A Heuristic Approach to Detect Opaque Predicates that Disrupt Static Disassembly

By: Yu-Jye Tung, Ian G. Harris

**Opaque Predicates** 

**Definition:** conditional branches that always evaluate to true or false. Thus, one of their branches is unreachable at runtime (a.k.a **superfluous branch**).



Invariant expression evaluates to True

**Opaque Predicates** 

The damage is what's inserted into the unreachable basic blocks introduced by opaque predicates' superfluous branches.



Invariant expression evaluates to True

# Opaque Predicates' Damage

- Code Bloat
- Disassembly Desynchronization



#### Other Approaches

# Machine Learning Statistical Dynamic Symbolic Execution Value-Set Analysis



#### BINSEC

Vector35 / OpaquePredicatePatcher

#### Does the conditional branch contain an invariant expression?

Analysis

Ref.: S. Bardin, R. David, and J.-Y. Marion, "Backward-bounded dse: targeting infeasibility questions on obfuscated codes," in 2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP). IEEE, 2017, pp. 633–651.

Ref.: M. Dalla Preda, M. Madou, K. De Bosschere, and R. Giacobazzi, "Opaque predicates detection by abstract interpretation," in International Conference on Algebraic Methodology and Software Technology. Springer, 2006, pp. 81–95.

Ref.: P. LaFosse (2017) Automated opaque predicate removal. [Online]. Available: <u>https://binary.ninja/2017/10/01/automated</u> -opaque-predicate-removal.htm.

Ref.: R. Tofighi-Shirazi, I. Asăvoae, P. Elbaz-Vincent, and T.-H. Le, "Defeating opaque predicates statically through machine learning and binary analysis," in Proceedings of the 3rd ACM Workshop on Software Protection. ACM, 2019, pp. 15–26.

Ref.: |. Ming, D. Xu, L. Wang, and D. Wu, "Loop: Logic-oriented opaque predicate detection in obfuscated binary code," in Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security. ACM, 2015, pp. 757–768.

# Classification of Opaque Predicates



Invariant expression is constructed across multiple processes.

**Ref.:** C. Collberg, C. Thomborson, and D. Low, "A taxonomy of obfuscating transformations," Department of Computer Science, The University of Auckland, New Zealand, Tech. Rep., 1997.

#### Our Detection Method

We detect opaque predicates by identifying the superfluous branch whose target basic block contains the damage. Currently, we focus on when the damage is **disassembly desynchronization**.



Invariant expression evaluates to True

#### How Our Method Identifies Damage

Our method can correctly identify the superfluous branch by analyzing each conditional branch's outgoing basic blocks for illogical behaviors.



## Our Rules To Identify Illogical Behaviors

# nonexistence memory address unreasonable memory offset abrupt basic block end unimplemented BNILs percentage priviledge instruction usage memory pointer constraints defined but unused

#### $1: B \leftarrow$

set of basic blocks originating from a conditional branch

- 2:  $rules \leftarrow \{$
- 3: nonexistence\_memory\_address,
- 4: unreasonable\_memory\_offset,
- 5: abrupt\_basic\_block\_end,
- 6: unimplemented\_BNILs\_percentage,
- 7: privileged\_instruction\_usage,
- 8: memory\_pointer\_constraints
- 9: defined\_but\_unused,
- 10: }
- 11:

16:

17:

18:

- 12: for each  $b \in B$  do
- 13:  $illogical\_basic\_block \leftarrow false$
- 14: for each  $r \in rules$  do
- 15: **if** r(b) then
  - $illogical\_basic\_block \leftarrow true$

#### break

#### end if

- 19: **end for**
- 20: **if** *illogical\_basic\_block* **then**
- 21: print "b's origin is an opaque predicate"
- 22: **end if**
- 23: **end for**

#### Nonexistence Memory Address

- Target address of a control-flow altering instruction must be in the executable section of mapped address space.
- Memory location used to store written data must be in writable section of mapped address space.

			<b>•</b>			
0804878c	a2c3cd16db	mo∨	byte	[0xffffffffdb16cdc3],	al	{0xdb16cdc3}
08048791	c6	??				

## Unreasonable Memory Offset

- A memory offset should not be extremely large or small.
- A data structure in high-level programming languages (e.g., array, structure) is accessed by an offset from the beginning of the data structure when compiled to machine code.

		<b>•</b>	
08048c3b 08048c45	c7059c400001b800 00eb	mo∨ add	dword [0x100409c], 0xb8 bl, ch
08048c47	05b8000000	add	eax, 0xb8
08048c4c	008b7de46533	add	byte [ebx+0x3365e47d], cl
08048c52	3d14000000	стр	eax, 0x14

#### Abrupt Basic Block End

- An incomplete basic block cannot be part of the disassembly.
- A basic block is an incomplete basic block if it does not have a unique exit point, with explicit outgoing edges or implicit outgoing edges.

<u>bytes in hex</u>	<u>corresponding disassembly</u>				
42	inc	edx			
d0afeb158b85	shr	byte	[edi-0x7a74ea15],	0x1	
60	pusha	d			
ff	??				

