



A Sense of Time for JavaScript and Node.js: First-Class Timeouts as a Cure for Event Handler Poisoning

James C. Davis, Eric R. Williamson, and Dongyoon Lee, *Virginia Tech*

<https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity18/presentation/davis>

**This paper is included in the Proceedings of the
27th USENIX Security Symposium.**

August 15–17, 2018 • Baltimore, MD, USA

ISBN 978-1-931971-46-1

**Open access to the Proceedings of the
27th USENIX Security Symposium
is sponsored by USENIX.**

A Sense of Time for JavaScript and Node.js: First-Class Timeouts as a Cure for Event Handler Poisoning

James C. Davis
Virginia Tech

Eric R. Williamson
Virginia Tech

Dongyoon Lee
Virginia Tech

Abstract

The software development community is adopting the Event-Driven Architecture (EDA) to provide scalable web services, most prominently through Node.js. Though the EDA scales well, it comes with an inherent risk: the Event Handler Poisoning (EHP) Denial of Service attack. When an EDA-based server multiplexes many clients onto few threads, a blocked thread (EHP) renders the server unresponsive. EHP attacks are a serious threat, with hundreds of vulnerabilities already reported in the wild.

We make three contributions against EHP attacks. First, we describe EHP attacks, and show that they are a common form of vulnerability in the largest EDA community, the Node.js ecosystem. Second, we design a defense against EHP attacks, first-class timeouts, which incorporates timeouts at the EDA framework level. Our *Node.cure* prototype defends Node.js applications against all known EHP attacks with overheads between 0% and 24% on real applications. Third, we promote EHP awareness in the Node.js community. We analyzed Node.js for vulnerable APIs and documented or corrected them, and our guide on avoiding EHP attacks is available on `nodejs.org`.

1 Introduction

Web services are the lifeblood of the modern Internet. To minimize costs, service providers want to maximize the number of clients each server can handle. Over the past decade, this goal has led the software community to consider shifting from the One Thread Per Client Architecture (OTPCA) used in Apache to the Event-Driven Architecture (EDA) championed by Node.js.

Perhaps inspired by Welsh et al.'s Scalable Event-Driven Architecture (SEDA) concept [97], server-side EDA frameworks such as Twisted [24] have been in use since at least the early 2000s. But the boom in the EDA has come with Node.js. Node.js (“server-side JavaScript”) was introduced in 2009 and is now widely used in industry, including at IBM [36], Microsoft [32], PayPal [67], eBay [82], LinkedIn [77], and

others [1, 16, 35]. Node.js’s package ecosystem, *npm*, boasts over 625,000 modules [56]. Node.js is becoming a critical component of the modern web [18, 34].

In this paper we describe a Denial of Service (DoS) attack, *Event Handler Poisoning* (EHP), that can be used against EDA-based services such as Node.js applications (§3). EHP attacks observe that the source of the EDA’s scalability is a double-edged sword. While the OTPCA gives every client its own thread at the cost of context-switching overheads, the EDA multiplexes many clients onto a small number of *Event Handlers* (threads) to reduce per-client overheads. Because many clients share the same Event Handlers, an EDA-based server must correctly implement fair cooperative multitasking [89]. Otherwise an EHP attack is born: an attacker’s request can unfairly dominate the time spent by an Event Handler, preventing the server from handling other clients. We report that EHP vulnerabilities are common in *npm* modules (§3.4).

We analyze two approaches to EHP-safety in §4, and propose *First-Class Timeouts* as a universal defense with strong security guarantees. Since time is a precious resource in the EDA, built-in `TimeoutErrors` are a natural mechanism to protect it. Just as `OutOfBoundsErrors` allow applications to detect and react to buffer overflow attacks, so `TimeoutErrors` allow EDA-based applications to detect and react to EHP attacks.

Our *Node.cure* prototype (§5) implements first-class timeouts in the Node.js framework. First-class timeouts require changes across the entire Node.js stack, from the language runtime (V8), to the event-driven library (*libuv*), and to the core libraries. Our prototype secures real applications from all known EHP attacks with low overhead (§6).

Our findings have been corroborated by the Node.js community (§7). We have developed a guide for practitioners on building EHP-proof systems, updated the Node.js documentation to warn developers about the perils of several APIs, and improved the safety of the `fs.readFile` API.

In summary, here are our contributions:

1. We analyze the DoS potential inherent in the EDA. We define *Event Handler Poisoning* (EHP), a DoS attack against EDA-based applications (§3). We further demonstrate that EHP attacks are common in the largest EDA community, the Node.js ecosystem (§3.4).
2. We propose an antidote to EHP attacks: first-class timeouts (§4). First-class timeouts offer strong security guarantees against all known EHP attacks.
3. We implement and evaluate *Node.cure*, a prototype of first-class timeouts for Node.js (§5). *Node.cure* enables the detection of and response to EHP attacks with application performance overheads ranging from 0% to 24% (§6).
4. Our findings have been corroborated by the Node.js community. Our guide on EHP-safe techniques is available on `nodejs.org`, and we have documented and improved vulnerable Node.js APIs (§7).

2 Background

In this section we review the EDA (§2.1), explain our choice of EDA framework for study (§2.2), and describe relevant prior work (§2.3).

2.1 Overview of the EDA

There are two paradigms for web servers, distinguished by the ratio of clients to resources. The One Thread Per Client Architecture (OTPCA) dedicates resources to each client, for strong isolation but higher memory and context-switching overheads [84]. The Event-Driven Architecture (EDA) tries the opposite approach and reverses these tradeoffs, with many clients sharing execution resources: client connections are multiplexed onto a single-threaded *Event Loop*, with a small *Worker Pool* for expensive operations.

All mainstream server-side EDA frameworks use the Asymmetric Multi-Process Event-Driven (AMPED) architecture [83]. This architecture (hereafter “the EDA”) is illustrated in Figure 1. In the EDA the OS, or a framework, places events in a queue, and the *callbacks* of pending events are executed sequentially by the *Event Loop*. The Event Loop may offload expensive *tasks* such as file I/O to the queue of a small *Worker Pool*, whose workers execute tasks and generate “task done” events for the Event Loop when they finish [60]. We refer to the Event Loop and the Workers as *Event Handlers*.

Because the Event Handlers are shared by all clients, the EDA requires a particular development paradigm. Each callback and task is guaranteed atomicity: once scheduled, it runs to completion on its Event Handler. Because of the atomicity guarantee, if an Event Handler blocks, the time it spends being blocked is wasted rather than being preempted. Without preemptive multitasking, developers must implement cooperative multitasking to




Figure 1: This is the (AMPED) EDA. Incoming events from clients A and B are stored in the event queue, and the associated callbacks (CBs) will be executed sequentially by the Event Loop. We will discuss B’s EHP attack (CB_{B1}), which has poisoned the Event Loop, in §3.3.

avoid starvation [89]. They do this by partitioning the handling of each client request into multiple stages, typically at I/O boundaries. For example, with reference to Figure 1, a callback might perform some string operations in CB_{A1}, then offload a file I/O to the Worker Pool in Task_{A1} so that another client’s request can be handled on the Event Loop. The result of this partitioning is a per-request lifeline [42], a DAG describing the partitioned steps needed to complete an operation. A lifeline can be seen by following the arrows in Figure 1.

2.2 Node.js among other EDA frameworks

There are many EDA frameworks, including Node.js (JavaScript) [14], libuv (C/C++) [10], Vert.x (Java) [25], Twisted (Python¹) [24], and Microsoft’s P# [57]. These frameworks have been used to build a wide variety of industry and open-source services (e.g. [7, 82, 67, 78, 29, 28, 8, 4]).

