

Most existing EMBOSS is written in low-level languages, especially C/C++. Many works [63, 92, 100, 105] emphasize the importance of using SAST tools on software projects, especially those using unsafe languages such as C/C++. Many security and government organizations [1, 6] also recommend the use of SAST tools. It is important to ensure that SAST tools are also used in EMBOSS. However, *no study exists to understand the prevalence of SAST tool usage in EMBOSS.*

Existing studies [34, 51, 76, 88] try to evaluate the effectiveness of SAST tools on traditional or non-embedded software. However, embedded software differs [115] from traditional software in design, library usage, organization, build system, and toolchains. *It is unclear how challenging it is to use existing SAST tools, and their effectiveness, on EMBOSS.*

4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS & STUDY DESIGN

Based on the background and motivation given above, we divide our study into two themes. First, we measure the state of practice for SAST in EMBOSS. Then, we measure the opportunity if state-of-the-art SAST were applied to EMBOSS.

Theme 1: State-of-Practice SAST in EMBOSS

RQ1 What perspectives do developers hold about the use of SAST in EMBOSS?

Theme 2: Effectiveness of State-of-Art SAST on EMBOSS

RQ2 What defects does SOTA SAST find in EMBOSS?
RQ3 How do results vary by EMBOSS type?
RQ4 What is the false positive rate?
RQ5 How do developers respond to SAST results?
RQ6 Will developers integrate SAST tools in CI pipelines?

4.1 Overview of Study Design

We first curate a corpus of major EMBOSS from GitHub (§5). This corpus is used for all RQs.

We tackle Theme 1 (RQ1) with a mixed-methods approach (§6). We analyze the corpus to understand current SAST practices and obtain a complementary view by surveying the developers of the projects in the corpus.

Our preliminary analysis (§7.1) revealed that CodeQL is the most effective SAST tool. We therefore address Theme 2 (RQ2-6) by applying CodeQL to projects in the corpus (§7). We apply selected CodeQL queries and analyze the results (RQ2-RQ4). For RQ5, we propose patches for SAST reported issues and report our findings. Similarly, for RQ6, we raise pull-requests to integrate our SAST Workflows to CI pipeline and analyze the results.

5 CORPUS OF MAJOR EMBOSS PROJECTS

Here we describe our approach to build the EMBOSS corpus (§5.1), and then our analysis of the corpus (§5.2).

5.1 Approach

We aim to collect a set of representative and well-engineered EMBOSS. We combine two approaches (Figure 1). First, we searched GitHub for embedded software projects (§5.1.1). Second, we used an external index of RTOSes (§5.1.2).

5.1.1 EMBOSS from GitHub Search. We searched GitHub for popular embedded software on GitHub. Specifically, we collected original (*i.e.,* non-forked), active (*i.e.,* non-archived) C/C++ embedded software. Figure 1 shows the exact filters for our search. The initial query yields ~20K projects. We sorted them by popularity (operationalized as the number of stars [30]) and collected the top 250. We then manually filtered out 12 false positives (non-embedded repositories) based on their READMEs. For instance, we filtered out a machine learning project that also contained the word "embedded" in its keywords.

5.1.2 EMBOSS from Index of RTOSes. Embedded systems are usually powered by an RTOS, which provides the necessary library and scheduling support for various application components. We collected RTOSes from osrtos.com [2], which maintains the list of all open-source RTOSes released to date. Specifically, we selected

Table 1: Summary of repositories in our EMBOSS dataset, grouped by project categories. SLOC calculated with `cloc` [42]. Criticality with the OSSF tool [24]. Data is as of July, 2023. The *Total* row gives medians across corpus, not by category.

Category	# Repos	Example Repo	Median GH stars	Median SLOC	Median Crit. Score
Hardware access library (HAL)	18	grbl	303.5	98,502	0.44
Device drivers (DD)	10	TinyUSB	452	20,078	0.41
Network (NET)	54	contik-ng	314	36,345	0.46
Database access libraries (DAL)	8	tiny SQL	659	26,977	0.39
File systems (FS)	5	littlefs	401	11,195	0.49
Parsing utilities (PAR)	10	mjson	313.5	2,547	0.41
Language support (LS)	33	micropython	479	33,389	0.42
UI utilities (UI)	14	flutterpi	584.5	56,712	0.46
Embedded applications (APP)	32	Infinitime	508	22,662.5	0.39
OSes (OS)	42	FreeRTOS	727.5	409,667.5	0.47
Memory Management Library (MML)	4	tinyobjloader-c	242.5	6,205.5	0.34
Other General Purpose Library for Embedded Use (GPL)	22	tinyprintf	391	12,742.5	0.35
Other (OT)	6		368.5	94,805	0.43
Total	258		406.5	33545	0.43



Figure 1: Two-pronged approach to collecting embedded software dataset. The GitHub search (left side) was performed on April 8, 2023. The osrtos.com search (right side) was performed on June 7, 2023.

those available on GitHub with >100 stars. This resulted in a total of 32 repositories.

5.2 Analysis of Corpus

We combined the repositories and de-duplicated them, resulting in a total of 258 unique EMBOSS repositories. Table 1 summarizes all projects along with their fine-grained categorization (performed manually). Most repositories are reasonably large, with a median of 33K Source Lines of Code (SLOC) and a maximum >400K SLOC. This is similar to the project sizes examined in other studies [106].

We also measured the repositories using the OSSF criticality measure (§2.1.2). All 13 categories have a median project with "medium" or "high" criticality score; the overall median criticality score is 0.43 (high). This indicates that our corpus includes important projects.

6 THEME 1: SOTP OF SAST IN EMBOSS

In this Theme, our goal is to understand the state of practice usage of SAST in EMBOSS. We examine this from two views: the use of SAST in the CI workflows of the corpus, and a survey of the project developers in the corpus. We describe the methods and results from each view.

6.1 RQ1: Methods

6.1.1 Workflow analysis. We noticed that 42% (109/258) of the EMBOSS repositories use GitHub Workflows to automate building and testing the underlying codebase. We performed an automated analysis of these Workflows to detect the use of SAST tools. Specifically, for each Action used in a Workflow, we check if it is a SAST tool by checking its category in the GitHub CI Actions marketplace. We define SAST tools as those whose marketplace category is "code quality" or "security." Next, we manually check every matching Action to validate that it is indeed a SAST tool.

For workflows for which no SAST was found (248/258 of projects), we estimated whether or not this occurred due to errors in our automated analysis, or because they indeed used no SAST. We performed a random sampling of 20 Workflows and manually checked them.

To make the measured rate of SAST usage interpretable, we performed the same measurement on the top 5,000 OSS projects deemed "critical" and "extremely critical" according to the OpenSSF criticality score. These projects do not target embedded contexts — none of the projects from our corpus appear in this list.

6.1.2 Developer survey. Under the supervision of our institution's Institutional Review Board (IRB), we surveyed projects' maintainers about their practices as well as to identify any alternative ways in which they use SAST tools. Our population of interest was the maintainers of the 248 (96%) of projects that do not use any SAST Actions. For each of these projects, we collected emails of users who recently contributed and sent them an email with the link to

our survey.[2] We were able to find the maintainers' email for 104 (out of 248) projects. There were 15 questions in the survey with an anticipated time of 5 min. The full survey is in Appendix B.

6.2 RQ1: Results

Finding 1: Sophisticated SAST tools are rarely used in EMBOSS repositories. Only 4% of the EMBOSS repositories do so. With the same measure, 19% of non-embedded OSS do. Many EMBOSS repositories rely only on compiler warnings for SAST, which fail to find many common security defects.
Finding 2: The surveyed developers are generally aware of CI Workflows and use them to run their SAST tools. When they do not use SAST, it is commonly because they believe the security impact or effectiveness of SAST is low.

6.2.1 Workflow analysis. By automatically searching for SAST use, we found that only 10 (4%) of the repositories use a sophisticated SAST tool. All of these use free SAST tools, specifically, CodeQL. None of them use commercial SAST tools. Of the 10 repositories that use CodeQL, 7 use an out-of-date version.

By comparison to the top 5,000 OSS projects by criticality (without the embedded constraint), we can see how small this adoption rate is. Of the top 5,000 OSS projects we examined for comparison, 958 (19%) use ≥1 SAST tools by our definition.

In our random sampling to check for false negatives in the EMBOSS measure (random sample of 20 projects), we found only two false negatives, *i.e.,* 10% false negative rate. Both were due to a level of indirection around the use of a SAST tool. `RIOT-OS/RIOT` runs its static tests in a Docker container, and `InfiniTimeOrg/InfiniTime` runs `clang-tidy` in a script.

6.2.2 Developer survey. We got 25 responses (24% response rate), representing 20 distinct repositories. This response rate is comparable to that reported by other works that survey developers from GitHub (*e.g.,* [10, 66]).

Figure 2 illustrates the responses to our survey. We discuss why developers do and do not use SAST tools.

Use of SAST Tools. Most of the surveyed developers (80% (20/25)) use SAST tools, out of which 90% (18/20) do so as part of their GitHub Workflows. This suggests that our approach — analyzing GitHub Workflows — was a reasonable approximation of the actual use of SAST in this projects. However, most of these SAST users consider compiler warnings such as `gcc -Wall -Wextra` to be adequate SAST. Although compiler analyses have low false positive rates, they also have high false negative rates.

As a simple demonstration of the weaknesses of compiler warnings as SAST, we executed `gcc`'s analyses on a set of test cases from the CodeQL repository. These are simple test cases (<10 lines), each demonstrating a security issue, *e.g.,* using `%s` in `scanf` or passing invalid pointer types to a function call. We compiled these test cases using a recent version of `gcc` (11.4.0) with strict warnings. This configuration of `gcc` found issues in only 17 (21%) defect types. Some simple security issues were flagged, such as the use of `strcpy` instead of `strncpy`. However, more complex ones were missed, such as inconsistent `NULL` checks and use-after-free errors. We provide more details in Appendix I. This shows that current SAST practices in EMBOSS are not adequate.

Not Using SAST Tools. 20% (5/25) of the developers do not use any SAST tools. Most of these respondents (3/5) believe the security vulnerabilities in the corresponding projects have a low impact. However, these projects have an average OSSF criticality score of 0.43 ("high"). These developers may underestimate the severity of security issues in their projects, in line with previous studies [75, 117]. The developers of another project reported insufficient resources (*e.g.,* time). Unfortunately, this project is one of the most popular (>5K stars) open-source C++ libraries for embedded systems, with an OSSF score of >0.6 ("critical").

A final common reason for non-SAST use was concerns about their effectiveness. Five respondents felt that using SAST tools on embedded software is questionable and might result in many false positives. This finding is consistent with previous surveys of non-embedded software developers [68].

7 THEME 2: EFFECTIVENESS OF SOTA SAST IN EMBOSS

In this Theme, our goal is to understand the potential effectiveness of applying SAST to EMBOSS. First we select a state-of-the-art SAST tool for detailed measurements. Then we apply it to our questions.

7.1 Selection of the SOTA SAST tool

We want to apply the best-performing open-source SAST for our EMBOSS measurements. We expected that CodeQL would be the best performer (§2.2), but previous studies have not applied it to embedded software. Therefore, we evaluated available SAST tools on a security benchmark as well as on a sample of the EMBOSS corpus, and chose the tool with the lowest false positive rate.

Competing Tools We selected popular GitHub Actions that perform SAST on C/C++ repositories. Table 2 gives the Actions and the underlying SAST tools. These Actions are specifically those that are stable (not pre-release), free (not requiring licenses), and "plug-and-play" (support a range of compilers, do not require knowledge of program semantics/modeling, etc.). Details of our selection criteria are in Appendix C. We created a Workflow for each Action so that we could apply them uniformly to the benchmarks for comparison.

