Detecting Logic Bugs in Graph Database Management Systems via Injective and Surjective Graph Query Transformations

Yuancheng Jiang, Jiahao Liu, Jinsheng Ba Roland Yap, Zhenkai Liang, Manuel Rigger



Database Systems: Relational vs. Graph



Relational Data Model

Courseld

		Student	Courses	
			StudentId	Coursel
Students			001	1
ID	Name		001	2
001	Sam		001	3
002	Mary		002	3
003	Tine		002	4
004	Jay			

ID

004

 	1
Cou	rses
ID	Name
1	SQL Server
2	ASP.NET
3	MongoDB
4	Java
5	PHP

Database Systems: Relational vs. Graph



Relational Data Model

Courseld

			Student	Courses
			StudentId	Coursel
Students			001	1
ID	Name		001	2
001	Sam		001	3
002	Mary		002	3
003	Tine		002	4
004	Jay			

Cou	rses
ID	Name
1	SQL Server
2	ASP.NET
3	MongoDB
4	Java
5	PHP

Graph Data Model





The Fastest Growing Model in Past Decade*



The Fastest Growing Model in Past Decade*



Graph Database Testing becomes essential to improve Robustness and Accuracy

*: Statistics collected at db-rank: https://db-engines.com/en/ranking_categories

Internal Errors (Crash): out of service (segfault, unexpected exception)

- Oracle: sanitizers, unexpected exception handlers
- Difficulty: low (users can help to submit issues when noticed)

Internal Errors (Crash): out of service (segfault, unexpected exception)

- Oracle: sanitizers, unexpected exception handlers
- Difficulty: low (users can help to submit issues when noticed)

Logic Bugs: outputs incorrect results (wrong count, inaccurate data)

- Oracle: test oracles like differential or metamorphic testing
- Difficulty: high (logic bugs often go unnoticed by users without alerts)

Internal Errors (Crash): out of service (segfault, unexpected exception)

- Oracle: sanitizers, unexpected exception handlers
- Difficulty: low (users can help to submit issues when noticed)

Logic Bugs: outputs incorrect results (wrong count, inaccurate data)

- Oracle: test oracles like differential or metamorphic testing
- Difficulty: high (logic bugs often go unnoticed by users without alerts)

Performance Issues: unreasonable query computing time

- Oracle: test oracles like differential or metamorphic testing
- Difficulty: **high** (hard to discover performance issues without references)

Internal Errors (Crash): out of service (segfault, unexpected exception)

- Oracle: sanitizers, unexpected exception handlers
- Difficulty: low (users can help to submit issues when noticed)

Logic Bugs: outputs incorrect results (wrong count, inaccurate data)

- Oracle: test oracles like differential or metamorphic testing
- Difficulty: high (logic bugs often go unnoticed by users without alerts)

Performance Issues: unreasonable query computing time

- Oracle: test oracles like differential or metamorphic testing
- Difficulty: **high** (hard to discover performance issues without references)

Internal Errors (Crash): out of service (segfault, unexpected exception)

cle: sanitizers, unexpected exception handlers

What is the effective test oracle for discovering logic bugs when testing graph database systems?

Perfo

- Oracle: test oracles like differential or metamorphic testing
- Difficulty: high (hard to discover performance issues without references)

Grand (ISSTA'22): differential testing on *Gremlin* graph databases

Grand (ISSTA'22): differential testing on *Gremlin* graph databases

⊙ high false alarm rate

Essential Semantic Difference				
foo(id, name)	Neo4J			
	RedisGraph	1.0		

Grand (ISSTA'22): differential testing on *Gremlin* graph databases

😥 high false alarm rate 🛛 😥 many missed bugs





Cypher, Gremlin are the top two popular graph query languages

Grand (ISSTA'22): differential testing on Gremlin graph databases

↔ high false alarm rate ↔ many missed bugs ↔ *Cypher* not supported





Cypher, Gremlin are the top two popular graph query languages

Grand (ISSTA'22): differential testing on Gremlin graph databases

😥 high false alarm rate 😟 many missed bugs 💮 Cypher not supported





GDBMeter (ISSTA'23): metamorphic testing (TLP*)

GDBMeter

• focus on mutating **predicates** (constraints)

Cypher, Gremlin are the top two popular graph query languages

GDBMeter

Grand (ISSTA'22): differential testing on Gremlin graph databases

↔ high false alarm rate ↔ many missed bugs ↔ Cypher not supported





GDBMeter (ISSTA'23): metamorphic testing (TLP*)

- focus on mutating **predicates** (constraints)
- ⊙ shows limited effectiveness (most bugs are **NOT** related to **Graph**)

*: Ternary Logic Partitioning (TLP) splits predicate P into three possible outcomes: True, False, or Null.