Most prominent among these frameworks is Node.js, a server-side EDA framework for JavaScript introduced in 2009. The popularity of Node.js comes from its promise of “full stack JavaScript” — client- and server-side developers can speak the same language and share the same libraries. This vision has driven the rise of the Node.js-JavaScript package ecosystem, *npm*, which with over 625,000 modules is the largest of any language [56]. The Node.js Foundation reported that the number of Node.js developers doubled from 3.5 million to 7 million between 2016 and 2017 [30, 31].

The Node.js framework has three major parts [62], whose interactions complicate top-to-bottom extensions such as *Node.cure*. An application’s JavaScript code is executed using Google’s V8 JavaScript engine [64], the event-driven architecture is implemented using libuv [10], and Node.js has core JavaScript libraries with C++ bindings for system calls.

¹In addition, Python 3.4 introduced native EDA support.

2.3 Algorithmic complexity attacks

Our work is inspired by Algorithmic Complexity (AC) attacks ([75, 51]), which are a form of DoS attack. In an AC attack, a malicious client crafts input that shifts the performance of the victim service’s data structures and algorithms from average-case to worst-case, reducing throughput to cause denial of service. Well-known examples of AC attacks include attacks on hash tables [51] and regular expressions (ReDoS) [50].

As will be made clear in §3, EHP attacks are not simply the application of AC attacks to the EDA. AC attacks focus on the complexity of the algorithms a service employs, while EHP attacks are concerned with the effect of malicious input on the software architecture used by a service. Because EHP attacks are only concerned with time, AC attacks are just one mechanism by which an EHP attack can be realized; any time-consuming operation, whether computation or I/O, is a potential EHP vector. However, not all AC attacks can be used to launch an EHP attack.

3 Event Handler Poisoning Attacks

In this section we provide our threat model (§3.1) and define Event Handler Poisoning (EHP) attacks (§3.2). In §3.3 we give two examples of EHP attacks, one CPU-bound (ReDoS) and one I/O-bound (“ReadDoS”). Lastly we show that EHP vulnerabilities are common in the modules in the *npm* registry.

3.1 Threat model

The victim is an EDA-based server with an EHP vulnerability. The attacker knows how to exploit this vulnerability: they know the victim feeds user input to a *vulnerable API*, and they know *evil input* that will cause the vulnerable API to block the Event Handler executing it.

Not all DoS attacks are EHP attacks. An EHP attack must cause an Event Handler to block. This blocking could be due to computation or I/O, provided it takes the Event Handler a long time to handle. Other ways to trigger DoS, such as crashing the server through unhandled exceptions or memory exhaustion, are not time oriented and are thus out of scope. Distributed denial of service (DDoS) attacks are also out of scope; they consume a server’s resources with myriad light clients providing normal input, rather than one heavy client providing malicious input.

3.2 Definition of an EHP attack

Supporting definitions. Before we can define EHP attacks, we must introduce a few definitions. First, recall the EDA illustrated in Figure 1. As discussed in §2.1, a client request is handled by a lifeline [42], a sequence of operations partitioned into one or more callbacks and

tasks. A lifeline is a DAG whose vertices are callbacks or tasks and whose edges are events or task submissions.

We define the *total complexity* of a lifeline as the cumulative complexity of all of its vertices as a function of their cumulative input. The *synchronous complexity* of a lifeline is the greatest individual complexity among its vertices. Two EDA-based services may have lifelines with the same total complexity if they offer the same functionality, but these lifelines may have different synchronous complexity due to different choices of partitions. While computational complexity is an appropriate measure for compute-bound vertices, time may be a more appropriate measure for vertices that perform I/O. Consequently, we define a lifeline’s *total time* and *synchronous time* analogously.

If there is a difference between a lifeline’s average and worst-case synchronous complexity (time), then we call this a *vulnerable lifeline*². We attribute the root cause of the difference between average and worst-case performance to a *vulnerable API* invoked in the problematic vertex.

The notion of a “vulnerable API” is a convenient abstraction. The trouble may of course not be an API at all but the use of an unsafe language feature (e.g. ReDoS). And if an API is asynchronous, it is itself partitioned and will have its own sub-Lifeline. In this case we are concerned about the costs of those vertices.

EHP attacks. An EHP attack exploits an EDA-based service with an incorrect implementation of cooperative multitasking. The attacker identifies a *vulnerable lifeline* (server API) and *poisons* the Event Handler that executes the corresponding large-complexity callback or task with *evil input*. This evil input causes the Event Handler executing it to block, starving pending requests.

An EHP attack can be carried out against either the Event Loop or the Workers in the Worker Pool. A poisoned Event Loop brings the server to a halt, while the throughput of the Worker Pool will degrade for each simultaneously poisoned Worker. Thus, an attacker’s aim is to poison either the Event Loop or enough of the Worker Pool to harm the throughput of the server. Based on typical Worker Pool sizes, we assume the Worker Pool is small enough that poisoning it will not attract the attention of network-level defenses.

Since the EDA relies on cooperative multitasking, a lifeline’s synchronous complexity (time) provide theoretical and practical bounds on how vulnerable it is. Note that a lifeline with large total complexity (time) is not vulnerable so long as each vertex (callback/task) has small synchronous complexity (time). It is for this reason that not all AC attacks can be used for EHP attacks. If an AC attack triggers large total complexity (time) but

²Differences in complexity are well defined. For differences in I/O time we are referring to performance outliers.

```

1 def serveFile(name):
2   if name.match(/(\./+)$/): # ReDoS
3     data = await readFile(name) # ReadDoS
4     client.write(data)

```

Figure 2: Example code of our simple server. It is vulnerable to two EHP attacks: ReDoS (Line 2) and ReadDoS (Line 3).

not large synchronous complexity (time) then it is not an EHP attack. For example, an AC attack could result in a lifeline with $O(n^2)$ callbacks each costing $O(1)$. Although many concurrent AC attacks of this form would degrade the service’s throughput, this would comprise a DDoS attack, which is outside our threat model (§3.1).

Speaking more broadly, EHP attacks are only possible when clients share execution resources. In the OTPCA, a blocked client affects only its own thread, and frameworks such as Apache support thousands of “Event Handlers” (client threads) [61]. In the EDA, all clients share one Event Loop and a limited Worker Pool; for example, in Node.js the Worker Pool can contain at most 128 Workers [17]. Exhausting the set of Event Handlers in the OTPCA requires a DDoS attack, while exhausting them in the EDA is trivial if an EHP vulnerability can be found.

3.3 Example EHP attacks: ReDoS and ReadDoS

To illustrate EHP attacks, we developed a minimal vulnerable file server with EHP vulnerabilities common in real *npm* modules as described in §3.4. Figure 2 shows pseudocode, with the EHP vulnerabilities indicated: ReDoS on line 2, and ReadDoS on line 3.

The regular expression on Line 2 is vulnerable to ReDoS. A string composed of */*’s followed by a newline takes exponential time to evaluate in Node.js’s regular expression engine, poisoning the Event Loop in a CPU-bound EHP attack.

The second EHP vulnerability is on Line 3. Our server has a directory traversal vulnerability, permitting clients to read arbitrary files. In the EDA, directory traversal vulnerabilities can be parlayed into I/O-bound EHP attacks, “ReadDoS”, provided the attacker can identify a *slow file*³ from which to read. Since Line 3 uses the asynchronous framework API `readFile`, each ReadDoS attack on this server will poison a Worker in an I/O-bound EHP attack.