Juliet Benchmark Performance As one measure of effectiveness, we tested these tools on the Juliet Test Suite. The Juliet Test Suite is a labeled dataset commonly used to test SAST tools [93]. It does not focus on embedded software, so this is a measure of performance on general C/C++ code that may not reflect performance on embedded code. We used a time limit of 6 hours, the maximum time allowed for a job on many CI platforms, such as GitHub CI [57].

The middle column of Table 2 shows the results. Most tools either errored out or timed out. CodeQL completed in 40 minutes. CodeQL raised 11,101 warnings with a precision of 71% (7,904/11,101) and a recall of 12% (7,904/65,263).[3]

[2]This is consistent with GitHub's Acceptable Use policy [55]. Profile emails are public information. The number of emails sent was small enough to not be mass spam.

[3]We count a reported flaw as a true positive if the reported location matches that of a ground truth bug.



Figure 2: Summary of our developer survey on the use of SAST tools.

Table 2: Comparison of the SAST tools we considered, on the Juliet benchmark and our EMBOSS dataset. The median # of warnings is reported for repositories on which the tool ran successfully (CodeQL did not produce warnings on over half of repositories). *EMBOSS dataset precision is estimated based on a sample. The cpp-lint performance measurement may be biased (see text).

GitHub Action	SAST	Juliet perf.	# Repos	Failure(s)	Median # warnings	Precision
david-a-wheeler/flawfinder	flawfinder [113]	Error	176 (68%)	Invalid SARIF; Crashes	12	64/316 (20%)
cpp-linter/cpp-linter-action	cpplinter [71]	Timeout	230 (89%)	Timeout; Crashes	111	0/213 (0%)*
deep5050/cppcheck-action	cppcheck [99]	Timeout	256 (99%)	Timeout	19	116/200 (58%)
github/codeql-action	CodeQL [25]	F_1: 0.21	74 (29%)	Autobuild failure	0	154/160 (96%)

EMBOSS Sample Performance To obtain another vantage, we also ran the tools on the 258 repositories in our EMBOSS corpus. We needed ground truth to evaluate the precision of each tool. CodeQL produced 471 warnings, while the others produced between 4K-200K warnings. It was infeasible to check them all. Therefore, we randomly sampled warnings to determine if they were legitimate. Specifically, for each tool, we randomly selected 30 repositories with fewer than 20 warnings and manually checked each warning for these repositories.

The final columns of Table 2 show the results. CodeQL has by far the highest precision, at 96% — this is unsurprising given its effectiveness on Juliet Test Suite. cppcheck and flawfinder had false positive rates over 40%. We recorded cpp-linter as having 100% false positives, though this was likely a flaw in our sampling approach. All sampled warnings were related to compile-time issues that did not cause cpp-linter to error out, but we expect the sampling approach caused us to only examine warnings related to projects it struggled to compile.

As with Theme 1, we next report Methods (§7.2) and Results (§7.3). We use CodeQL as our target SAST tool as it outperformed the competition.

7.2 Methods

First, we describe how we applied CodeQL to our EMBOSS corpus. Then, we explain the method to answer RQs 2-5.

7.2.1 Applying CodeQL to EMBOSS corpus. **Build Scripts Creation.** As shown in Table 2, CodeQL failed to run on 71% of EMBOSS repositories. Specifically, the `Autobuild` phase of CodeQL failed to handle the diverse build setup of these repositories. We therefore manually created build scripts for all repositories based on their documentation and existing CI Workflows. We made the build scripts cover as much part of the codebase as possible (*e.g.,* by compiling all example applications and all supported architecture and boards whenever possible). We successfully created build scripts for 156 (60%) repositories. For the other 102 repositories, the build instructions were either missing (17), too complex (*i.e.,* unavailable toolchains or dependencies) (49), or we could not get them to work (36). This manual process took ~45-60 minutes per repository.

Analysis and Configuration Details of CodeQL. CodeQL supports many suites (*i.e.,* collections of queries). There are three built-in suites for security scanning: `default`, `cpp-security-extended`, and `cpp-security-and-quality`. Each is a subset of the next, so we used the largest of these, `cpp-security-and-quality`, which contains 166

queries. We examined each query's purpose and omitted 9 of them from the CodeQL suite for three reasons: (1) they only identify code readability issues; (2) the potential risk of the corresponding defects is relatively low (*e.g.,* converting the result of an integer multiplication to a larger type is an issue only when the result is too large to fit in the smaller type); or (3) they are not applicable to embedded software. See Appendix E for details.

Furthermore, based on initial results, we modified three queries to improve their precision and ignore certain restrictions. First, we modified the `cpp/stack-address-escape` query to ignore cases of assigning a function parameter of a pointer type to a non-local variable. This usage is commonplace in practice and is unlikely to constitute a defect of significant concern. Second, we modified `cpp/constant-comparison` to only report comparison that is always false because we found that always-true comparisons are usually not defects in the EMBOSS context. For instance, developers can be overly cautious and perform the same check multiple times, where the second check will always be true. *e.g.,* `if (p != NULL) ... if (p != NULL)`. Third, we modified `cpp/uninitialized-local` to eliminate false positives caused by casting a variable explicitly to `void`. Developers use this cast to suppress compiler warnings on unused variables, *e.g.,* `(void) x;`. CodeQL accepted one of our query modifications into their main repository [3].

Finally, we created GitHub Workflows for all the successfully built repositories (156). These Workflows, when triggered, invoke the necessary build scripts and run CodeQL with the required configuration. We used CodeQL command-line toolchain release 2.13.1 (May 3, 2023) and the query repository based on the commit 202037e925 (May 12, 2023). We ran these GitHub Workflows on all the successfully built repositories (156). This produced many *issues*, which CodeQL divides into *errors* (high-severity concerns such as memory safety) and *warnings* (lower-severity issues such as code smells).

7.2.2 RQ2: Defects in EMBOSS. To answer these research questions, we manually analyzed all CodeQL issues for 151 repositories (out of a possible 156). The others have a substantial number of issues, and we did not have time to analyze them thoroughly.

For RQ2, we report summary statistics as well as examples of the main classes of defects. We also distinguish the proportion of defects that can be deemed security-relevant to understand whether the studied CodeQL query suite has security benefits (*e.g.,* memory safety issues) vs. broader quality benefits (*e.g.,* code smells). To be conservative, we define a defect as **security-relevant** if and only if "the CodeQL query finding the defect contains the security tag, or the defect is clearly related to memory safety (*e.g.,* null pointer dereference, out-of-bounds read/write)". We also summarize the common classes of security and non-security defects.

7.2.3 RQ3: Trends across EMBOSS type. For RQ3, we present the distribution of security and non-security defects across different types of EMBOSS and summarize the results.

7.2.4 RQ4: False positive rates. False positive rate analysis requires a significant amount of work, yet false positives are also a major concern in the adoption of SAST tools. Given the large number of repositories, we sampled 123 successfully built repositories (the 50 most starred, the 50 least starred, and 23 randomly picked repositories) and manually categorized all issues in them into true and false positives. A false positive means that the result does not match what the rule intends to detect, *e.g.,* an error for an uninitialized variable when it is actually initialized.

Two analysts worked for one month to analyze the results. The two analysts worked largely independently but discussed uncertainties with each other and with the rest of the research team. All analysts and researchers had substantial training (coursework and experience) in C/C++ programming and cybersecurity, and we believe they were able to make correct judgments about whether or not a CodeQL issue represented a true positive.

7.2.5 RQ5: Developer response on SAST defects. For RQ5, we responsibly disclosed all identified defects in repositories that are actively maintained (had commits in the past three months). We opened issues and raised pull requests with appropriate patches where possible. We report the number of confirmed defects and the kinds of replies made by the developers.

7.2.6 RQ6: Developer response on SAST Integration. For RQ6, we opened pull requests to integrate our CodeQL scanning Workflows (§7.2) into projects CI pipeline.. This would have the effect of using CodeQL's SAST to check or gate all subsequent pull requests. We measured the number of merged pull requests and the kinds of replies made by the developers. An example PR is given in Appendix D.

7.3 Results

Finding 3 (RQ2): CodeQL finds hundreds of real defects in the studied EMBOSS repositories, including in repositories maintained by reputable organizations like Amazon and Microsoft.
Finding 4 (RQ3): Defect density (defects per SLOC) is not uniform across different categories of EMBOSS. Some categories of projects (*e.g.,* APP and NET) are more likely to contain defects than others (*e.g.,* OS and HAL).
Finding 5 (RQ4): CodeQL has a false positive rate of 34% in the 123 sampled repositories. However, false positives are polarized, *i.e.,* A few rules contribute to the majority of false positives.
Finding 6 (RQ4): Although the overall false positive rate is high, it has minimal impact on EMBOSS repositories: ~40% of repos have no false positives, ~55% of the repos have less than one false positive, and 90% of repos have less than ten false positives.
Finding 7 (RQ5): Developers readily accept fixes for SAST defects – demonstrating that they care about these defects.
Finding 8 (RQ6): Many EMBOSS developers are willing to integrate the CodeQL SAST into their projects' CI as a GitHub Workflow, provided that someone else (our research team) prepares, validates and explains the Workflow for them.
Finding 9: A default Autobuild fails on many EMBOSS projects. However, producing a customized build suitable for CodeQL takes minimal engineering effort, 45-60 minutes per project. LLMs shows promise in automating this task and warrants further research (§7.3.6).

Our results for all RQs are summarized in Table 3. We walk through it and give more detailed measurements for each RQ in turn.

Table 3: Summary of CodeQL results: setup, raw data, manual Analysis, and disclosure.

Number of ...	Value
Setup	
Repos in dataset	258
Repos built	156
Repos analyzed	151
CodeQL Results	
Errors reported	772
Warnings reported	2,286
Manual Analysis	
Defects discovered	709
Repos where defects were discovered	97 (64%)
Security defects discovered	535
Repos where security defects were discovered	85 (56%)
Responsible Disclosure	
Defects disclosed	586
Defects confirmed	376
Security defects disclosed	433
Security defects confirmed	302
Patch pull requests submitted	163
Patch pull requests merged (*i.e.,* accepted)	104
CVEs issued	2
CodeQL SAST Workflow	
Pull requests submitted	129
Pull requests merged	37 (71% (Active) and 29% (Total))

7.3.1 RQ2: Analysis of defects found. As reported in the *Defects Discovered* row of Table 3, we identified 709 defects across 97 repositories. There were 535 (85 repositories) likely security vulnerabilities, including in major projects maintained by organizations including Microsoft, Amazon, and the Apache Foundation. EMBOSS engineers have confirmed 376 (53%) of these defects, mainly by accepting our pull requests.

Defect Rates Per Repository. Figure 3 shows CDFs of the number of all defects and security defects in each repository. A point (x, y) on a line indicates that y% of repositories contain less than or equal to x corresponding type of defects. The left-most point on both the lines indicates that there are 64% (97) repositories with at least one defect, and 56% (85) repositories with at least one security defect. The security defects line has almost the same trend as total defects, indicating that most defects in all repositories are security-relevant. Although ~90% of the repositories have less than ten total defects, some repositories (9) have a much larger number of defects. Table 4 shows the top 5 repositories with the highest total defects, security defects, and their OSSF criticality score.



Figure 3: CDFs of # of all and security-relevant defects in a repository.



Figure 4: Top 10 CodeQL queries by # of security-relevant defects found. (Counts and Percentages)

Common Types of Security Defects. We found several classes of security defects across all repositories. Figure 4 shows the top 10 types of security defects (*i.e.,* vulnerabilities) [54] found along with the corresponding number of defects. We discuss the top three major types of security defects in Appendix G.1.