Cypher, Gremlin are the top two popular graph query languages

Grand (ISSTA'22): differential testing on Gremlin graph databases

↔ high false alarm rate ↔ many missed bugs ↔ Cypher not supported





GDBMeter (ISSTA'23): metamorphic testing (TLP*)

GDBMeter

- focus on mutating **predicates** (constraints)
- Shows limited effectiveness (most bugs are NOT related to Graph)



Why? Have we considered all features in graph queries?

*: Ternary Logic Partitioning (TLP) splits predicate *P* into three possible outcomes: *True, False,* or *Null*.





(must-have unit representing the look-like of fetched data) Graph Query: graph patterns + predicates + others

Additional Constraints in Graph Queries

MATCH (a:Movie) -- (b) -- (c) WHERE a.year=2012 RETURN count(a) LIMIT 1

(must-have unit representing the look-like of fetched data) Graph Query: **graph patterns** + predicates + others

Additional Constraints in Graph Queries

In addition to mutating **predicates** like existing works, we aim to mutate the **graph patterns** to generate new testing queries

MATCH (a:Movie) -- (b) -- (c) WHERE a.year=2012 RETURN count(a) LIMIT 1

(must-have unit representing the look-like of fetched data) Graph Query: **graph patterns** + predicates + others

Additional Constraints in Graph Queries

In addition to mutating **predicates** like existing works, we aim to mutate the **graph patterns** to generate new testing queries



How to systematically mutate Graph Patterns?

(a) -- (b) -- (c) $\implies \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc ?$



Directed Edge Sets: edges with their heads, tails, and edges information



Directed Edge Sets: edges with their heads, tails, and edges information

Graph Query Mutation i Graph Pattern Mutation i Sets Mapping



Directed Edge Sets: edges with their heads, tails, and edges information

Graph Query Mutation i Graph Pattern Mutation i Sets Mapping





Directed Edge Sets: edges with their heads, tails, and edges information

Graph Query Mutation i Graph Pattern Mutation i Sets Mapping



Restricted Query Mutation

Restricted Pattern Mutation

Injective Mapping



Directed Edge Sets: edges with their heads, tails, and edges information

Graph Query Mutation i Graph Pattern Mutation i Sets Mapping



Restricted Query Mutation

Restricted Pattern Mutation

Injective Mapping

first metamorphic testing approach considering graph pattern mutations

first metamorphic testing approach considering graph pattern mutations

Testing Process: (1) Query Generation (2) Query Mutation (3) Result Analysis

- Query Generation: focus on **Cypher**, diverse in graph patterns, incremental
- Transformation Combinations: helps to generate more complex graph queries

first metamorphic testing approach considering graph pattern mutations

Testing Process: (1) Query Generation (2) Query Mutation (3) Result Analysis

- Query Generation: focus on **Cypher**, diverse in graph patterns, incremental
- Transformation Combinations: helps to generate more complex graph queries

first metamorphic testing approach considering graph pattern mutations

Testing Process: (1) Query Generation (2) Query Mutation (3) Result Analysis

- Query Generation: focus on **Cypher**, diverse in graph patterns, incremental
- Transformation Combinations: helps to generate more complex graph queries



first metamorphic testing approach considering graph pattern mutations

Testing Process: (1) Query Generation (2) Query Mutation (3) Result Analysis

- Query Generation: focus on **Cypher**, diverse in graph patterns, incremental
- Transformation Combinations: helps to generate more complex graph queries

first metamorphic testing approach considering graph pattern mutations

Testing Process: (1) Query Generation (2) Query Mutation (3) Result Analysis

- Query Generation: focus on **Cypher**, diverse in graph patterns, incremental
- Transformation Combinations: helps to generate more complex graph queries



first metamorphic testing approach considering graph pattern mutations

Testing Process: (1) Query Generation (2) Query Mutation (3) Result Analysis

- Query Generation: focus on **Cypher**, diverse in graph patterns, incremental
- Transformation Combinations: helps to generate more complex graph queries