Figure 3 shows the impact of EHP attacks on baseline Node.js, as well as the effectiveness of our *Node.cure* prototype. The methodology is described in the caption. On baseline Node.js these attacks result in complete DoS, with zero throughput. Without *Node.cure* the

³In addition to files exposed on network file systems, `/dev/random` is a good example of a slow file: “[r]eads from `/dev/random` may block” [33].




Figure 3: This figure shows the effect of evil input on the throughput of a server based on Figure 2, with realistic vulnerabilities. Legitimate requests came from 80 clients using `ab` [2] from another machine. The attacks are against either baseline Node.js (grey) or our prototype, *Node.cure* (black). For ReDoS (triangles), evil input was injected after three seconds, poisoning the baseline Event Loop. For ReadDoS (circles), evil input was injected four times at one second intervals beginning after three seconds, eventually poisoning the baseline Worker Pool. The lines for *Node.cure* shows its effectiveness against these EHP attacks. When attacked, *Node.cure*’s throughput dips until a `TimeoutError` aborts the malicious request(s), after which its throughput temporarily rises as it bursts through the built-up queue of pending events or tasks.

only remedy would be to restart the server, dropping all existing client connections. Unfortunately, restarting the server would not solve the problem, since the attacker could simply submit another malicious request. With *Node.cure* the server can return to its steady-state performance.

The architecture-level behavior of the ReDoS attack is illustrated in Figure 1. After client *A*’s benign request is sanitized (CB_{A1}), the `readFile` task goes to the Worker Pool ($Task_{A1}$), and when the read completes the callback returns the file content to *A* (CB_{A2}). Then client *B*’s malicious request arrives and triggers ReDoS (CB_{B1}), dropping the server throughput to zero. The ReadDoS attack has a similar effect on the Worker Pool, with the same unhappy result.

3.4 Study of reported vulnerabilities in *npm*

Modern software commonly relies on open-source libraries [88], and Node.js applications are no exception. Third-party *npm* modules are frequently used in production [40], so EHP vulnerabilities in *npm* may translate directly into EHP vulnerabilities in Node.js servers. For example, Staicu and Pradel recently demonstrated that many ReDoS vulnerabilities in popular *npm* modules can be used for EHP attacks in hundreds of websites from the Alexa Top Million [92].

In this section we present an EHP-oriented analysis of the security vulnerabilities reported in *npm* modules. As shown in Figure 4, we found that 35% (403/1132)

of the security vulnerabilities reported in a major *npm* vulnerability database could be used as an EHP vector.

Methodology. We examined the vulnerabilities in *npm* modules reported in the database of Snyk.io [22], a security company that monitors open-source library ecosystems for vulnerabilities. We also considered the vulnerabilities in the CVE database and the Node Security Platform database [13], but found that these databases were subsets of the Snyk.io database.

We obtained a dump of Snyk.io’s *npm* database in June 2018. Each entry was somewhat unstructured, with inconsistent CWE IDs and descriptions of different classes of vulnerabilities. Based on its title and description, we assigned each vulnerability to one of 17 main categories based on those used by Snyk.io. We used regular expressions to ensure our classification was consistent. We iteratively improved our regular expressions until we could automatically classify 93% of the vulnerabilities, and marked the remaining 7% as “Other”. A similar analysis relying solely on manual classification appeared in our previous work [52].

Some of the reported security vulnerabilities could be used to launch EHP attacks: Directory Traversal vulnerabilities that permit arbitrary file reads, Denial of Service vulnerabilities (those that are CPU-bound, e.g. ReDoS), and Arbitrary File Write vulnerabilities. We identified such vulnerabilities using regular expressions on the descriptions of the vulnerabilities in the database, manually verifying the results. In the few cases where the database description was too terse, we manually categorized vulnerabilities based on the issue and patch description in the module’s bug tracker and version control system.

Results. Figure 4 shows the distribution of vulnerability types, absorbing categories with fewer than 20 vulnerabilities into the aforementioned “Other” category. A high-level CWE number is given next to each class.

The dark bars in Figure 4 show the 403 vulnerabilities (35%) that can be employed in an EHP attack under our threat model (§3.1). The 266 EHP-relevant *Directory Traversal* vulnerabilities are exploitable because they allow arbitrary file reads, which can poison the Event Loop or the Worker Pool through ReadDoS (§3.3). The 121 EHP-relevant *Denial of Service* vulnerabilities poison the Event Loop; 115 are ReDoS⁴, and the remaining 11 can trigger infinite loops or worst-case performance in inefficient algorithms. In *Other* are 11 Arbitrary File Write vulnerabilities that, similar to ReadDoS, can be used for EHP attacks by writing to slow files.

⁴The number of ReDoS vulnerabilities in the Snyk.io database may be skewed by recent studies of ReDoS incidence in the *npm* ecosystem [92, 53].




Figure 4: Classification of the 1132 *npm* module vulnerabilities, by category and by usefulness in EHP attacks. We obtained the dump of the database from Snyk.io on 7 June 2018.

4 Defending Against EHP Attacks

EHP vulnerabilities stem from vulnerable APIs that fail to provide fair cooperative multitasking. If a service cannot provide a (small) bound on the synchronous time of its APIs, then it is vulnerable to EHP attacks. Conversely, if an application can bound the synchronous time of its APIs, then it is EHP-safe.

An EHP attack has two faces: mechanism (vulnerable API) and effect (poisoned Event Handler). Thus there are two ways to defeat an EHP attack. Either the vulnerable API can be refactored, or a poisoned Event Handler can be detected and addressed. In this section we summarize both of these approaches and then evaluate them.

4.1 Prevent through partitioning

An API is *vulnerable* if there is a difference between its average-case and worst-case synchronous costs, provided of course that this worst-case cost is unbearable. A service can achieve EHP safety by statically bounding the cost of each of its APIs, both those that it invokes and those that it defines itself. For example, a developer could partition every API into a sequence of Constant Worst-Case Execution Time stages. Such a partitioning would render the service immune to EHP attacks since it would bound the synchronous complexity and time of each lifeline.

4.2 Detect and react through timeouts

The goal of the partitioning approach is to bound a lifeline’s synchronous complexity as a way to bound its synchronous time. Instead of statically bounding an API’s synchronous complexity through program refactoring, using timeouts we can dynamically bound its synchronous time. Then the worst-case complexity of each callback and task would be irrelevant, because they would be unable to take more than the quantum provided by the runtime. In this approach, the runtime detects and aborts long-running callbacks and tasks by emitting a `TimeoutError`, thrown from synchronous code (callbacks) and returned from asynchronous code (tasks).

We refer to this approach as *first-class timeouts* and we believe it is novel. To the best of our knowledge, existing timeout schemes take one of two forms. Some are per-API, e.g. the timeout option in the .NET framework’s regular expression API to combat ReDoS [19]. Per-API timeouts are ad hoc by definition. The other class of timeouts is on a per-process or per-thread basis. For example, desktop and mobile operating systems commonly use a heartbeat mechanism to detect and restart unresponsive applications, and in the OTPCA a client thread can easily be killed and replaced if it exceeds a timeout. This approach fails in the EDA because clients are not isolated on separate execution resources. Detecting and restarting a blocked Event Loop will break all existing client connections, resulting in DoS. Because of this, timeouts must be a first-class member of an EDA framework, non-destructively guaranteeing that no Event Handler can block.