Severity of Security Defects. The severity of a security bug depends on its exploitability and the criticality of the underlying software [40, 108]. Given the large number of defects, manually assessing exploitability is intractable. Instead, we use the OSSF criticality score (§2.1.2) of the target repository to assess the severity of a bug. Figure 5 shows the CDF of the severity of security defects. Specifically, a point (x, y) on the line indicates y% of the defects have severity less than or equal to x. Approximately 50% of bugs have a severity score of more than 0.5, which represents high-severity repositories (§2.1.2). Specifically, ~40% of bugs have a score of more than 0.6, representing vulnerabilities in critical repositories. For instance, we found an out-of-bounds access in `micropython/micropython` (Listing 2) and a use-after-free in `apache/nuttx` (Listing 1), an RTOS with a score of 0.69 – both of these are critical projects.

Common Types of Non-Security Defects. These defects may not lead to security vulnerabilities but can cause functionality issues, undefined behavior, and compilation issues. For instance, the rule `cpp/missing-return` detects non-void functions with no explicit

Table 4: EMBOSS repositories with the top 5 highest total defects and security defects.

Total Defects			Security Defects		
Repo	**Criticality Score**	**Num**	**Repo**	**Criticality Score**	**Num**
apache/nuttx	0.69	35	raysan5/raylib	0.70	33
contiki-ng/contiki-ng	0.67	34	openlgtv/epk2extract	0.45	27
raysan5/raylib	0.70	33	gozfree/gear-lib	0.43	26
ARMmbed/mbed-os	0.72	32	apache/nuttx	0.69	24
openlgtv/epk2extract	0.45	29	contiki-ng/contiki-ng	0.67	24



Figure 5: CDF of the severity of security defects



Figure 6: Top 10 CodeQL queries by # of non-security-relevant defects found. (Counts and Percentages)

```
// apache/nuttx/drivers/sensors/apds9960.c
ret = register_driver(devpath, &g_apds9960_fops, 0666, priv);
if (ret < 0)
{
  snerr("ERROR: Failed to register driver: %d\n", ret);
  kmm_free(priv)⚠;
}
💣priv->config->irq_attach(priv->config, apds9960_int_handler, priv);
```

Listing 1: The memory pointed by `priv` can be freed (⚠) inside the `if` condition but will be accessed later outside, resulting in use-after-free (💣).

return statement. This may result in undefined behavior during

```
// micropython/extmod/vfs_lfsx.c
size_t from = 1;
char *cwd = vstr_str(&self->cur_dir);
while (from < CWD_LEN) {
  for (; cwd[from]💣 == '/' && from < CWD_LEN⚠; ++from) {
    // Scan for the start
  }
  ...
```

Listing 2: The offset `from` is used before the range check (⚠), leading to an out-of-bounds access of one byte (💣).

runtime [73]. Similarly, the rule `cpp/virtual-call-in-constructor` detects calls to virtual functions in a constructor. This also could lead to undefined behavior as the object's virtual table may not be completely initialized [58]. Figure 6 shows the top ten non-security defects along with the corresponding number of defects.

7.3.2 RQ3: Trends by EMBOSS type. Figure 7 shows the number of defects found across various repositories according to their categories. *At a high level, across all categories, the number of security defects is more than that of the number of non-security defects.* Furthermore, the number of defects is proportional to the number of repositories of the particular category (Table 1). For instance, Network (NET), Operating Systems (OS), and Applications (APP) are the top three categories containing the highest number of repositories (128 (50%)), and they also contain the highest number of defects (423 (60%)). The Memory management libraries with the least number (4) of repositories also have the least defects (6). Interestingly, we noticed that defect density, *i.e.,* number of defects per KSLOC, is non-uniform. The Figure 10 in the Appendix provides defect distribution per-repo and defect density across various categories of EMBOSS. In summary, APP and NET have the highest defect densities. On the other hand, OS and HAL have the lowest densities. *Our results empirically show defect density is not uniform across different categories of EMBOSS.*

7.3.3 RQ4: False positive rates. The overall percentages of true and false positives are 66% (1039/1577) and 34% (538/1577), respectively. Figure 8 shows the CDF of the false positive rates of different rules. Specifically, a point (x, y) on a line indicates y% of the rules have false positive rates of less than or equal to x%. Approximately 60% rules had no false positives, and 10% had no true positives. This indicates that false positives are polarized, and a few rules contribute to the majority of false positives. Specifically, 20% of rules contribute to more than 60% of false positives. We present



Figure 7: Number of defects of each type in EMBOSS of various categories (Table 1). The number next to the category indicates the number of repositories containing at least one defect.



Figure 8: CDF of the false positive rates of rules

comprehensive information of CodeQL rules contributing to false positives in Appendix G.3.

Although the cumulative false positive rate is high (34%), it does not affect most repositories. The Figure 9a shows the CDF of % of repos and false positive rate; we can see that ~40% of repos have no false positives and more than 60% of the repos have less than 20% false positive rate. Furthermore, *the actual number of false positives is very low, as shown in Figure 9b. Specifically, ~55% of the repos have less than one false positive, and 90% of repos have less than ten false positives.* These results show that the majority of EMBOSS repositories are not affected by false positives.

7.3.4 RQ5: Developer response on SAST defects. The bottom part of Table 3 shows the summary of our responsible disclosure. In total, 53% (376/709) of defects have been confirmed by developers (via merging our pull requests or expressing confirmation in replies to issues).

Most of the patches were readily accepted by the developers. In a few cases, developers were even interested in knowing the techniques we used to find the defects. For instance, developers of an AWS-owned repository said *"I'm curious how you stumbled across this — Was there some sort of test you ran or was this something that came up during your development? I'm hoping we can duplicate your method of discovery to add some sort of check/test to the repo."*

There were two pull requests where the developers did not choose to fix potential security issues. They stated that although code robustness is important, they deemed reduced code size and RAM usage to be a higher priority in their embedded software. These observations support the conventional wisdom that software engineers (and especially engineers in embedded systems) trade-off between security and performance [50, 60].

Although many security-relevant defects were resolved, only two Common Vulnerabilities and Exposures (CVEs) were assigned. When we disclosed the security-relevant defects, we did not explicitly ask the engineering teams to issue CVEs. Of the 94 repositories against which we opened at least one security-relevant defect, only two issued CVEs for these defects: `mbedtls` issued CVE-2023-*BLINDED*, and `contiki-ng` issued CVE-2023-*BLINDED*. We eventually followed up on our 77 reports of defects to the 10 most popular repositories (by GitHub stars) to inquire whether CVEs were being prepared. Two of the engineering teams replied suggesting that we email their security teams — we did so, but received no response. The other eight teams did not respond. Our research supports the observation of prior work [80], that security defects are often fixed "silently", without tracking via a CVE.

7.3.5 RQ6: Developers response on Integrating SAST Workflows. We raised 129 pull requests (PRs) to integrate our CodeQL Workflows into the corresponding projects. We did not submit some pull requests as the repositories do not accept external contributions, *e.g.,* Microsoft Azure. In addition, some of our workflows became out of date due to concurrent changes in the project's build process. The Appendix D.1 shows our pull request with some details redacted for anonymity. We received responses for 52 of our PRs, of which 37 were merged (71% acceptance rate for responses, 29% acceptance rate overall).

Accepted Requests. Most of the developers readily accepted our Workflow. In a few cases (3), we had to make syntactic adjustments (DETAILS OMITTED FOR ANONYMITY) to our Workflow according to the repository coding practices. Few developers (2) had concerns regarding the effectiveness of CodeQL. We responded with the defects identified in our study as evidenced by CodeQL's effectiveness. Interestingly, a developer of a repository (REDACTED FOR ANONYMITY) resorted to X (formerly Twitter) to get opinions about CodeQL before accepting our pull request.

Closed Requests. Several developers (7) closed our pull requests, assuming that these were generated by bots. We contacted them again to clarify that we were not bots but received no response. A few developers (3) mentioned that they do not have enough



(a) CDF of the false positive rate v/s % of repos

(b) CDF of the number of false positives v/s % of repos

Figure 9: CDFs of the rate and number of false positives v/s percentage of repositories (repos).

resources to handle the alerts raised by CodeQL. A few developers (2) mentioned concerns about licensing.

7.3.6 Automating Workflow Creation using LLMs. Our results suggest that developers are willing to integrate SAST Workflows into their CI pipeline. However, as mentioned in §7.2, we manually created these Workflows because of the diversity in the build setups. This approach required substantial manual effort and would not scale to a larger dataset of repositories, *e.g.,* if one wanted to benchmark SAST tools on a larger sample. We need a technique to create these Workflows automatically. Towards this goal, we created a common Workflow template that can be configured for any repository by just using the build script (*i.e.,* `build.sh`) corresponding to the repository. Consequently, we can automatically create SAST Workflow if we can identify the build script (or set of build commands) for the repository. During our manual analysis, we identified the build commands by referring to the repositories' README and CI scripts. Recent developments in LLMs have shown their effectiveness in various software engineering and information extraction tasks [37, 67, 90, 94, 103, 120]. We report on our efforts and insights on using LLM to automatically extract the build commands.

Methodology. First, we extracted the relevant sections of README or CI scripts. Specifically, these are sections of the document most likely containing the build commands. We use cosine similarity of build-related keywords (*e.g.,* configure, install, build, etc.) to identify these sections. Second, we configure LLMs with a system prompt to restrict its output to be bash commands and other useful hints (Details in Appendix H). Finally, we provided LLMs with the extracted sections and the following prompt: *"Generate a bash shell script that compiles an embedded system project."*

Results. We sampled 45 repositories. Our criteria are: (a) extracted textual sections of the repositories contain enough information for building; and (b) we were previously able to build them by hand (from the 156 successfully-built repositories) so we could diagnose the build failures. *We ran the generated scripts and found that 25 (55%) of the repositories could be successfully compiled.* GPT-4 [97] gave the best outcome. Table 5 summarizes the categories of mistakes in the GPT-4 output and the corresponding number of affected repositories. Most of the mistakes are spurious commands, which do not affect the overall build process. Out-of-context (m6) and incorrect commands (m4) are the major contributors to build script failures. However, these are minor errors that can be easily repaired with minimal effort. We also measured the min/mean/median/max ratio of the shell commands from the ground truth present in generated scripts, which is 0%, 82%, 100%, and 100%, respectively. In summary, LLMs show promise in automating SAST Workflow creation. Our results might be further improved with other advanced techniques, such as multi-turn dialogue [119].

8 LIMITATIONS AND THREATS TO VALIDITY

We acknowledge limitations and threats to the validity of our study.

Construct Validity: We scope the construct of security vulnerabilities to those detectable by the SAST tools from the GitHub Marketplace. Other classes of security vulnerabilities exist but are beyond the scope of our work.

Internal Validity: This work was a measurement study, and we made no causal inferences.

External Validity: Our methodology applies the SAST tools available in the GitHub Marketplace to the open-source embedded software available on GitHub. Our results may not generalize to other SAST tools, particularly commercial-grade ones such as Coverity and Sonar. Our results may not be generalized to other embedded software, particularly commercial-grade embedded software, to which costly techniques such as formal methods have been applied. To shed light on this threat, in our analysis, we reported on the subset of commercially-developed open-source software, such as Amazon's `aws/aws-iot-device-sdk-embedded-C` (which are known to use Coverity), and show that SAST tool was able to find defects. Our study may suffer from data collection bias as we focus on projects and SAST tools available on GitHub. There could be other EMBOSS projects (*e.g.,* in BitBucket) and tools on which our observations may not hold. We tried to avoid this by collecting diverse projects with varying sizes.

Limited Developer Study: Given the low number of responses, the observations from our developer study (§6.2.2) may not be generalizable to other EMBOSS repositories. As a mitigation, the response rate was consistent with other surveys of GitHub developers.