*: GraphGenie is available at https://github.com/YuanchengJiang/GraphGenie

first metamorphic testing approach considering graph pattern mutations

Testing Process: (1) Query Generation (2) Query Mutation (3) Result Analysis

- Query Generation: focus on **Cypher**, diverse in graph patterns, incremental
- Transformation Combinations: helps to generate more complex graph queries



*: GraphGenie is available at https://github.com/YuanchengJiang/GraphGenie

Graph Query Transformations (GQT)

Structure-GQT: mutations considering Graph patterns
 Property-GQT: mutations considering Graph properties
 Non-GQT: mutations on other parts of graph queries

ID	Rule Name	Class	Туре	Transformation	Example (In <i>Cypher</i>)
01	SymmetricPattern	lacksquare	Equivalent	Replace graph pattern with a symmetric one	MATCH (A :MOVIE)(B :MOVIE) RETURN COUNT(AB);
02	UnfoldCyclicPattern	lacksquare	Equivalent	Unfold cyclic pattern via adding predicate	match (A)(b:movie)(c a) where a=c return count(A);
03	PatternPartition	lacksquare	Equivalent	Split graph pattern to disjoint sub-patterns	match (a)>(b:movie), (b:movie)>(c) return count(a);
04	AddEdgeDirection	lacksquare	Variant	Add edge direction to undirected edge	match (a)>(b:movie) where b.year=2012 return count(a);
05	SpanningSubgraph	lacksquare	Variant	Spanning subgraph by deleting edges	MATCH (A)>(B:MOVIE)>(C) , (A)>(C) RETURN COUNT(A);
06	InducedSubgraph	lacksquare	Variant	Induced subgraph by deleting vertices	match (a)(b:movie)(c) (d:actor) return count(a);
07	ExpandPattern	${}^{\bullet}$	Variant	Expand graph pattern by adding nodes	MATCH (A)(B:MOVIE)(C:MOVIE)(D) RETURN COUNT(A);
08	AddNodeLabel	\bullet	Variant	Add node label to existing node	MATCH (A: user)(b:movie) where not A=b return count(A);
09	AddEdgeType	\bullet	Variant	Add edge type to existing edge	match (A:user)- [r:rated] -(b:movie) return count(A);
10	MoveLabelPredicate	\bullet	Equivalent	Move node label to the predicate	match (a :user)(b:movie) where a:user return count(a);
11	CountIdProperty	\bullet	Equivalent	Count the node id property	match (A:user)(b:movie)>(c) return count(id(a));
12	CountOtherName	\bullet	Equivalent	Count other name in the same path	match (a:user)(b:movie)>(c) return count(ac);
13	DisjointPredicate	0	Equivalent	Split predicate into disjoint parts	match (A) where A.p>0 and with * where A.q>0 count(A);
14	RedundantPredicate	\bigcirc	Equivalent	Append alway-true condition to predicate	match (A:user)–(b:movie) where not A=b return count(A);
15	RenameVariables	\bigcirc	Equivalent	Rename node or edge variables	MATCH (AN)(BM:MOVIE) WHERE AN:USER RETURN COUNT(AN);
16	AddCallWrapper	0	Equivalent	Return results by calling the function	CALL { MATCH (A:USER) RETURN COUNT(A) AS X } RETURN X;

Effectiveness

Effectiveness in discovering unknown bugs in mature graph database systems?

		Logic Bugs		Internal Errors	
GDBMS	Unconfirmed	Confirmed	Fixed	Fixed	Total
Neo4j	0	0	2	3	5
RedisGraph	1	3	1	0	5
AgensGraph	0	0	3	0	3
Gremlin-DBs	6	0	0	0	6
Total	7	3	6	3	19

Effectiveness

Effectiveness in discovering unknown bugs in mature graph database systems?

	Logic Bugs			Internal Errors	
GDBMS	Unconfirmed	Confirmed	Fixed	Fixed	Total
Neo4j	0	0	2	3	5
RedisGraph	1	3	1	0	5
AgensGraph	0	0	3	0	3
Gremlin-DBs	6	0	0	0	6
Total	7	3	6	3	19

Logic Bug via Symmetric Pattern in RedisGraph

https://github.com/RedisGraph/RedisGraph/issues/2865

Graph Pattern: variable length patterns having endpoints with (a:A) and (b:B)

Fixed. Caused by incorrect logic to stop expanding a path upon detecting a cycle.

Effectiveness

Effectiveness in discovering unknown bugs in mature graph database systems?