4.3 Analysis

Soundness. The partitioning approach can prevent EHP attacks that exploit high-complexity operations. However, soundly preventing EHP attacks by this means is difficult since it requires case-by-case changes. In addition, it is not clear how to apply the partitioning approach to I/O. At the application level, I/O can be partitioned at the byte granularity, but an I/O may be just as slow for 1 byte as for 1 MB. If an OS offers truly asynchronous I/O interfaces then these provide an avenue to more fine-grained partitioning, but unfortunately Linux’s asynchronous I/O mechanisms are incomplete for both file I/O and DNS resolution.

If timeouts are applied systematically across the software stack (application, framework, language), then they offer a strong guarantee against EHP attacks. When a timeout is detected, the application can respond appropriately to it. The difficulty with timeouts is choosing a threshold [85], since a too-generous threshold still permits an attacker to disrupt legitimate requests. As a result, if the timeout threshold cannot be tightly defined, then it ought to be used in combination with a blacklist; after observing a client request time out, the server should drop subsequent connections from that client.

Refactoring cost. Both of these approaches incur a refactoring cost. For partitioning the cost is prohibitive. Any APIs invoked by an EHP-safe service must have (small) bounded synchronous time. To guarantee this bound, developers would need to re-implement any third-party APIs with undesirable performance. This task would be particularly problematic in a module-dominated ecosystem similar to Node.js. As the composition of safe APIs may be vulnerable⁵, application

⁵For example, consider `while(1){}`, which makes an infinite sequence of constant-time language “API calls”.

APIs might also need to be refactored. The partitioning approach is by definition case-by-case, so future development and maintenance would need to preserve the bounds required by the service.

For timeouts, we perceive a lower refactoring cost. The timeout must be handled by application developers, but they can do so using existing exception handling mechanisms. Adding a new `try-catch` block should be easier than re-implementing functionality in a partitioned manner.

Position. We believe that relying on developers to implement fair cooperative multitasking via partitioning is unsafe. Just as modern languages offer null pointer exceptions and buffer overflow exceptions to protect against common security vulnerabilities, so too should modern EDA frameworks offer timeout exceptions to protect against EHP attacks.

In the remainder of the paper we describe our design, implementation, and evaluation of first-class timeouts in Node.js. We devote a large portion of our discussion (§8) to the choice of timeout and the refactoring implications of first-class timeouts.

5 *Node.cure*: First-Class Timeouts for Node.js

Though first-class timeouts are conceptually simple, realizing them in a real-world framework such as Node.js is difficult. For soundness, every aspect of the Node.js framework must be able to emit `TimeoutErrors` without compromising the system state, from the language to the libraries to the application logic, and in both synchronous and asynchronous aspects. For practicality, monitoring for timeouts must be lightweight, lest they cost more than they are worth.

Here is the desired behavior of first-class timeouts. We want to bound the synchronous time of every callback and task and deliver a `TimeoutError` if this bound is exceeded. A long-running callback poisons the Event Loop; with first-class timeouts a `TimeoutError` should be thrown within such a callback. A long-running task poisons its Worker; such a task should be aborted and fulfilled with a `TimeoutError`.

To ensure soundness, we begin with a taxonomy of the places where vulnerable APIs can be found in a Node.js application (§5.1). The subsequent subsections describe how we provide `TimeoutErrors` across this taxonomy for the Worker Pool (§5.2) and the Event Loop (§5.3). We discuss performance optimizations in §5.5, and summarize our prototype in §5.6.

5.1 Taxonomy of vulnerable APIs

Table 1 classifies vulnerable APIs along three axes. Along the first two axes, a vulnerable API affects either the Event Loop or a Worker, and it might be CPU-bound

Vuln. APIs	Event Loop (§5.3)		Worker Pool (§5.2)	
	CPU-bound	I/O-bound	CPU-bound	I/O-bound
Language	Regexp, JSON	N/A	N/A	N/A
Framework	Crypto, zlib	FS	Crypto, zlib	FS, DNS
Application	while(1)	DB query	Regexp [12]	DB query

Table 1: Taxonomy of vulnerable APIs in Node.js, with examples. An EHP attack through a vulnerable API poisons the Event Loop or a Worker, and its synchronous time is due to CPU-bound or I/O-bound activity. A vulnerable API might be part of the language, framework, or application, and might be synchronous (Event Loop) or asynchronous (Worker Pool). *zlib* is the Node.js compression library. *N/A*: JavaScript has no native Worker Pool nor any I/O APIs. We do not consider memory access as I/O.

or I/O-bound. Along the third axis, a vulnerable API can be found in the language, the framework, or the application. In our evaluation we provide an exhaustive list of vulnerable APIs for Node.js (§6.1). Although the examples in Table 1 are specific to Node.js, the same general classification can be applied to other EDA frameworks.

5.2 Timeout-aware tasks

EHP attacks targeting the Worker Pool use vulnerable APIs to submit long-running tasks that poison a Worker. *Node.cure* defends against such attacks by bounding the synchronous time of tasks. *Node.cure* short-circuits long-running tasks with a `TimeoutError`.

Timeout-aware Worker Pool. Node.js’s Worker Pool is implemented in `libuv`. As illustrated in Figure 1, the Workers pop tasks from a shared queue, handle them, and return the results to the Event Loop. Each Worker handles its tasks synchronously.

We modified the `libuv` Worker Pool to be timeout-aware, replacing `libuv`’s *Workers* with *Executors* that combine a permanent *Manager* with a disposable Worker. Every time a Worker picks up a task, it notifies its Manager. If the task takes the Worker too long, the Manager kills it with a Hangman and creates a new Worker. The long-running task is returned to the Event Loop with a `TimeoutError` for processing, while the new Worker resumes handling tasks. These roles are illustrated in Figure 5.

This design required several changes to the `libuv` Worker Pool API. The `libuv` library exposes a task submission API `uv_queue_work`, which we extended as shown in Table 2. Workers invoke `work`, which is a function pointer describing the task. On completion the Event Loop invokes `done`. This is also the typical behavior of our timeout-aware Workers. When a task takes too long, however, the potentially-poisoned Worker’s Manager invokes the new `timed_out` callback. If the submitter does not request an extension, the Manager creates a replacement Worker so that it can continue to process subsequent tasks, creates a Hangman thread for the poisoned Worker, and notifies the Event Loop that the task timed




Figure 5: This figure illustrates *Node.cure*’s timeout-aware Worker Pool, including the roles of Event Loop, executors (both worker pool and priority), and Hangman. Grey entities were present in the original Worker Pool, and black are new. The Event Loop can synchronously access the Priority Executor, or asynchronously offload tasks to the Worker Pool. If an Executor’s manager sees its worker time out, it creates a replacement worker and passes the dangling worker to a Hangman.

Callback	Description
<code>void work</code>	Perform task.
<code>int timed_out*</code>	When task has timed out. Can request extension.
<code>void done</code>	When task is done. Special error code for timeout.
<code>void killed*</code>	When a <code>timed_out</code> task’s thread has been killed.

Table 2: Summary of the Worker Pool API. `work` is invoked on the Worker. `done` is invoked on the Event Loop. The new callbacks, `timed_out` and `killed`, are invoked on the Manager and the Hangman, respectively. On a timeout, `work`, `timed_out`, and `done` are invoked, in that order; there is no ordering between the `done` and `killed` callbacks, which sometimes requires reference counting for safe memory cleanup. *New callbacks.

out. The Event Loop then invokes its `done` callback with a `TimeoutError`, permitting a rapid response to evil input. Concurrently, once the Hangman successfully kills the Worker thread, it invokes the task’s `killed` callback for resource cleanup, and returns. We used synchronization primitives to prevent races when a task completes just after it is declared timed out.