Table 5: Summary of mistakes made by LLM (GPT-4) in generating build instructions from documentation and CI scripts.

Mistake Type	Example	# of repos affected
m1) Missing setup cmd	Missing `sudo apt-get install -y libcmocka-dev`	5
m2) Missing build cmd	Missing `make`	2
m3) Missing auxiliary cmd	Missing `./autogen.sh`	3
m4) Incorrect cmd	`make CROSS_COMPILE=/path/to/arm-none-linux-gnueabihf- PLATFORM=arm32-realview`	11
m5) Spurious cmd	`echo "Build completed successfully!"`	27
m6) Out-of-context cmd	Run `cd acados; ./ci/shared/install_eigen.sh` in acados directory	11

9 DISCUSSION AND FUTURE WORK

We were surprised to find many security defects across various embedded software by using an existing SAST tool. In retrospect, these results could be anticipated as most EMBOSS repositories do not use SAST tools. Developers expressed concerns over the benefit and false positive rates of SAST tools. However, most of the defects found by SAST tools are acknowledged and fixed by developers; this shows that SAST tools can find important defects. Compilation required SAST tools, such as CodeQL, cannot handle the diverse build setups of EMBOSS repositories and consequently might fail to run. However, these tools can be easily configured to run with minimal engineering effort. As part of this research, we created many GitHub Workflows for CodeQL, which other developers can use as templates for their own projects.

In summary, our results provide a solid case for the need to use standard SAST tools in EMBOSS repositories. Our results also complement a recent work [21] that used simple systematic testing to find several severe security issues in popular embedded network stacks. The research and engineering communities need to enable and adopt well-known techniques on embedded software. As part of our future work, we will work on improving CodeQL to improve its plug-and-play performance and its query precision on embedded repositories.

10 RELATED WORK

In §2 and §3, we discussed directly related work. Here we compare to more broadly related work.

Embedded Operating Systems and Frameworks: Al-Boghdady *et al.* [11] conducted a thorough analysis of four IoT Operating Systems, namely RIOT [8], Contiki [7], FreeRTOS [18], and Amazon FreeRTOS [17]. Their results indicated an increasing trend in the number of security errors over time. However, the error density remained stable or showed a minor decrease. Alnaeli *et al.* [14, 15] focused their investigation on Contiki and TinyOS, finding an increase in the use of unsafe statements over five years. Meanwhile, McBride *et al.* [87] analyzed the Contiki operating system and found that while errors increased over time, error density decreased. Malik *et al.* [81] carried out a study on embedded frameworks, evaluating security vulnerabilities from four popular edge frameworks. Their findings revealed that vulnerabilities often slipped through during development due to the challenges of in-house testing of complex Edge features.

Other Analyses of Embedded Systems: Bagheri *et al.* [26] proposed a method for automatically generating assurance cases for software certification. Jia *et al.* [65] propose ContexIoT, a context-based permission system that instruments IoT apps to log fine-grained control and data flow context in order to distinguish malicious behaviors in a robust manner. Celik *et al.* [32] present SOTERIA, a system that applies static analysis and model checking to automatically analyze IoT apps and environments for security and safety violations. They extract a state model from IoT source code and use a model checker to validate desired properties. Evaluation on real-world SmartThings [104] apps shows SOTERIA can effectively identify security and functionality issues in both individual apps and multi-app environments. Our work broadens the scope of these studies. We analyze not only several operating systems but also a diverse corpus of embedded software, highlighting the challenges and effectiveness and offering a more comprehensive and holistic view of the security landscape in IoT systems.

Developers' Perspectives on SAST Tools: Johnson *et al.* [68] found that while developers are aware of the benefits, false positives and the presentation of warnings act as barriers. Lenarduzzi *et al.* [72] proposed a comparison of six popular SAST tools for Java projects, showing minimal agreement among the tools and a low level of precision. Our study revealed slightly different findings. In addition to false positives, developers were unaware of the effectiveness of SAST tools on embedded software. However, Johnson *et al.* [68] did not provide any insight into the adoption rates of static analysis tools. In a similar vein, Ami *et al.* [19] conducted in-depth semi-structured interviews with 20 practitioners to shed light on developer perceptions and desires related to static analysis tools. They considered these tools to be highly beneficial in reducing developer effort and covering areas that manual analysis might overlook. Among the challenges faced by developers, the significant pain points were false negatives, the absence of meaningful alert messages, and the effort required for configuration and integration. Our experiments with CodeQL (an effective SAST tool) showed contradictory results. We were able to easily (with minimal engineering effort) configure and integrate CodeQL in EMBOSS repositories. The alert messages were displayed in SARIF format and were easy to understand and evaluate.

11 CONCLUSIONS

Empirical software security research has a substantial body of knowledge on open-source software, but has focused on IT or general-purpose software. We present a large-scale evaluation of embedded open-source software, reporting on both the effectiveness of static analysis security tools and on developers' perceptions. Across 258 embedded open-source software projects, the CodeQL

SAST tool finds hundreds of defects with modest per-repository configuration and a low false positive rate. We found 709 defects (with a false positive rate of 34%), 376 of which have been confirmed. This includes 302 defects that are security vulnerabilities such as crashes and memory corruption. The primary difficulty we observed in the process was configuring diverse build systems, but this took minimal engineering effort per project. We conclude that the current generation of static analysis tools, exemplified by CodeQL, has overcome concerns about false positives and can be easily incorporated into embedded software projects. If engineers adopted these tools, many security vulnerabilities would be prevented. *Future research should push the bounds of vulnerability discovery, but we call for efforts to promote adoption of existing tools.*

12 DATA AVAILABILITY

For replicability, all data related to the project — defects, analysis, pull requests — will be published along with the paper. We share the anonymizable subset of this data at: https://anonymous.4open.science/r/scanner-workflows-73F4.

REFERENCES

[1] [n. d.]. Application Security Testing. https://www.gsa.gov/technology/it-contract-vehicles-and-purchasing-programs/technology-products-services/it-security/application-security-testing

[2] [n. d.]. OSRTOS. https://www.osrtos.com/.

[3] [n. d.]. Pull Request for Improvements to CodeQL. REDACTED.

[4] 2021. mogwailabs finds bugs using CodeQL. https://mogwailabs.de/en/blog/2021/09/vulnerability-digging-with-codeql/.

[5] 2022. Trail of Bits finds bugs using CodeQL. https://blog.trailofbits.com/2022/01/11/finding-unhandled-errors-using-codeql/.

[6] 2023. Computer Security: Avoiding salmonella in your code. https://rb.gy/yky2e

[7] 2023. The Contiki Operating System. https://github.com/contiki-os/contiki. original-date: 2012-10-24T05:59:36Z.

[8] 2023. *RIOT - The friendly Operating System for the Internet of Things.* https://www.riot-os.org/

[9] Ali Abbasi, Jos Wetzels, Thorsten Holz, and Sandro Etalle. 2019. Challenges in designing exploit mitigations for deeply embedded systems. In *2019 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*. IEEE, 31–46.

[10] Yasemin Acar, Christian Stransky, Dominik Wermke, Michelle L. Mazurek, and Sascha Fahl. 2017. Security Developer Studies with GitHub Users: Exploring a Convenience Sample. In *Thirteenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS 2017)*. USENIX Association, Santa Clara, CA, 81–95. https://www.usenix.org/conference/soups2017/technical-sessions/presentation/acar

[11] Abdullah Al-Boghdady, Khaled Wassif, and Mohammad El-Ramly. 2021. The Presence, Trends, and Causes of Security Vulnerabilities in Operating Systems of IoT's Low-End Devices. *Sensors* 21, 7 (2021). https://doi.org/10.3390/s21072329

[12] Mohammed Ali Al-Garadi, Amr Mohamed, Abdulla Khalid Al-Ali, Xiaojiang Du, Ihsan Ali, and Mohsen Guizani. 2020. A Survey of Machine and Deep Learning Methods for Internet of Things (IoT) Security. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* 22, 3 (2020), 1646–1685. https://doi.org/10.1109/COMST.2020.2988293 Conference Name: IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials.

[13] Fadi Al-Turjman and Joel Poncha Lemayian. 2020. Intelligence, security, and vehicular sensor networks in internet of things (IoT)-enabled smart-cities: An overview. *Computers & Electrical Engineering* 87 (2020), 106776.

[14] Saleh M. Alnaeli, Melissa Sarnowski, Md Sayedul Aman, Ahmed Abdelgawad, and Kumar Yelamarthi. 2016. Vulnerable C/C++ code usage in IoT software systems. In *2016 IEEE 3rd World Forum on Internet of Things (WF-IoT)* (Reston, VA, USA, 2016-12). IEEE, 348–352. https://doi.org/10.1109/WF-IoT.2016.7845497

[15] Saleh Mohamed Alnaeli, Melissa Sarnowski, Md Sayedul Aman, Ahmed Abdelgawad, and Kumar Yelamarthi. 2017. Source Code Vulnerabilities in IoT Software Systems. 2, 3 (2017), 1502–1507. https://doi.org/10.25046/aj0203188

[16] Omar Alrawi, Chaz Lever, Manos Antonakakis, and Fabian Monrose. 2019. SoK: Security Evaluation of Home-Based IoT Deployments. *Proceedings - IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy* 2019-May (2019), 1362–1380.

[17] Amazon Web Services, Inc. or its affiliates. 2023. *Amazon FreeRTOS.* https://aws.amazon.com/freertos/

[18] Amazon Web Services, Inc. or its affiliates. 2023. *FreeRTOS - Market leading RTOS (Real Time Operating System) for embedded systems with Internet of Things extensions.* https://www.freertos.org/index.html

[19] Amit Seal Ami, Kevin Moran, Denys Poshyvanyk, and Adwait Nadkarni. 2024. "False negative - that one is going to kill you" - Understanding Industry Perspectives of Static Analysis based Security Testing. In *Proceedings of the 2024 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P).* To appear.

[20] Mahdi Amiri-Kordestani and Hadj Bourdoucen. 2017. A survey on embedded open source system software for the internet of things. In *Free and Open Source Software Conference*, Vol. 2017.

[21] Paschal Amusuo, Andres Calvo Mendez Ricardo, Zhongwei Xu, Aravind Machiry, and James Davis. 2023. Systematically Detecting Packet Validation Vulnerabilities in Embedded Network Stacks. In *Proceedings of the 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering.*

[22] Sundaram Ananthanarayanan, Masoud Saeida Ardekani, Denis Haenikel, Balaji Varadarajan, Simon Soriano, Dhaval Patel, and Ali-Reza Adl-Tabatabai. 2019. Keeping master green at scale. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth EuroSys Conference 2019.* 1–15.

[23] Manos Antonakakis, Tim April, Michael Bailey, Matt Bernhard, Elie Bursztein, Jaime Cochran, Zakir Durumeric, J Alex Halderman, Luca Invernizzi, Michalis Kallitsis, et al. 2017. Understanding the mirai botnet. In *26th {USENIX} security symposium ({USENIX} Security 17).* 1093–1110.

[24] Abhishek Arya, Caleb Brown, Rob Pike, and The Open Source Security Foundation. 2023. Open Source Project Criticality Score. https://github.com/ossf/criticality_score. original-date: 2020-11-17T16:14:23Z.

[25] Pavel Avgustinov, Oege De Moor, Michael Peyton Jones, and Max Schäfer. 2016. QL: Object-oriented queries on relational data. In *30th European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming (ECOOP 2016).* Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik.

[26] Hamid Bagheri, Eunsuk Kang, and Niloofar Mansoor. 2020. Synthesis of Assurance Cases for Software Certification. In *2020 IEEE/ACM 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering: New Ideas and Emerging Results (ICSE-NIER)* (2020-10). 61–64.