## Unimplemented BNILs Percentage

• A basic block is illogical if it contains too many instructions that BinaryNinja's lifter cannot lift to BNILs.





# Privileged Instruction Usage

• A user space program, cannot executes a privileged instruction, or any instruction that can only be executed in the most privileged level.

		<b>.</b>	
08048612	ee	out	dx, al
08048613	a5	movsd	dword [edi], [esi] {0x0}
08048614	dd81a2eb380f	fld	<pre>qword [ecx+0xf38eba2]</pre>
0804861a	b645	mov	dh, 0x45
0804861c	e30f	jecxz	0x804862d

"Copies the value from the second operand (source operand) to the I/O port specified with the destination operand (first operand)."

#### Memory Pointer Constraints

- A memory pointer should only be stored or accessed in a full-length register and never a sub-register (e.g., AX instead of EAX in x86).
- A memory pointer is restricted from operation by × and ÷ in the set of primitive arithmetic operators {+, -, ×, ÷}.
- A memory pointer should not store its own memory address to itself.
- If a memory pointer is a stack pointer, it cannot be directly assigned a constant since a stack pointer keeps track of current stack frame.

#### Defined But Unused

• Every defined variable should have a subsequent instruction that uses it.

		<u>v</u>	
080486e9	a9bf1cd221	test	eax, 0x21d21cbf
080486ee	92	xchg	edx, eax
080486ef	e945010000	jmp	0x8048839

"None of the status flags that TEST affects (SF, ZF, and PF ) are used"

#### Main Limitation

Detecting opaque predicates in the presence of the obfuscation technique **junk code insertion**.

• Inserts carefully selected code into the instruction stream such that the inserted code will not affect program functionalities.

mov eax, 1
mov eax, 3

Our dataflow rule, *defined\_but\_unused*, will erroneously identify a basic block containing junk code as exhibiting illogical behaviors.



#### We implement our method as a BinaryNinja plugin. github.com/yellowbyte/opaque-predicates-detective

#### RQ1

• What is the performance of our tool on protected code (TP, FN, F1)?

#### RQ2

• What is the error rate of our tool on unprotected code?

#### Evaluation: RQ2

We use all 109 GNU core utilities' executable binaries compiled with GCC at optimization level O0, O1, O2, and O3 as ground truth.

Of the 436 combined GNU core utilities' executable binaries across the four optimization levels, our tool has **61 false positive identifications**.

All 61 false positive identifications are found when analyzing executable binaries compiled at optimization level O0 since unoptimized binaries can naturally contain junk code and the *defined\_but\_unused* rule causes false identification in the presence of junk code.

#### Evaluation: Dataset

We evaluate our tool by inserting *trivial, weak,* and *strong* opaque predicates generated by Tigress into the obfuscation benchmark provided by Banescu.

github.com/tum-i22/obfuscation-benchmarks

**Note:** we discard source files in benchmark that are randomly generated by Tigress since randomly generated programs are unrealistic examples.

#### Evaluation: RQ1

Tool	Classification	Total Conditionals	<b>TP/Total Opaque Predicates</b>	<b>Detection Percentage</b>	FP	F1 Score
	trivial	2465	221/297	74.41%	40	79.21%
Our Tool	weak	4657	212/297	71.38%	33	78.22%
	strong	757	26/33	78.78%	2	85.24%
	total	7879	459/627	73.20%	75	79.06%

Accuracy of our tool on detecting *trivial*, *weak*, and *strong* opaque predicates.

Tool	Classification	Total Conditionals	<b>TP/Total Opaque Predicates</b>	<b>Detection Percentage</b>	FP	F1 Score
	trivial	2465	174/297	58.58%	31	69.32%
Our Tool	weak	4657	155/297	52.18%	23	65.26%
	strong	757	20/33	60.60%	2	72.72%
	total	7879	349/627	55.66%	56	67.63%

Accuracy of our tool on detecting *trivial*, *weak*, and *strong* opaque predicates without *defined\_but\_unused* rule.

#### Reason For FP Other Than Junk Code

If the inserted junk bytes create multiple unreachable basic blocks and our rules detect illogical behaviors in an unreachable basic block that does not contain the start of the junk bytes sequence.

**Basic Block A** 2f das "2f a0 29 ab 61 4b 72" a029ab614b mov al, byte [0x4b61ab29] 72eb jb 0x8048752 **Basic Block B** al, byte [ebx+0xf01907d] 0a837d90010f or 8ed7 ss, di mov 0100 add dword [eax], eax byte [ebx-0x3e666fbb], cl 008b459099c1 add Ea1f01d083e001 far 0x83d0011f, 0x1e0 imp



An invariant expression in a conditional branch is not the only identifier for an opaque predicate; it can also be identified through its superfluous branch.

Here we present the first approach to detect opaque predicates by identifying corresponding superfluous branches. github.com/yellowbyte/opaque-predicates-detective

This novel approach allows us to detect opaque predicates that disrupt disassembly regardless of how the invariant expression is constructed.