Differentiating between `timed_out` and `killed` permits more flexible error handling, but introduces technical challenges. If a rapid response to a timeout is unnecessary, then it is simple to defer `done` until `killed` finishes, since they run on separate threads. If a rapid response is necessary, then `done` must be able to run before `killed` finishes, resulting in a *dangling worker* problem: an API’s `work` implementation may access externally-visible state after the Event Loop receives the associated `TimeoutError`. We addressed the dangling worker problem in Node.js’s Worker Pool customers using a mix of `killed`-waiting, message passing, and blacklisting.

Affected APIs. The Node.js APIs affected by this change (*viz.* those that create tasks) are in the encryption, compression, DNS, and file system modules. In all cases we allowed timeouts to proceed, killing the long-running Worker. Handling encryption and compression was straightforward, while the DNS and file system APIs were more complex.

Node.js's asynchronous encryption and compression APIs are implemented in Node.js C++ bindings by invoking APIs from `openssl` and `zlib`, respectively. If the Worker Pool notifies these APIs of a timeout, they wait for the Worker to be killed before returning, to ensure it no longer modifies state in these libraries nor accesses memory that might be released after `done` is invoked. Since `openssl` and `zlib` are purely computational, the dangling worker is killed immediately.

Node.js implements its file system and DNS APIs by relying on `libuv`'s file system and DNS support, which on Linux make the appropriate calls to `libc`. Because the `libuv` file system and DNS implementations share memory between the Worker and the submitter, we modified them to use message passing for memory safety of dangling workers — wherever the original implementation's work accessed memory owned by the submitter, e.g. for `read` and `write`, we introduced a private buffer for work and added `copyin/copyout` steps. In addition, we used `pthread_setcancelstate` to ensure that Workers will not be killed while in a non-cancelable `libc` API [6]. DNS queries are read-only so there is no risk of the dangling worker modifying external state. In the file system, `write` modifies external state, but we avoid any dangling worker state pollution via blacklisting. Our blacklisting-based Slow Resource policy is discussed in more detail in §5.5.

At the top of the Node.js stack, when the Event Loop sees that a task timed out, it invokes the application's callback with a `TimeoutError`.

5.3 Timeouts for callbacks

Node.cure defends against EHP attacks that target the Event Loop by bounding the synchronous time of callbacks. To make callbacks timeout-aware, we introduce a `TimeoutWatchdog` that monitors the start and end of each callback and ensures that no callback exceeds the timeout threshold. We time out JavaScript instructions using V8's interrupt mechanism (§5.3.1), and we modify Node.js's C++ bindings to ensure that callbacks that enter these bindings will also be timed out (§5.3.2).

5.3.1 Timeouts for JavaScript

TimeoutWatchdog. Our `TimeoutWatchdog` instruments every callback using the experimental Node.js `async-hooks` module [15], which allows an application to register special callbacks before and after a callback is invoked.

Before a callback begins, our `TimeoutWatchdog` starts a timer. If the callback completes before the timer expires, we erase the timer. If the timer expires, the watchdog signals V8 to interrupt JavaScript execution by throwing a `TimeoutError`. The watchdog then starts another timer, ensuring that recursive timeouts while handling the previous `TimeoutError` are also detected.

While an infinite sequence of `TimeoutErrors` is possible with this approach, this concern seems more academic than practical⁶.

V8 interrupts. To handle the `TimeoutWatchdog`'s request for a `TimeoutError`, *Node.cure* extends the interrupt infrastructure of Node.js's V8 JavaScript engine to support timeouts. In V8, low priority interrupts such as a pending garbage collection are checked regularly (e.g. each loop iteration, function call, etc.), but no earlier than *after* the current JavaScript instruction finishes. In contrast, high priority interrupts take effect immediately, interrupting long-running JavaScript instructions. Timeouts require the use of a high priority interrupt because they must be able to interrupt long-running individual JavaScript instructions such as `str.match(regex)` (possible ReDoS).

To support a `TimeoutError`, we modified V8 as follows: (1) We added the definition of a `TimeoutError` into the `Error` class hierarchy; (2) We added a `TimeoutInterrupt` into the list of high-priority interrupts; and (3) We added a V8 API to raise a `TimeoutInterrupt`. The `TimeoutWatchdog` calls this API, which interrupts the current JavaScript stack by throwing a `TimeoutError`.

The only JavaScript instructions that V8 instruments to be interruptible are regular expression matching and JSON parsing; these are the language-level vulnerable APIs. Other JavaScript instructions are viewed as effectively constant-time, so these interrupts may be slightly deferred, e.g. to the end of the nearest basic block. We agreed with the V8 developers in this⁷, and did not instrument other JavaScript instructions to poll for pending interrupts.

5.3.2 Timeouts for the Node.js C++ bindings

The `TimeoutWatchdog` described in §5.3.1 will interrupt any vulnerable APIs implemented in JavaScript, including language-level APIs such as regular expressions and application-level APIs that contain blocking code such as `while(1){}`. It remains to give a sense of time to the Node.js C++ bindings that allow the JavaScript code in Node.js applications to interface with the broader world. A separate effort is required here because a pending `TimeoutError` triggered by the `TimeoutWatchdog` will not be delivered until control returns from a C++ binding to JavaScript.

Node.js has asynchronous and synchronous C++ bindings. The asynchronous bindings are safe in general because they do a fixed amount of synchronous work to submit a task and then return; the tasks are protected as

⁶To obtain an infinite sequence of `TimeoutErrors` in a first-class timeouts system, place a `try-catch` block containing an infinite loop inside another infinite loop.

⁷For example, we found that string operations complete in milliseconds even when a string is hundreds of MBs long.

discussed earlier. However, the synchronous C++ bindings complete the entire operation on the Event Loop before returning, and therefore must be given a sense of time. The relevant vulnerable synchronous APIs are those in the file system, cryptography, and compression modules. Both synchronous and asynchronous APIs in the `child_process` module are also vulnerable, but these are intended for scripting purposes rather than the server context with which we are concerned.

Because the Event Loop holds the state of all pending clients, we cannot `pthread_cancel` it as we do poisoned Workers, since this would result in the DoS the attacker desired. We could build off of our timeout-aware Worker Pool by offloading the request to the Worker Pool and awaiting its completion, but this would incur high request latencies when the Worker Pool's queue is not empty. We opted to combine these approaches by offloading the work in vulnerable synchronous framework APIs to a dedicated Worker, which can be safely killed and whose queue never has more than one item.

In our implementation, we extended the Worker Pool paradigm with a *Priority Executor* whose queue is exposed via a new API: `uv_queue_work_prio` (Figure 5). This Executor follows the same Manager-Worker-Hangman paradigm as the Executors in *Node.cure*'s Worker Pool. To make these vulnerable synchronous APIs timeout-aware, we offload them to the Priority Executor using the existing asynchronous implementation of the API, and had the Event Loop await the result. Because these synchronous APIs are performed on the Event Loop as part of a callback, we propagate the callback's remaining time to this Executor's Manager to ensure that the TimeoutWatchdog's timer is honored.

5.4 Timeouts for application-level vulnerable APIs

As described above, *Node.cure* makes tasks (§5.2) and callbacks (§5.3) timeout-aware to defeat EHP attacks against language and framework APIs. An application composed of calls to these APIs will be EHP-safe.

However, an application could still escape the reach of these timeouts by defining its own C++ bindings. These bindings would need to be made timeout-aware, following the example we set while making Node.js's vulnerable C++ bindings timeout-aware (file system, DNS, encryption, and compression). Without refactoring, applications with their own C++ bindings may not be EHP-safe. In our evaluation we found that application-defined C++ bindings are rare (§6.3).