[27] Pranshu Bajpai and Adam Lewis. 2022. Secure Development Workflows in CI/CD Pipelines. In *2022 IEEE Secure Development Conference (SecDev).* IEEE, 65–66.

[28] Deval Bhamare, Maede Zolanvari, Aiman Erbad, Raj Jain, Khaled Khan, and Nader Meskin. 2020. Cybersecurity for industrial control systems: A survey. *computers & security* 89 (2020), 101677.

[29] Davide Bonaventura., Sergio Esposito., and Giampaolo Bella. 2023. Smart Bulbs Can Be Hacked to Hack into Your Household. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Security and Cryptography - SECRYPT.* INSTICC, SciTePress, 218–229. https://doi.org/10.5220/0012092900003555

[30] Hudson Borges and Marco Tulio Valente. 2018. What's in a GitHub Star? Understanding Repository Starring Practices in a Social Coding Platform. *Journal of Systems and Software* 146 (Dec. 2018), 112–129. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2018.09.016

[31] Guillaume Brat, Jorge A Navas, Nija Shi, and Arnaud Venet. 2014. IKOS: A framework for static analysis based on abstract interpretation. In *Software Engineering and Formal Methods: 12th International Conference, SEFM 2014, Grenoble, France, September 1-5, 2014. Proceedings 12.* Springer, 271–277.

[32] Z. Berkay Celik, Patrick McDaniel, and Gang Tan. 2018. Soteria: Automated IoT Safety and Security Analysis. In *2018 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 18).* USENIX Association, Boston, MA, 147–158. https://www.usenix.org/conference/atc18/presentation/celik

[33] Chaminda Chandrasekara, Pushpa Herath, Chaminda Chandrasekara, and Pushpa Herath. 2021. Introduction to github actions. *Hands-on GitHub Actions: Implement CI/CD with GitHub Action Workflows for Your Applications* (2021), 1–8.

[34] George Chatzieleftheriou and Panagiotis Katsaros. 2011. Test-driving static analysis tools in search of C code vulnerabilities. In *2011 IEEE 35th annual computer software and applications conference workshops.* IEEE, 96–103.

[35] Checkmarx Ltd. 2023. *Checkmarx.* https://checkmarx.com/

[36] Ben Chelf and Christof Ebert. 2009. Ensuring the Integrity of Embedded Software with Static Code Analysis. *IEEE Software* 26, 3 (May 2009), 96–99. https://doi.org/10.1109/MS.2009.65

[37] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Josh Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2021. Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code. arXiv:2107.03374 [cs.LG]

[38] Continuous Integration and Delivery - CircleCI [n. d.]. Continuous Integration and Delivery - CircleCI. https://circleci.com/.

[39] cpp-linter. 2023. C/C++ Linter Action | Clang-Format & Clang-Tidy. cpp-linter.

[40] Roland Croft, M. Ali Babar, and Li Li. 2022. An Investigation into Inconsistency of Software Vulnerability Severity across Data Sources. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER).* 338–348. https://doi.org/10.1109/SANER53432.2022.00050

[41] Tobias Dam, Lukas Daniel Klausner, and Sebastian Neumaier. 2023. Towards a Critical Open-Source Software Database. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023* (Austin, TX, USA) *(WWW '23 Companion).* Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 156–159. https://doi.org/10.1145/3543873.3587336

[42] Albert Danial. 2021. *cloc: v1.92.* https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5760077

[43] Alexandre Decan, Tom Mens, Pooya Rostami Mazrae, and Mehdi Golzadeh. 2022. On the use of GitHub actions in software development repositories. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution (ICSME).* IEEE, 235–245.

[44] Will Dietz, Peng Li, John Regehr, and Vikram Adve. 2015. Understanding integer overflow in C/C++. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM)* 25, 1 (2015), 1–29.

[45] Jacob Domagala. 2023. Static Analysis.

[46] Andrew Fasano, Tiemoko Ballo, Marius Muench, Tim Leek, Alexander Bulekov, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, Manuel Egele, Aurélien Francillon, Long Lu, Nick Gregory, et al. 2021. Sok: Enabling security analyses of embedded systems via rehosting. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Asia conference on computer and communications security.* 687–701.

[47] Daniel Feitosa, Apostolos Ampatzoglou, Paris Avgeriou, and Elisa Yumi Nakagawa. 2015. Investigating Quality Trade-Offs in Open Source Critical Embedded Systems. In *Proceedings of the 11th International ACM SIGSOFT Conference on Quality of Software Architectures* (Montréal, QC, Canada) *(QoSA*

'15). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 113–122. https://doi.org/10.1145/2737182.2737190

[48] Nicole Forsgren, Jez Humble, and Gene Kim. 2018. *Accelerate: The science of lean software and devops: Building and scaling high performing technology organizations*. IT Revolution.

[49] Frama-C. 2023. Frama-C/Eva: Sound Analysis of Possible Runtime Errors. Frama-C.

[50] Radek Fujdiak, Petr Mlynek, Petr Blazek, Maros Barabas, and Pavel Mrnustik. 2018. Seeking the Relation Between Performance and Security in Modern Systems: Metrics and Measures. In *2018 41st International Conference on Telecommunications and Signal Processing (TSP)*. 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1109/TSP.2018.8441496

[51] Christoph Gentsch. 2020. Evaluation of open source static analysis security testing (SAST) tools for c. (2020).

[52] GitHub, Inc. 2021. CodeQL Wall of Fame. https://securitylab.github.com/codeql-wall-of-fame/.

[53] GitHub, Inc. 2023. CodeQL Action. GitHub.

[54] GitHub, Inc. 2023. CodeQL Query Help for C and C++ — CodeQL Query Help Documentation. https://codeql.github.com/codeql-query-help/cpp/.

[55] GitHub, Inc. 2023. GitHub Acceptable Use Policies - GitHub Docs. https://rb.gy/vlqaw.

[56] GitHub, Inc. 2023. GitHub Marketplace · Actions to improve your workflow. https://github.com/marketplace?category=&query=&type=actions&verification=.

[57] GitHub, Inc. 2023. Usage limits, billing, and administration. https://docs.github.com/en/actions/learn-github-actions/usage-limits-billing-and-administration.

[58] GitHub, Inc. 2023. Virtual Call from Constructor or Destructor — CodeQL Query Help Documentation. https://codeql.github.com/codeql-query-help/cpp/cpp-virtual-call-in-constructor/.

[59] Mehdi Golzadeh, Alexandre Decan, and Tom Mens. 2022. On the rise and fall of CI services in GitHub. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER)*. 662–672.

[60] Nikhil Krishna Gopalakrishna, Dharun Anandayuvaraj, Annan Detti, Forrest Lee Bland, Sazzadur Rahaman, and James C. Davis. 2022. "If Security Is Required": Engineering and Security Practices for Machine Learning-based IoT Devices. In *4th International Workshop on Software Engineering Research & Practices for the Internet of Things (SERP4IoT)*. 8.

[61] Jez Humble and David Farley. 2010. *Continuous delivery: reliable software releases through build, test, and deployment automation*. Pearson Education.

[62] Nasif Imtiaz, Brendan Murphy, and Laurie Williams. 2019. How Do Developers Act on Static Analysis Alerts? An Empirical Study of Coverity Usage. In *2019 IEEE 30th International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering (ISSRE)* (2019-10). 323–333. https://doi.org/10.1109/ISSRE.2019.00040 ISSN: 2332-6549.

[63] Nasif Imtiaz and Laurie Williams. 2019. A synopsis of static analysis alerts on open source software. In *Proceedings of the 6th Annual Symposium on Hot Topics in the Science of Security*. 1–3.

[64] IvanKuchin. 2021. C/C++ SAST.

[65] Yunhan Jack Jia, Qi Alfred Chen, Shiqi Wang, Amir Rahmati, Earlence Fernandes, Z. Morley Mao, and Atul Prakash. 2017. ContexIoT: Towards Providing Contextual Integrity to Appified IoT Platforms. In *21st Network and Distributed Security Symposium*.

[66] Jing Jiang, David Lo, Jiahuan He, Xin Xia, Pavneet Singh Kochhar, and Li Zhang. 2017. Why and how developers fork what from whom in GitHub. *Empirical Software Engineering* 22 (2017), 547–578.

[67] Nan Jiang, Kevin Liu, Thibaud Lutellier, and Lin Tan. 2023. Impact of Code Language Models on Automated Program Repair. In *Proceedings of the 45th International Conference on Software Engineering* (Melbourne, Victoria, Australia) *(ICSE '23)*. IEEE Press, 1430–1442. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00125

[68] Brittany Johnson, Yoonki Song, Emerson Murphy-Hill, and Robert Bowdidge. 2013. Why Don't Software Developers Use Static Analysis Tools to Find Bugs?. In *2013 35th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)* (San Francisco, CA, USA, 2013-05). IEEE, 672–681. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE.2013.6606613

[69] Igibek Koishybayev, Aleksandr Nahapetyan, Raima Zachariah, Siddharth Muralee, Bradley Reaves, Alexandros Kapravelos, and Aravind Machiry. 2022. Characterizing the Security of Github {CI} Workflows. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*. 2747–2763.

[70] Konstantin343. 2022. CppCheck Annotation Action.

[71] Brenno Lemos. 2023. C/C++ Linter Action — Cached | Clang-Format & Clang-Tidy.

[72] Valentina Lenarduzzi, Fabiano Pecorelli, Nyyti Saarimaki, Savanna Lujan, and Fabio Palomba. 2023. A critical comparison on six static analysis tools: Detection, agreement, and precision. *Journal of Systems and Software* 198 (2023), 111575. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2022.111575

[73] Linearity. 2010. Omitting Return Statement in C++.

[74] Stephan Lipp, Sebastian Banescu, and Alexander Pretschner. 2022. An Empirical Study on the Effectiveness of Static C Code Analyzers for Vulnerability Detection. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. ACM, Virtual South Korea, 544–555. https://doi.org/10.1145/3533767.3534380

[75] Tamara Lopez, Helen Sharp, Thein Tun, Arosha Bandara, Mark Levine, and Bashar Nuseibeh. 2019. "Hopefully We Are Mostly Secure": Views on Secure Code in Professional Practice. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 12th International Workshop on Cooperative and Human Aspects of Software Engineering (CHASE)*. 61–68. https://doi.org/10.1109/CHASE.2019.00023

[76] Bailin Lu, Wei Dong, Liangze Yin, and Li Zhang. 2018. Evaluating and integrating diverse bug finders for effective program analysis. In *Software Analysis, Testing, and Evolution: 8th International Conference, SATE 2018, Shenzhen, Guangdong, China, November 23–24, 2018, Proceedings 8*. Springer, 51–67.

[77] Björn Lundell, Brian Lings, and Edvin Lindqvist. 2010. Open Source in Swedish Companies: Where Are We?: Open Source in Swedish Companies. *Information Systems Journal* 20, 6 (2010), 519–535.

[78] Björn Lundell, Brian Lings, and Anna Syberfeldt. 2011. Practitioner Perceptions of Open Source Software in the Embedded Systems Area. *Journal of Systems and Software* 84, 9 (2011), 1540–1549.

[79] Chujiao Ma, Matthew Bosack, Wendy Rothschell, Noopur Davis, and Vaibhav Garg. [n. d.]. Wanted Hacked or Patched. ([n. d.]).

[80] Aravind Machiry, Nilo Redini, Eric Camellini, Christopher Kruegel, and Giovanni Vigna. 2020. SPIDER: Enabling Fast Patch Propagation In Related Software Repositories. In *2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. 1562–1579.

[81] Jahanzaib Malik and Fabrizio Pastore. 2023. An empirical study of vulnerabilities in edge frameworks to support security testing improvement. 28, 4 (2023), 99. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-023-10330-x

[82] Valentin JM Manès, HyungSeok Han, Choongwoo Han, Sang Kil Cha, Manuel Egele, Edward J Schwartz, and Maverick Woo. 2019. The art, science, and engineering of fuzzing: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 47, 11 (2019), 2312–2331.