		Logic Bugs	Internal Errors		
GDBMS	Unconfirmed	Confirmed	Fixed	Fixed	Total
Neo4j	0	0	2	3	5
RedisGraph	1	3	1	0	5
AgensGraph	0	0	3	0	3
Gremlin-DBs	6	0	0	0	6
Total	7	3	6	3	19

Logic Bug via Symmetric Pattern in RedisGraph

https://github.com/RedisGraph/RedisGraph/issues/2865

Graph Pattern: partition the pattern (a)->(b) into two paths (a) and (a)->(b)

Fixed. Caused by columns not visible when involving variable length edge

Graph Pattern: variable length patterns having endpoints with (a:A) and (b:B)

Fixed. Caused by incorrect logic to stop expanding a path upon detecting a cycle.

Logic Bug via Pattern Partition in AgensGraph

Q: MATCH (a)-[*1..1]->(b) RETURN count(a);

// Result: 100

- Q⁽⁼⁾: MATCH (a),(a)-[*1..1]->(b) RETURN count(a);
 - // ERROR: column "a" does not exist

Improvement via Graph Patterns

Q: MATCH (a)-[]-(a) RETURN count(a); // Base Query Result: 200 MATCH (a)-[]-(a) WHERE id(a)>=1.0 RETURN count(a); // (TLP-True) Result: 200 MATCH (a)-[]-(a) WHERE NOT id(a)>=1.0 RETURN count(a); // (TLP-False) Result: 0 MATCH (a)-[]-(a) WHERE id(a)>=1.0 IS NULL RETURN count(a); // (TLP-Null) Result: 0 Q⁽⁼⁾: MATCH (a)-[]-(b) WHERE a=b RETURN count(a); // (GraphGenie) Result: 16



We analyze fixed bugs found by us and use GDBMeter's approach to detect them. Out of 9 bugs that are applicable to Ternary Logic Partition, GDBMeter was able to detect only 3 bugs.

Improvement via Graph Patterns

```
Q: MATCH (a)-[]-(a) RETURN count(a);
    // Base Query Result: 200
MATCH (a)-[]-(a) WHERE id(a)>=1.0 RETURN count(a);
    // (TLP-True) Result: 200
MATCH (a)-[]-(a) WHERE NOT id(a)>=1.0 RETURN count(a);
    // (TLP-False) Result: 0
MATCH (a)-[]-(a) WHERE id(a)>=1.0 IS NULL RETURN count(a);
    // (TLP-Null) Result: 0
Q<sup>(=)</sup>: MATCH (a)-[]-(b) WHERE a=b RETURN count(a);
    // (GraphGenie) Result: 16
```



We analyze fixed bugs found by us and use GDBMeter's approach to detect them. Out of 9 bugs that are applicable to Ternary Logic Partition, GDBMeter was able to detect only 3 bugs.

Non-GQT rules are effective in finding buginducing test cases while using GQT rules facilitates uncovering more bug-inducing cases in testing GDBMS.



Finding Performance Issues

Graph Query Transformations:

We reuse transformations for logic bugs, then redesign the test oracles

Test Oracle (e.g. for equivalent mutated queries):

The difference of execution time should be less than the threshold T[=].

$$max(time(Q), time(Q^{\equiv})) \le min(time(Q), time(Q^{\equiv})) \times T^{\equiv}$$

(T[=] is customizable, we set it as **5x**)

Finding Performance Issues

Graph Query Transformations:

We reuse transformations for logic bugs, then redesign the test oracles

Test Oracle (e.g. for equivalent mutated queries):

The difference of execution time should be less than the threshold T[=].

$$max(time(Q), time(Q^{\equiv})) \le min(time(Q), time(Q^{\equiv})) \times T^{\equiv}$$

(T[=] is customizable, we set it as **5**x)

Bug ID	Status	Time(Q)	Time(Q')	Developer Feedback
12973	Fixed	4642011ms	5984ms	A fix will come with the next release
13034	Fixed	100ms	201384ms	A fix will come with the next release
13010	Confirmed	77ms	12147ms	Bad plan but low priority to optimize
12957	Confirmed	13933ms	22ms	A suboptimal plan in old version
13003	Intended	165547ms	332ms	Query plan is suboptimal but intended
13033	Intended	1402ms	16585ms	Inaccurate estimated rows and bad plan

Performance Issues found in Neo4J

Thank You!

Check Our Paper: <u>https://yuanchengjiang.github.io/docs/GraphGenie-ICSE24.pdf</u>

Try GraphGenie: <u>https://github.com/YuanchengJiang/GraphGenie</u>