5.5 Performance optimizations

Since first-class timeouts are an always-on mechanism, it is important that their performance impact be negligible. Here we describe two optimizations.

Lazy TimeoutWatchdog. Promptly detecting TimeoutErrors with a *precise* TimeoutWatchdog can

be expensive, because the Event Loop must synchronize with the TimeoutWatchdog every time a callback is entered and exited. If the application workload contains many small callbacks, whose cost is comparable to this synchronization cost, then the overhead of a precise TimeoutWatchdog may be considerable.

If the timeout threshold is soft, then the overhead from a TimeoutWatchdog can be reduced by making the Event Loop-TimeoutWatchdog communication asynchronous. When entering and exiting a callback the Event Loop can simply increment a shared counter. A *lazy* TimeoutWatchdog wakes up at intervals and checks whether the callback it last observed has been executing for more than the timeout threshold; if so, it emits a TimeoutError. A lazy TimeoutWatchdog reduces the overhead of making a callback, but decreases the precision of the TimeoutError threshold based on the frequency of its wake-up interval.

Slow resource policies. Our *Node.cure* runtime detects and aborts long-running callbacks and tasks executing on Node.js's Event Handlers. For unique evil input this is the best we can do at runtime, because accurately predicting whether a not-yet-seen input will time out is difficult. If an attacker might re-use the same evil input multiple times, however, we can track whether or not an input led to a timeout and short-circuit subsequent requests that use this input with an early timeout.

While evil input memoization could in principle be applied to any API, the size of the input space to track is a limiting factor. The evil inputs that trigger CPU-bound EHP attacks such as ReDoS exploit properties of the vulnerable algorithm and are thus usually not unique. In contrast, the evil inputs that trigger I/O-bound EHP attacks such as ReadDoS must name a particularly slow *resource*, presenting an opportunity to short-circuit requests on this slow resource.

In *Node.cure* we implemented a slow resource management policy for libuv's file system APIs, targeting those that reference a single resource (e.g. `open`, `read`, `write`). When one of the APIs we manage times out, we mark the file descriptor and the associated inode number as slow. We took the simple approach of permanently blacklisting these aliases by aborting subsequent accesses⁸, with the happy side effect of solving the dangling worker problem for `write`. This policy is appropriate for the file system, where access times are not likely to change⁹. We did not implement a policy for DNS queries. In the context of DNS, timeouts might be due to a network hiccup, and a temporary blacklist might be more appropriate.

⁸To avoid leaking file descriptors, we do not eagerly abort `close`.

⁹Of course, if the slow resource is in a networked file system such as NFS or GPFS, slowness might be due to a network hiccup, and incorporating temporary device-level blacklisting might be more appropriate.

5.6 Implementation

Node.cure is built on top of Node.js LTS v8.8.1, a recent long-term support version of Node.js¹⁰. Our prototype is for Linux, and we added 4,000 lines of C, C++, and JavaScript code across 50 files spanning V8, libuv, the Node.js C++ bindings, and the Node.js JavaScript libraries.

Node.cure passes the core Node.js test suite, with a handful of failures due to bad interactions with experimental or deprecated features. In addition, several cases fail when they invoke rarely-used file system APIs we did not make timeout-aware. Real applications run on *Node.cure* without difficulty (Table 3).

In *Node.cure*, timeouts for callbacks and tasks are controlled by environment variables. Our implementation would readily accommodate a fine-grained assignment of timeouts for individual callbacks and tasks.

6 Evaluating *Node.cure*

We evaluated *Node.cure* in terms of its effectiveness (§6.1), runtime overhead (§6.2), and security guarantees (§6.3). In summary: with a lazy TimeoutWatchdog, *Node.cure* detects all known EHP attacks with overhead ranging from 1.3x-7.9x on micro-benchmarks but manifesting at 1.0x-1.24x using real applications. *Node.cure* guarantees EHP-safety to all Node.js applications that do not define their own C++ bindings.

All measurements provided in this section were obtained on an otherwise-idle desktop running Ubuntu 16.04.1 (Linux 4.8.0-56-generic), 16GB RAM, Intel i7 @3.60GHz, 4 physical cores with 2 threads per core. For a baseline we used Node.js LTS v8.8.1 from which *Node.cure* was derived, compiled with the same flags. We used a default Worker Pool (4 Workers).

6.1 Effectiveness

To evaluate the effectiveness of *Node.cure*, we developed an EHP test suite that makes every type of EHP attack, as enumerated in Table 1. Our suite is comprehensive and conducts EHP attacks using every vulnerable API we identified, including the language level (regular expressions, JSON), framework level (all vulnerable APIs from the file system, DNS, cryptography, and compression modules), and application level (infinite loops, long string operations, array sorting, etc.). This test suite includes each type of real EHP attack from our study of EHP vulnerabilities in *npm* modules (§3.4). *Node.cure* detects all 92 EHP attacks in this suite: each synchronous vulnerable API throws a `TimeoutError`, and each asynchronous vulnerable API

returns a `TimeoutError`. Our suite could be used to evaluate alternative defenses against EHP attacks.

To evaluate any difficulties in porting real-world Node.js software to *Node.cure*, we ported the `node-oniguruma` [12] *npm* module. This module offloads worst-case exponential regular expression queries from the Event Loop to the Worker Pool using a C++ add-on. We ported it using the API described in Table 2 without difficulty, as we did for the core modules, and *Node.cure* then successfully detected ReDoS attacks against this module’s vulnerable APIs.

6.2 Runtime overhead

We evaluated the runtime overhead using micro-benchmarks and macro-benchmarks. We address other costs in the Discussion.

Overhead: Micro-benchmarks. Whether or not they time out, *Node.cure* introduces several sources of overheads to monitor callbacks and tasks. We evaluated the most likely candidates for performance overheads using micro-benchmarks:

1. Every time V8 checks for interrupts, it now tests for a pending timeout as well.
2. Both the precise and lazy versions of the TimeoutWatchdog require instrumenting every asynchronous callback using `async-hooks`, with relative overhead dependent on the complexity of the callback.
3. To ensure memory safety for dangling workers, Workers operate on buffered data that must be allocated when the task is submitted. For example, Workers must copy the I/O buffers supplied to `read` and `write` twice.

New V8 interrupt. We found that the overhead of our V8 Timeout interrupt was negligible, simply a test for one more interrupt in V8’s interrupt infrastructure.

TimeoutWatchdog’s async hooks. We measured the additional cost of invoking a callback due to TimeoutWatchdog’s `async` hooks. A precise TimeoutWatchdog increases the cost of invoking a callback by 7.9x due to the synchronous communication between Event Loop and TimeoutWatchdog, while a lazy TimeoutWatchdog increases the cost by 2.4x due to the reduced cost of asynchronous communication. While these overheads are large, note that they are for an empty callback. As the number of instructions in a callback increases, the cost of executing the callback will begin to dominate the cost of issuing the callback. For example, if the callback executes 500 empty loop iterations, the precise overhead drops to 2.7x and the lazy overhead drops to 1.3x. At 10,000 empty loop iterations, the precise and lazy overheads are 1.15x and 1.01x, respectively.

Worker buffering. Our timeout-aware Worker Pool requires buffering data to accommodate dangling workers, affecting DNS queries and file system I/O. Our micro-

¹⁰Specifically, we built *Node.cure* on Node.js v8.8.1 commit dc6bbb44da from Oct. 25, 2017.