[83] Muskan Mangla. 2023. *Securing CI/CD Pipeline: Automating the detection of misconfigurations and integrating security tools*. Ph. D. Dissertation. Dublin, National College of Ireland.

[84] Steve Mansfield-Devine. 2018. DevOps: finding room for security. *Network security* 2018, 7 (2018), 15–20.

[85] Joel Margolis, Tae Tom Oh, Suyash Jadhav, Young Ho Kim, and Jeong Neyo Kim. 2017. An in-depth analysis of the mirai botnet. In *2017 International Conference on Software Security and Assurance (ICSSA)*. IEEE, 6–12.

[86] Daniel Marjamäki. 2013. Cppcheck: a tool for static c/c++ code analysis. *URL: https://cppcheck. sourceforge. io* (2013).

[87] Jack McBride, Budi Arief, and Julio Hernandez-Castro. 2018. Security Analysis of Contiki IoT Operating System. In *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Embedded Wireless Systems and Networks* (Madrid, Spain) *(EWSN '18)*. Junction Publishing, USA, 278–283.

[88] Jonathan Moerman, Sjaak Smetsers, and Marc Schoolderman. 2018. Evaluating the performance of open source static analysis tools. *Bachelor thesis, Radboud University, The Netherlands* 24 (2018).

[89] Marius Muench, Jan Stijohann, Frank Kargl, Aurélien Francillon, and Davide Balzarotti. 2018. What You Corrupt Is Not What You Crash: Challenges in Fuzzing Embedded Devices. In *Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS)*.

[90] Daye Nam, Andrew Macvean, Vincent Hellendoorn, Bogdan Vasilescu, and Brad Myers. 2024. Using an LLM to Help With Code Understanding. In *2024 IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE Computer Society, 881–881.

[91] Nataliia Neshenko, Elias Bou-Harb, Jorge Crichigno, Georges Kaddoum, and Nasir Ghani. 2019. Demystifying IoT Security: An Exhaustive Survey on IoT Vulnerabilities and a First Empirical Look on Internet-Scale IoT Exploitations. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* 21, 3 (2019), 2702–2733. https://doi.org/10.1109/COMST.2019.2910750

[92] Anh Nguyen-Duc, Manh Viet Do, Quan Luong Hong, Kiem Nguyen Khac, and Anh Nguyen Quang. 2021. On the adoption of static analysis for software security assessment–A case study of an open-source e-government project. *computers & security* 111 (2021), 102470.

[93] Anh Nguyen-Duc, Manh Viet Do, Quan Luong Hong, Kiem Nguyen Khac, and Anh Nguyen Quang. 2021. On the Adoption of Static Analysis for Software Security Assessment–A Case Study of an Open-Source e-Government Project. *Computers & Security* 111 (Dec. 2021), 102470. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2021.102470

[94] Erik Nijkamp, Bo Pang, Hiroaki Hayashi, Lifu Tu, Huan Wang, Yingbo Zhou, Silvio Savarese, and Caiming Xiong. 2022. Codegen: An open large language model for code with multi-turn program synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.13474* (2022).

[95] Eoin O'driscoll and Garret E O'donnell. 2013. Industrial power and energy metering–a state-of-the-art review. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 41 (2013), 53–64.

[96] Open Text. 2023. *Fortify*. https://www.microfocus.com/en-us/cyberres/application-security/static-code-analyzer
[97] OpenAI. 2024. GPT-4 Technical Report. arXiv:2303.08774 [cs.CL]
[98] Dipankar Pal. 2022. Flawfinder-Action.
[99] Dipankar Pal. 2023. Deep5050/Cppcheck-Action.
[100] Quoc-Sang Phan, Kim-Hao Nguyen, and ThanhVu Nguyen. 2023. The Challenges of Shift Left Static Analysis. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Practice (ICSE-SEIP)*. IEEE, 340–342.
[101] J. Pincus and B. Baker. 2004. Beyond Stack Smashing: Recent Advances in Exploiting Buffer Overruns. *IEEE Security & Privacy* 2, 4 (July 2004), 20–27. https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2004.36
[102] Dipika Roy Prapti, Abdul Rashid Mohamed Shariff, Hasfalina Che Man, Norulhuda Mohamed Ramli, Thinagaran Perumal, and Mohamed Shariff. 2022. Internet of Things (IoT)-based aquaculture: An overview of IoT application on water quality monitoring. *Reviews in Aquaculture* 14, 2 (2022), 979–992.
[103] Baptiste Rozière, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Romain Sauvestre, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, Artyom Kozhevnikov, Ivan Evtimov, Joanna Bitton, Manish Bhatt, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Aaron Grattafiori, Wenhan Xiong, Alexandre Défossez, Jade Copet, Faisal Azhar, Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Nicolas Usunier, Thomas Scialom, and Gabriel Synnaeve. 2024. Code Llama: Open Foundation Models for Code. arXiv:2308.12950 [cs.CL]
[104] Samsung Electronics Co., LTD. 2023. *SmartThings*. https://www.smartthings.com/
[105] Wedy Freddy Santoso and Dadang Syarif Sihabudin Sahid. 2021. Implementation and performance analysis development security operations (DevSecOps) using static analysis and security testing (SAST). *International ABEC* (2021), 17–19.
[106] Mingjie Shen, James C. Davis, and Aravind Machiry. 2023. Towards Automated Identification of Layering Violations in Embedded Applications (WIP). In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGPLAN/SIGBED International Conference on Languages, Compilers, and Tools for Embedded Systems* (Orlando, FL, USA) *(LCTES 2023)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 143–147. https://doi.org/10.1145/3589610.3596271
[107] NB Soni and Jaideep Saraswat. 2017. A review of IoT devices for traffic management system. In *2017 international conference on intelligent sustainable systems (ICISS)*. IEEE, 1052–1055.
[108] Nuthan TestMunaiah and Andrew Meneely. 2016. Vulnerability Severity Scoring and Bounties: Why the Disconnect?. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on Software Analytics* (Seattle, WA, USA) *(SWAN 2016)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 8–14. https://doi.org/10.1145/2989238.2989239
[109] The Linux Foundation. 2023. Zephyr® Project. https://www.zephyrproject.org/.
[110] Travis CI - Test and Deploy Your Code with Confidence [n. d.]. Travis CI - Test and Deploy Your Code with Confidence. https://travis-ci.org/.
[111] trunk-io. 2023. Trunk.Io GitHub Action. Trunk.io.
[112] Veracode. 2023. *Veracode*. https://www.veracode.com/
[113] David Wheeler. 2006. Flawfinder home page. *Web page: http://www. dwheeler. com/flawfinder* (2006).
[114] whisperity. 2023. CodeChecker C++ Static Analysis Action.
[115] Elecia White. 2011. *Making Embedded Systems: Design Patterns for Great Software*. "O'Reilly Media, Inc.".
[116] Guest Writer. 2020. The 5 Worst Examples of IoT Hacking and Vulnerabilities in Recorded History. https://www.iotforall.com/5-worst-iot-hacking-vulnerabilities.
[117] Jing Xie, Heather Richter Lipford, and Bill Chu. 2011. Why do programmers make security errors?. In *2011 IEEE symposium on visual languages and human-centric computing (VL/HCC)*. IEEE, 161–164.
[118] Ruotong Yu, Francesca Del Nin, Yuchen Zhang, Shan Huang, Pallavi Kaliyar, Sarah Zakto, Mauro Conti, Georgios Portokalidis, and Jun Xu. 2022. Building embedded systems like it's 1996. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.06834* (2022).
[119] Zhuosheng Zhang and Hai Zhao. 2021. Advances in multi-turn dialogue comprehension: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03125* (2021).
[120] Yutao Zhu, Huaying Yuan, Shuting Wang, Jiongnan Liu, Wenhan Liu, Chenlong Deng, Haonan Chen, Zhicheng Dou, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2024. Large Language Models for Information Retrieval: A Survey. arXiv:2308.07107 [cs.CL]

A OUTLINE OF APPENDICES

- Appendix A: This outline.
- Appendix B: Developer survey instrument (cf. §6.1.2).
- Appendix C: Selection of SAST tools (cf. §7.1).
- Appendix D: Example PR opened to propose a CodeQL workflow (cf. §7.2.6).
- Appendix E: CodeQL queries omitted or modified from the suite we used (cf. §7.2.1).
- Appendix F: Further details and example GitHub CI pipeline (cf. §2.2.3).
- Appendix G: Further results of applying CodeQL to the EMBOSS dataset (cf. §7.3).
- Appendix H: Details of the LLM prompt for automatic compilation of an EMBOSS project (cf. §7.3.6).
- Appendix I: Evaluation of compiler flags in lieu of CodeQL (cf. §6.2.2).

B DEVELOPER SURVEY QUESTIONS

(1) What is the name of the open-source project that brought you to this survey (owner/repo, e.g. torvalds/linux)?
(2) What roles do you play in the project? (select all that apply)
    - Developer (you implement new features)
    - Tester (you validate that new features work properly and that regressions are avoided)
    - Maintainer (you give feedback on issues, fix defects, and review and merge PRs)
    - Owner (e.g., you help determine the future path of the project / steering member)
(3) How long have you been involved in the project?
    - Less than 1 year
    - 1-3 years
    - 4-6 years
    - More than 6 years
(4) What level of risk do you perceive if a functionality defect is present in this project?
    - Critical
    - High
    - Medium
    - Low
(5) What level of risk do you perceive if a security vulnerability is present in this project?
    - Critical
    - High
    - Medium
    - Low
(6) What is your experience with static analysis tools (SAST) such as CodeQL, Flawfinder, CodeChecker, cppcheck, clang-tidy, Clang Static Analyzer, and 'gcc -Wall -Werror'?
    - I use them regularly on this project
    - I use them regularly on other projects but not this project
    - I have read about them but not used them
    - I tried them out but stopped using them
    - I have never used them
(7) Do any corporations or other entities support this software? (check all that apply)
    - Yes, financially (e.g. donations)
    - Yes, technically (e.g. engineers)
    - Yes, through infrastructure (e.g., servers)
    - No
(8) Do you know that SAST tools can be integrated into GitHub Workflows and can be configured to run on various events

(e.g. when a commit is pushed, when a pull request is opened, etc)?
  - Yes
  - No

(9) What SAST tools are you using in GitHub Workflows for this project? (select all that apply)
  - CodeQL
  - FlawFinder
  - CodeChecker
  - cppcheck
  - clang-tidy
  - Clang Static Analyzer
  - gcc with -Wall / -Wextra / -Werror
  - Other
  - No SAST tools

(10) Are you running any SAST tool outside the GitHub workflow, e.g. in Makefile, CMakeLists.txt, git-hooks, etc.?
  - Yes
  - No

(11) What SAST tools are you using outside of GitHub Workflows? (select all that apply)
  - CodeQL
  - FlawFinder
  - CodeChecker
  - cppcheck
  - clang-tidy
  - Clang Static Analyzer
  - gcc with -Wall / -Wextra / -Werror
  - Other
  - No SAST tools

(12) Why didn't you incorporate these SAST tools into a GitHub Workflow?
  - We use them in another CI (e.g. Travis CI).
  - There is no GitHub Action for the SAST tool we use.
  - I don't have time / Too much work
  - Other

(13) Why don't you use SAST tools for this project? (select all that apply)
  - I didn't bother, it's not a mission-critical project
  - Difficulty in configuration
  - Too many false positives
  - Other

(14) This project is embedded software. Does that affect your use of SAST?
  - No
  - Yes, please explain.

(15) Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your experiences with SAST related to this project or other embedded projects?

C SELECTION OF SAST TOOLS

Our goal is to find SAST tools that can be readily used on the collected GitHub repositories. Given that GitHub Actions are expected to be stable, easy to use, and can be seamlessly integrated into repositories, we used GitHub Marketplace and found GitHub Actions designed for SAST purposes. [4] We manually filtered out pre-release Actions due to their instability and/or lack of documentation. There were 6 commercial SAST tools, which we omitted as they require purchases of licenses or subscriptions and place restrictions on scientific publications.

This resulted in a total of 12 GitHub Actions using various SAST tools as shown in Table 6. Nine of these Actions are plug-and-play, meaning they do not need any repository-specific configuration.

Subsequently, for each plug-and-play SAST tool, we picked the most popular Action implementing it. For instance, for `flawfinder`, we picked `david-a-wheeler/flawfinder` — this repository has the most stars among the Actions offering this tool. This resulted in the SAST tools selected in Table 2.

D EXAMPLE PULL REQUEST CONTRIBUTING A CODEQL WORKFLOW

This appendix describes a pull request. Each heading corresponds to a markdown heading in the GitHub style.

D.1 Pull Request Summary

This pull request introduces a CodeQL workflow to enhance the security analysis of this repository.

D.2 What is CodeQL

CodeQL is a static analysis tool that helps identify and mitigate security vulnerabilities. It is primarily intra-function but does provide some support for inter-function analysis. By integrating CodeQL into a GitHub Actions workflow, it can proactively identify and address potential issues before they become security threats.

For more information on CodeQL and how to interpret its results, refer to the GitHub documentation and the CodeQL documentation (https://codeql.github.com/ and https://codeql.github.com/docs/).

D.3 What this PR does

We added a new CodeQL workflow file (.github/workflows/codeql.yml) that

- Runs on every pull request (functionality to run on every push to main branches is included as a comment for convenience).
- Runs daily.
- Excludes queries with a high false positive rate or low-severity findings.
- Does not display results for git submodules, focusing only on our own codebase.

D.4 Validation

To validate the functionality of this workflow, we have run several test scans on the codebase and reviewed the results. The workflow successfully compiles the project, identifies issues, and provides actionable insights while reducing noise by excluding certain queries and third-party code.

[4] The query is category=security&type=actions&query="C C++" and category=code-quality&type=actions&query="C C++".

Table 6: List of "usable" SAST GitHub Actions. These are GitHub Actions that perform SAST on C/C++ repositories, not including pre-release or commercial tools.

Name of GitHub Action	Plug-and-play?	Underlying tool(s)	Juliet Test Suite results
From Well-established Organizations			
github/codeql-action [53]	Yes	CodeQL	7,904 true positives
cpp-linter/cpp-linter-action [39]	Yes	clang-format, clang-tidy	Not finished in 6 hours
trunk-io/trunk-action [111]	No (Bazel/CMake projects required)	clang-format, clang-tidy, include-what-you-use, pragma-once	N/A
Frama-C/github-action-eva-sarif [49]	No (Frama-C Makefile required)	Frama-C	N/A
From Independent Developers			
IvanKuchin/SAST [64] deep5050/flawfinder-action [98] david-a-wheeler/flawfinder [113]	Yes	flawfinder	Error
Syndelis/cpp-linter-cached-action [71]	Yes	clang-format, clang-tidy	N/A
deep5050/cppcheck-action [99] Konstantin343/cppcheck-annotation-action [70]	Yes	cppcheck	Not finished in 6 hours
JacobDomagala/StaticAnalysis [45]	Yes	cppcheck, clang-tidy	Error
whisperity/codechecker-analysis-action [114]	No (Compilation DB required)	clang	N/A

D.5 Using the workflow results

If this pull request is merged, the CodeQL workflow will be automatically run on every push to the main branch and on every pull request to the main branch. To view the results of these code scans, follow these steps:

Under the repository name, click on the Security tab. In the left sidebar, click Code scanning alerts.

REDACTED FOR ANONYMITY

D.6 Review of engineering hazards

License: see the license at https://github.com/github/codeql-cli-binaries/blob/main/LICENSE.md:

Here's what you may also do with the Software, but only with an Open Source Codebase and subject to the License Restrictions provisions below:

- Perform analysis on the Open Source Codebase.
- If the Open Source Codebase is hosted and maintained on GitHub.com, generate CodeQL databases for or during automated analysis, CI, or CD.

False positives: We find that around 20% of errors are false positives, but that these FPs are polarized and only a few rules contribute to most FPs. We find that the top rules contributing to FPs are: cpp/uninitialized-local, cpp/missing-check-scanf, cpp/suspicious-pointer-scaling, cpp/unbounded-write, cpp/constant-comparison, and cpp/inconsistent-null-check. Adding a filter to filter out certain rules that contribute to a high FP rate can be done simply in the workflow file.

E OMITTED AND MODIFIED CODEQL QUERIES

E.1 Omitted Queries

The Table 7 lists all the CodeQL queries ignored, along with the corresponding reason.

Table 7: Reasons for ignoring some error- or warning-level CodeQL queries. "Code readability" means the query detects code readability issues but not defects.

Query	Reason for ignoring
cpp/path-injection	Low-risk
cpp/world-writable-file-creation	Inapplicable
cpp/poorly-documented-function	Code readability
cpp/potentially-dangerous-function[5]	Low-risk
cpp/use-of-goto	Code readability
cpp/integer-multiplication-cast-to-long	Low-risk
cpp/comparison-with-wider-type	Low-risk
cpp/leap-year/*	Low-risk
cpp/ambiguously-signed-bit-field	Low-risk

E.2 Modified Queries

We modified 3 queries to improve their precision and ignore certain restrictions.

First, we modified the `cpp/stack-address-escape` query to not detect cases of assigning a function parameter of a pointer type to a non-local variable. This usage is commonplace in practice and is unlikely to constitute a defect of significant concern.

[5] cpp/potentially-dangerous-function checks for calls to gmtime, localtime, ctime and asctime. These functions are not thread-safe.

Second, we modified `cpp/constant-comparison` to only report comparison that is always false because we found that always-true comparison is usually not a defect. For instance, developers can be overly cautious and perform the same check multiple times, where the second check will always be true, *e.g.*, `if (p != NULL) ... if (p != NULL)`.

Third, we modified `cpp/uninitialized-local` to eliminate false positives caused by casting a variable explicitly to `void`. Developers use this cast to suppress compiler warnings on unused variables, *e.g.*, `(void) x;`.

F Continuous Integration (CI) PIPELINE

A CI pipeline is event-driven: upon a triggering event, the CI framework executes a sequence of steps. For example, Listing 3 shows an example of a GitHub Workflow triggered on a push (①) to the underlying repository. The Workflow has five steps (② - ⑥). The first two steps, *i.e.*, Build Project (②) and Test Project (③), will build and run the tests on the project with newly pushed changes. The last three steps (④ - ⑥) are related to running CodeQL (a SAST tool) on the repository.

```yaml
name: MyWorkflow

on:
  # Workflow triggers on push
  push ①

steps: ← Steps
    # The following steps are executed sequentially

    ### Build and functional test

    - name: Build Project ②
      uses: actions/cmake-action

    - name: Test Project ③
      run: ./test.sh

    ### Execute CodeQL SAST

    # Initialize
    - name: Initialize CodeQL ④
      uses: github/codeql-action/init@v2

    # Build the Code
    - name: Autobuild ⑤
      uses: github/codeql-action/autobuild@v2

    # Run the analysis
    - name: Perform CodeQL Analysis ⑥
      uses: github/codeql-action/analyze@v2
```

Listing 3: Snippet of a GitHub Workflow (*i.e.*, a `YML` file) that builds, tests, and runs CodeQL on the underlying repository. The various Actions are taken from the GitHub CI marketplace of prebuilt actions [56].

G FURTHER SAST ANALYSIS RESULTS WITH CODEQL

G.1 Common Types of Security Defects

We discuss three major types of defects and corresponding rules:

- `cpp/inconsistent-null-check`: This rule identifies cases in which a function return value is not checked for `NULL`, while most other calls to the same function check the return for `NULL`. Developers should always check the return value of such function if it may return `NULL` to prevent subsequent null pointer dereference. This rule detected 135 such instances. Listing 4 shows an instance of this issue from the `ARMmbed/mbed-os` repository.
- `cpp/uncontrolled-allocation-size`: This indicates cases where the allocation size argument of a memory allocation call (*e.g.*, `malloc`) is a multiplication of operands derived from potentially untrusted input (*e.g.*, user input). When the operands hold a really large value, an integer overflow [44] might occur and yield a significantly smaller value than intended. Hence, the size of the allocated memory may be considerably less than expected. Subsequent attempts to access the allocated buffer would lead to buffer overflows. This rule detected 49 instances. Listing 5 shows an instance of this defect in the `embox/embox` repository.
- `cpp/unbounded-write`: This rule detects the class out-of-bound write vulnerabilities [101]. Specifically, this includes analysis of potentially dangerous function calls (*e.g.*, `strcpy`, `sscanf`) to check whether these are used properly with valid arguments. This rule detected 47 vulnerabilities of potential buffer overflow. Listing 6 shows an instance of this vulnerability in the `aws/aws-iot-device-sdk-embedded-C` repository.

```
// mbed-os/connectivity/FEATURE_BLE/libraries/cordio_stack/
↪  ble-host/sources/stack/att/att_eatt.c
static uint8_t eattL2cCocAcceptCback(dmConnId_t connId, uint8_t
↪  numChans)
{
  eattConnCb_t *pCcb = eattGetConnCb(connId)⚠;

  if ((pCcb->state🍎 == EATT_CONN_STATE_INITIATING) ...
```

Listing 4: The return value of `eattGetConnCb` (⚠) is not checked for null, possibly leading to null pointer dereference (🍎).

```
// embox/src/cmds/testing/block_dev/block_dev_test.c
static int block_dev_test(struct block_dev *bdev, uint64_t s_block,
↪  uint64_t n_blocks, uint64_t m_blocks⚠) {
    size_t blk_sz;
    int8_t *read_buf, *write_buf;

    blk_sz = bdev->block_size;
    if (blk_sz == 0) {
        return -1;
    }
    ...
    read_buf = malloc(blk_sz * m_blocks🍎);
    write_buf = malloc(blk_sz * m_blocks🍎);
    ...
}
```

Listing 5: The variable `m_blocks` is tainted (⚠), *i.e.*, derived from user inputs, whose value may be huge. The multiplication that calculates the `malloc` size may overflow (🍎), leading to the allocation size being considerably smaller than expected.

G.2 Defect Density Per Category

Figure 10 shows the defect density per number of repositories and KLOC across EMBOSS types.



Figure 10: Defect density per number of repositories and KLOC across EMBOSS types

```
// metrics_collector.c
MetricsCollectorStatus_t GetNetworkInferfaceInfo(
    char ( *pOutNetworkInterfaceNames )[16]i,
    uint32_t * pOutNetworkInterfaceAddresses,
    size_t bufferLength,
    size_t * pOutNumNetworkInterfaces )
{
  char lineBuffer[ MAX_LINE_LENGTH ];
  ...
  while((*pOutNumNetworkInterfaces < bufferLength)
    && (fgets(&(lineBuffer[0])⚠,
        MAX_LINE_LENGTH, fileHandle) != NULL))
  {
    filledVariables = sscanf(
      lineBuffer⚠,
      "%u.%u.%u.%u %*s %*s %*s %*s %s",
      &ipPart1,
      &ipPart2,
      &ipPart3,
      &ipPart4,
      pOutNetworkInterfaceNames[
        *pOutNumNetworkInterfaces]💣);
    ...
  }
}
```

Listing 6: The content of `lineBuffer` is read from a file via `fgets`. A part of it is then copied to the `char` array `pOutNetworkInterfaceNames[*pOutNumNetworkInterfaces]`, whose size is 16 bytes (i), via `sscanf` with the format specifier "%s". Since `lineBuffer` is tainted (⚠), the content copied to the `char` array may be strictly longer than 15 bytes (one byte is needed for the null terminator). Thus, the `sscanf` call may lead to buffer overwrite (💣).