Benchmark	Description	Overheads
LokiJS [11]	Server, Key-value store	1.00, 1.00
Node Acme-Air [3]	Server, Airline simulation	1.03, 1.02
webtorrent [26]	Server, P2P torrenting	1.02, 1.02
ws [27]	Utility, websockets	1.00, 1.00*
Three.js [23]	Utility, graphics library	1.09, 1.08
Express [5]	Middleware	1.24, 1.06
Sails [21]	Middleware	1.23, 1.14*
Restify [20]	Middleware	1.63, 1.14*
Koa [9]	Middleware	1.60, 1.24

Table 3: Results of our macro-benchmark evaluation of *Node.cure*'s overhead. Where available, we used the benchmarks defined by the project itself. Otherwise, we ran its test suite. Overheads are reported as “precise, lazy”, and are the ratio of *Node.cure*'s performance to that of the baseline Node.js, averaged over several steady-state runs. We report the average overhead because we observed no more than 3% standard deviation in all but LokiJS, which averaged 8% standard deviation across our samples of its sub-benchmarks. *: Median of sub-benchmark overheads.

benchmark indicated a 1.3x overhead using `read` and `write` calls with a 64KB buffer. This overhead will vary from API to API.

Overhead: Macro-benchmarks. Our micro-benchmarks suggested that the overhead introduced by *Node.cure* may vary widely depending on what an application is doing. Applications that make little use of the Worker Pool will pay the overhead of the additional V8 interrupt check (minimal) and the TimeoutWatchdog's async hooks, whose cost is strongly dependent on the number of instructions executed in the callbacks. Applications that use the Worker Pool will pay these as well as the overhead of Worker buffering (variable, perhaps 1.3x).

We chose macro-benchmarks using a GitHub pot-pourri technique: we searched GitHub for “language:JavaScript”, sorted by “Most starred”, and identified server-side projects from the first 50 results. To add additional complete servers, we also included LokiJS [11], a popular key-value store, and IBM's Acme-Air airline simulation [3], which is used in the Node.js benchmark suite.

Table 3 lists the macro-benchmarks we used and the performance overhead for each type of TimeoutWatchdog. These results show that *Node.cure* introduces minimal overhead on real server applications, and they confirm the value of a lazy TimeoutWatchdog. Matching our micro-benchmark assessment of the TimeoutWatchdog's overhead, the overhead from *Node.cure* increased as the complexity of the callbacks used in the macro-benchmarks decreased — the middleware benchmarks sometimes used empty callbacks to handle client requests. In non-empty callbacks similar to those of the real servers, this overhead is amortized.

6.3 Security guarantees

As described in §5, our *Node.cure* prototype implements first-class timeouts for Node.js. *Node.cure* enforces timeouts for all vulnerable JavaScript and framework APIs identified by both us and the Node.js developers as long-running: regular expressions, JSON, file system, DNS, cryptography, and compression. Application-level APIs composed of these timeout-aware language and framework APIs are also timeout-aware.

However, Node.js also permits applications to add their own C++ bindings, and these may not be timeout-aware without refactoring. To evaluate the extent of this limitation, we measured the number of *npm* modules that define C++ bindings. These modules typically depend on the `node-gyp` and/or `nan` modules [37, 38]. We obtained the dependency list for each of the 628,863 *npm* modules from `skimdb.npmjs.com` and found that 4,384 modules (0.7%) had these dependencies¹¹.

As only 0.7% of *npm* modules define C++ bindings, we conclude that C++ bindings are not widely used and that they thus do not represent a serious limitation of our approach. In addition, we found the refactoring process for C++ bindings straightforward when we performed it on the Node.js framework and the `node-oniguruma` module as described earlier.

7 Practitioner Community Impact

In conjunction with the development of our *Node.cure* prototype, we took a two-pronged approach to reach out to the EDA practitioner community. First, we published a guide on safe service architecture for Node.js on `nodejs.org`. Second, we studied unnecessarily vulnerable Node.js APIs and added documentation or increased the security of these APIs.

7.1 Guide on safe service architecture

Without first-class timeouts, developers in the EDA community must resort to partitioning as a preventive measure. Do new Node.js developers know this? We expect they would learn from the Node.js community's guides for new developers, hosted on the `nodejs.org` website. However, these guides skip directly from “Hello world” to deep dives on HTTP and profiling. They do not advise developers on the design of Node.js applications, which as we have discussed must fit the EDA paradigm and avoid EHP vulnerabilities.

We prepared a guide to building EHP-safe EDA-based applications, including discussions about appropriate work patterns and the risks of high-complexity operations. The pull request with the guide was merged after discussion with the community. It can

¹¹We counted those that matched the regexp `"nan"|"node-gyp"` on 11 May 2018.

be found at <https://nodejs.org/en/docs/guides/dont-block-the-event-loop/>. We believe that it will give developers insights into secure Node.js programming practices, and should reduce the incidence of EHP vulnerabilities in practice.

7.2 Changes to API and documentation

We studied the Node.js implementation and identified several unnecessarily vulnerable APIs in Node.js v8. Each of `fs.readFile`, `crypto.randomFill`, and `crypto.randomBytes` submits a single unpartitioned task to the Worker Pool, and in each of these cases a large task could be expensive in terms of I/O or computation. Were a careless developer to submit a large request to one of these APIs, it could cause one of the Workers to block. This risk was not mentioned in the API documentation. These APIs could instead be automatically partitioned by the framework to avoid their use as an EHP vector.

We took two steps to address this state of affairs. First, we proposed documentation patches warning developers against submitting large requests to these APIs, e.g. “The asynchronous version of `crypto.randomBytes()` is carried out in a single threadpool request. To minimize threadpool task length variation, partition large `randomBytes` requests when doing so as part of fulfilling a client request” [39]. These patches were merged without much comment. Second, we submitted a patch improving the simplest of these APIs, `fs.readFile`. This API previously read the entire file in a single read request. Our patch partitions it into a series of 64KB reads. As discussed earlier, partitioning I/O is an imperfect solution, but it is better than none. This patch was merged after several months of discussion on the performance-security tradeoff involved.

8 Discussion

Other examples of EHP attacks. Two other EHP attacks are worth mentioning. *First*, if the EDA framework uses a garbage collected language for the Event Loop (as do Node.js, Vert.x, Twisted, etc.), then triggering many memory allocations could lead to unpredictable blockage of the Event Loop. We are not aware of any reported attacks of this form, but such an attack would defeat first-class timeouts unless the GC were partitioned. *Second*, Linux lacks kernel support for asynchronous DNS requests, so they are typically implemented in EDA frameworks in the Worker Pool. If an attacker controls a DNS nameserver configured as a tarpit [73] and can convince an EDA-based victim to resolve name requests using this server, then each such request will poison one of the Workers in the Worker Pool. First-class timeouts will protect against this class of attacks as it does ReadDoS.

Programming with first-class timeouts. What would it be like to develop software for an EDA framework with

first-class timeouts? First-class timeouts change the language and framework specifications. First, developers must choose a timeout threshold. Then, exception handling code will be required for both asynchronous APIs, which may be fulfilled with a `TimeoutError`, and synchronous APIs, which may throw a `TimeoutError`.