G.3 Rules contributing to False Positives

The following are the top four queries contributing to false positives:

- cpp/uninitialized-local. Dataflow analysis of CodeQL is not path-sensitive. Some variables may not be initialized in all paths. However, when a variable is used, certain path conditions hold, under which it can be proved that the variable must have been initialized. Listing 7 shows an example.
- cpp/missing-check-scanf. Developers can use `switch case` statements (instead of `if` statements) to check the return value of `scanf` calls. These are valid checks but not detected by CodeQL.
- cpp/suspicious-pointer-scaling and cpp/suspicious-pointer-scaling-void. These rules detect risky pointer arithmetic operations. However, pointer casts, and type-punning are pretty common and unavoidable in low-level embedded system code.
- cpp/unbounded-write. `strcpy` is safe if the destination must be large enough. For example, developers can first use `strlen` to calculate the length of the source string, allocate enough memory for the destination string, and then call `strcpy`.

Table 8 provides detailed results across different CodeQL rules.

H SYSTEM PROMPT FOR GPT-4

We provided the following system prompt:

"You are a software engineer working on cross-compiling an embedded system project on a Ubuntu 22.04 PC. Given the following information from README or GitHub workflow files, generate a valid bash shell script that builds the project. Only generate the script, do not include other information. The script should NOT include git clone commands because the project and all of its submodules are already cloned. The current working directory of the script is the root of the project. The script should include sudo apt-get install commands for any dependencies required for Ubuntu 22.04. The script should NOT install the compiled project (no make install). The script should NOT run tests."

Table 8: The numbers of true positives, false positives, total reports, and repositories where defects are reported by CodeQL for each CodeQL query on a sample of 123 repositories in our dataset.

Query	#TP	#FP	#Results	#Repo
cpp/alloca-in-loop	3	0	3	2
cpp/assignment-does-not-return-this	2	0	2	1
cpp/assign-where-compare-meant	0	2	2	2
cpp/bad-addition-overflow-check	1	0	1	1
cpp/badly-bounded-write	1	0	1	1
cpp/bad-strncpy-size	5	4	9	5
cpp/cleartext-transmission	1	0	1	1
cpp/comma-before-misleading-indentation	0	1	1	1
cpp/comparison-of-identical-expressions	1	0	1	1
cpp/comparison-precedence	6	0	6	1
cpp/constant-comparison	197	8	205	41
cpp/double-free	0	1	1	1
cpp/duplicate-include-guard	27	0	27	6
cpp/futile-params	4	0	4	3
cpp/implicit-bitfield-downcast	1	0	1	1
cpp/implicit-function-declaration	18	1	19	5
cpp/incomplete-parity-check	3	0	3	2
cpp/inconsistent-loop-direction	1	0	1	1
cpp/inconsistent-null-check	181	2	183	35
cpp/incorrect-allocation-error-handling	15	0	15	1
cpp/incorrect-not-operator-usage	6	1	7	4
cpp/integer-used-for-enum	1	0	1	1
cpp/logical-operator-applied-to-flag	1	6	7	3
cpp/lossy-function-result-cast	28	0	28	3
cpp/memset-may-be-deleted	2	0	2	2
cpp/missing-case-in-switch	1	0	1	1
cpp/missing-check-scanf	58	41	99	18
cpp/missing-return	2	0	2	2
cpp/mistyped-function-arguments	0	23	23	4
cpp/nested-loops-with-same-variable	8	0	8	5
cpp/new-array-delete-mismatch	1	0	1	1
cpp/non-constant-format	2	0	2	1
cpp/non-https-url	6	0	6	1
cpp/non-member-const-no-effect	3	0	3	1
cpp/offset-use-before-range-check	19	4	23	15
cpp/overflow-destination	3	3	6	4
cpp/overflowing-snprintf	15	0	15	3
cpp/overrunning-write	9	7	16	8
cpp/overrunning-write-with-float	4	0	4	2
cpp/pointer-overflow-check	1	0	1	1
cpp/redefined-default-parameter	3	0	3	1
cpp/redundant-null-check-simple	2	0	2	2
cpp/resource-not-released-in-destructor	3	0	3	1
cpp/rule-of-two	5	0	5	1
cpp/signed-overflow-check	3	0	3	3
cpp/stack-address-escape	97	67	164	29
cpp/static-buffer-overflow	1	0	1	1
cpp/string-copy-return-value-as-boolean	4	0	4	1
cpp/suspicious-add-sizeof	0	1	1	1
cpp/suspicious-allocation-size	0	3	3	2
cpp/suspicious-pointer-scaling	0	19	19	9
cpp/suspicious-pointer-scaling-void	1	34	35	5
cpp/suspicious-sizeof	5	2	7	6
cpp/toctou-race-condition	13	0	13	8
cpp/too-few-arguments	1	0	1	1
cpp/unbounded-write	27	29	56	24
cpp/uncontrolled-allocation-size	39	11	50	13
cpp/uncontrolled-arithmetic	3	7	10	3
cpp/uncontrolled-process-operation	6	0	6	4
cpp/uninitialized-local	30	251	281	41
cpp/unsafe-strcat	7	5	12	6
cpp/unsigned-comparison-zero	18	0	18	8
cpp/unsigned-difference-expression-compared-zero	11	0	11	5
cpp/unterminated-variadic-call	1	0	1	1
cpp/use-after-free	6	1	7	5
cpp/use-in-own-initializer	1	0	1	1
cpp/useless-expression	59	2	61	13
cpp/user-controlled-bypass	2	2	4	2
cpp/virtual-call-in-constructor	6	0	6	1
cpp/weak-cryptographic-algorithm	10	0	10	2
cpp/wrong-number-format-arguments	3	0	3	2
cpp/wrong-type-format-argument	35	0	35	5
Total	**1039**	**538**	**1577**	

```
1  // zephyr/drivers/timer/nrf_rtc_timer.c
2  static struct z_nrf_rtc_timer_chan_data cc_data[CHAN_COUNT];
3  static void process_channel(int32_t chan)
4  {
5    void *user_context;
6    uint64_t curr_time;
7    uint64_t expire_time;
8    z_nrf_rtc_timer_compare_handler_t handler = NULL;
9
10   curr_time = z_nrf_rtc_timer_read();
11   ...
12   expire_time = cc_data[chan].target_time;
13   if (curr_time >= expire_time) {
14     handler = cc_data[chan].callback;
15     user_context = cc_data[chan].user_context;
16     ...
17   }
18   ...
19   if (handler) {
20     handler(chan, expire_time, user_context⚠);
21   }
22 }
```

Listing 7: CodeQL reports the variable `user_context` is used uninitialized (⚠) because it is not initialized in all paths. However, when it is used, `handle` must be non-null, which means that the assignment in line 14 must have been executed (since this is the only place where `handle` can get a non-null value). It follows that line 15 must also have been executed. Consequently, the variable `user_context` must have been initialized in line 20.

I EFFECTIVENESS OF STRINGENT COMPILER FLAGS INSTEAD OF CODEQL

EMBOSS developers often use strict compiler flags/warnings instead of SAST tools. We evaluated the effectiveness of these flags in finding the defects detected by CodeQL. We used security bug test case files from the CodeQL repository for this experiment. These are simple test cases (< 10 lines), each containing an obvious security issue, *e.g.,* passing an invalid pointer types to a function call. We selected test cases to cover all 82 of the identified defect types and compiled them using the latest version of `gcc`, *i.e.,* 11.4.0, with strict warnings (`-Wall, -Wextra -Werror`). This configuration of `gcc` found issues in only 17 (21%) defect types as shown in Table 9. `gcc` was able to find certain simple security issues, such as direct use of `strcpy`. However, it did not find more complex ones related to code quality, such as inconsistent null check. *Our results indicate that the current EMBOSS practice of reliance on `gcc` warnings is inadequate.*

Table 9: GCC -Wall Detection of CodeQL Queries

Issue	Detected
cpp/alloca-in-loop	No

Continued on next page

Continued from previous page

Issue	Detected
cpp/ambiguously-signed-bit-field	No
cpp/assign-where-compare-meant	No
cpp/badly-bounded-write	No
cpp/bad-strncpy-size	No
cpp/certificate-result-conflation	No
cpp/cgi-xss	No
cpp/cleartext-transmission	No
cpp/comma-before-misleading-indentation	No
cpp/command-line-injection	No
cpp/compare-where-assign-meant	No
cpp/comparison-with-wider-type	Yes
cpp/dangerous-cin	No
cpp/dead-code-goto	No
cpp/double-free	No
cpp/external-entity-expansion	No
cpp/HRESULT-boolean-conversion	No
cpp/inconsistent-loop-direction	Yes
cpp/inconsistent-null-check	No
cpp/incorrect-allocation-error-handling	No
cpp/incorrect-not-operator-usage	Yes
cpp/incorrect-string-type-conversion	No
cpp/insufficient-key-size	No
cpp/integer-multiplication-cast-to-long	No
cpp/logical-operator-applied-to-flag	No
cpp/memset-may-be-deleted	No
cpp/missing-check-scanf	No
cpp/new-free-mismatch	No
cpp/non-https-url	No
cpp/no-space-for-terminator	No
cpp/offset-use-before-range-check	No
cpp/overflowing-snprintf	No
cpp/path-injection	No
cpp/pointer-overflow-check	No
cpp/potentially-dangerous-function	No
cpp/potential-system-data-exposure	No
cpp/redundant-null-check-simple	No
cpp/resource-not-released-in-destructor	Yes
cpp/return-stack-allocated-memory	Yes
cpp/sql-injection	No
cpp/static-buffer-overflow	No
cpp/suspicious-add-sizeof	No

Continued on next page

Continued from previous page

Issue	Detected
cpp/suspicious-allocation-size	No
cpp/suspicious-pointer-scaling	No
cpp/suspicious-sizeof	No
cpp/tainted-format-string	Yes
cpp/tainted-permissions-check	No
cpp/toctou-race-condition	No
cpp/uncontrolled-allocation-size	No
cpp/uncontrolled-arithmetic	No
cpp/uncontrolled-process-operation	No
cpp/uninitialized-local	Yes
cpp/unsafe-create-process-call	No
cpp/unsafe-dacl-security-descriptor	No
cpp/unsafe-strcat	No
cpp/unsafe-strncat	No
cpp/unsafe-use-of-this	Yes
cpp/unsigned-difference-expression-compared-zero	No
cpp/unterminated-variadic-call	No
cpp/upcast-array-pointer-arithmetic	No
cpp/use-after-free	No
cpp/useless-expression	Yes
cpp/user-controlled-bypass	No
cpp/using-expired-stack-address	No
cpp/weak-cryptographic-algorithm	No
cpp/wrong-type-format-argument	Yes
cpp/allocation-too-small	No
cpp/bad-addition-overflow-check	No
cpp/certificate-not-checked	No
cpp/cleartext-storage-buffer	No
cpp/cleartext-storage-file	No
cpp/dangerous-function-overflow	Yes
cpp/open-call-with-mode-argument	No
cpp/overrunning-write	Yes
cpp/overrunning-write-with-float	No
cpp/signed-overflow-check	No
cpp/suspicious-pointer-scaling-void	Yes
cpp/system-data-exposure	No
cpp/tainted-format-string-through-global	Yes
cpp/too-few-arguments	Yes
cpp/unbounded-write	Yes
cpp/very-likely-overrunning-write	Yes