The choice of a timeout is a Goldilocks problem. Too short, and legitimate requests will result in an erroneous `TimeoutError` (false positive). Too long, and malicious requests will waste a lot of service time before being detected (false negative). Timeouts in other contexts have been shown to be selected without much apparent consideration [85], but for first-class timeouts we suggest that a good choice is relatively easy. Consider that a typical web server can handle hundreds or thousands of clients per second. Since each of these clients requires the invocation of at least one callback on the Event Loop, simple arithmetic tells us that in an EDA-based server, individual callbacks and tasks must take no longer than milliseconds to complete. Thus, a universal callback-task timeout on the order of 1 second should not result in erroneous timeouts during the normal execution of callbacks and tasks, but would permit relatively rapid detection of and response to an EHP attack¹². By definition, first-class timeouts preclude the possibility of undetected EHP attacks (false negatives) with a reasonable choice of timeout, and our *Node.cure* prototype demonstrates that this guarantee can be provided in practice.

Developers can assign tighter timeout thresholds to reduce the impact of an EHP attack. If a tight timeout can be assigned, then a malicious request trying to trigger EHP will get about the same amount of server time as a legitimate request will, before the malicious request is detected and aborted with a `TimeoutError`. The lower the variance in callback and task times, the more tightly the timeout thresholds can be set without false positives. Though our implementation uses coarse-grained timeouts for callbacks and tasks, more fine-grained timeouts are possible. Such an API might be called `process.runWithTimeout(func)`. Appropriate coarse or fine-grained timeout thresholds could also be suggested automatically or tuned over the process lifetime of the server.

If a tight timeout cannot be assigned, perhaps because there is significant natural variation in the cost of handling legitimate requests, then we recommend that the `TimeoutError` exception handling logic incorporate a blacklist. With a blacklist, the total time wasted by EHP attacks is equal to the number of attacks multiplied by the timeout threshold. Since DDoS is outside of our

¹²If a service is unusually structured so as to run operations on behalf of many clients in a single callback, then when this service is overloaded such a callback might throw a `TimeoutError`. We recommend that such a callback be partitioned.

threat model, this value should be small and EHP attacks should not prove overly disruptive.

After choosing a timeout, developers would need to modify their code to handle `TimeoutErrors`. For asynchronous APIs that submit tasks to the Worker Pool, a `TimeoutError` will be delivered just like any other error, and error handling logic should already be present. This logic could be extended, for example to blacklist the client. For synchronous APIs or synchronous links in an asynchronous sequence of callbacks, we acknowledge that it is a bit strange that an unexceptional-looking sequence of code such as a loop can now throw an error, and wrapping every function with a `try-catch` block seems inelegant. Happily, recent trends in asynchronous programming techniques have made it easy for developers to handle these errors. The ECMAScript 6 specification made Promises a native JavaScript feature, simplifying data-flow programming (explicit encoding of a lifeline) [44]. Promise chains permit catch-all handling of exceptions thrown from any link in the chain, so existing catch-all handlers can be extended to handle a `TimeoutError`.

Detecting EHP attacks without first-class timeouts. Without first-class timeouts, a service that is not perfectly partitioned may have EHP vulnerabilities. In existing EDA frameworks there is no way to elegantly detect and recover from an EHP attack. Introducing a heartbeat mechanism into the service would enable the detection of an EHP attack, but what then? If more than one client is connected, as is inevitable given the multiplexing philosophy of the EDA, it is not feasible to interrupt the hung request without disrupting the other clients, nor it does seem straightforward to identify which client was responsible. In contrast, first-class timeouts will produce a `TimeoutError` at some point during the handling of the malicious request, permitting exception handling logic to easily respond by dropping the client and, perhaps, adding them to a blacklist.

Other avenues toward EHP-safety. In §4 we described two ways to achieve EHP-safety within the existing EDA paradigm. Other approaches are also viable but they depart from the EDA paradigm. Significantly increasing the size of the Worker Pool, performing speculative concurrent execution [48], or switching to preemptable callbacks and tasks could each prevent or reduce the impact of EHP attacks. However, each of these is a variation on the same theme: dedicating isolated execution resources to each client, a road that leads to the One Thread Per Client Architecture. The recent development of serverless architectures [70] is yet another form of the OTPCA, with the load balancing role played by a vendor rather than the service provider. If the server community wishes to use the EDA, which offers high responsiveness and scalability through the use of coop-

erative multitasking, we believe first-class timeouts are a good path to EHP-safety.

Generalizability. Our first-class timeouts technique can be applied to any EDA framework. Callbacks must be made interruptible, and tasks must be made abortable. While these properties are more readily obtained in an interpreted language, they could in principle be enforced in compiled or VM-based languages as well.

9 Related Work

JavaScript and Node.js. Ojamaa and Duuna assessed the security risks in Node.js applications [79]. Their analysis included ReDoS and other expensive computation as a means of blocking the event loop, though they overlooked the risks of I/O and the fact that the small Worker Pool makes its poisoning possible. Two recent studies have explored the incidence and impact of ReDoS in the Node.js ecosystem [92, 53].

Our preliminary work [52] sketched EHP attacks and advocated Constant Worst-Case Execution Time partitioning as a solution. However, analysis in the present work reports that this approach imposes significant refactoring costs and is an ad hoc security mechanism (§4.3).

Other works have identified the use of untrusted third-party modules as a common liability in Node.js applications. DeGroef et al. proposed a reference monitor approach to securely integrate third-party modules from *npm* [55]. Vasilakis et al. went a step further in their BreakApp system, providing strong isolation guarantees at module boundaries with dynamic policy enforcement at runtime [95]. The BreakApp approach is complete enough that it can be used to defeat EHP attacks, through what might be called Second-Class Timeouts. Our work mistrusts particular *instructions* and permits the delivery of `TimeoutErrors` at arbitrary points in sequential code, while these reference monitor approaches mistrust *modules* and thus only permit the delivery of `TimeoutErrors` at module boundaries. In addition, moving modules to separate processes in order to handle EHP attacks incurs significant performance overheads at start-up and larger performance overheads than *Node.cure* at run-time, and places more responsibility on developers to understand implementation details in their dependencies.

Static analysis can be used to identify a number of vulnerabilities in JavaScript and Node.js applications. Guarnieri and Livshits demonstrated static analyses to eliminate the use of vulnerable language features or program behaviors in the client-side context [65]. Staicu et al. offered static analyses and dynamic policy enforcement to prevent command injection vulnerabilities in Node.js applications [93]. Static taint analysis for JavaScript, as proposed by Tripp et al., enables the detection of other injection attacks as well [94]. The techniques in these works can detect the possibility of EHP

attacks that exploit known-vulnerable APIs (e.g. I/O such as `fs.readFile`), but not those exploiting arbitrary computation. Our first-class timeouts approach is instead a dynamic detect-and-respond defense against EHP attacks.

More broadly, other research on the EDA has studied client-side JavaScript/Web [71, 69, 54, 76] and Java/Android [59, 58, 43, 68, 72] applications. These have often focused on platform-specific issues such as DOM issues in web browsers [71].

Embedded systems. Time is precious in embedded systems as well. Lyons et al. proposed the use of `TimeoutErrors` in mixed-criticality systems to permit higher-priority tasks to interrupt lower-priority tasks [74]. Their approach incorporates timeouts as a notification mechanism for processes that have overrun their time slices, toying with preemption in a non-preemptive operating system. Our work is similar in principle but differs significantly in execution.

Denial of Service attacks. Research on DoS can be broadly divided into network-level attacks (e.g. DDoS attacks) and application-level attacks [41]. Since EHP attacks exploit the semantics of the application, they are application-level attacks, not easily defeated by network-level defenses.

DoS attacks seek to exhaust the resources critical to the proper operation of a server, and various kinds of exhaustion have been considered. The brunt of the literature has focused on exhausting the CPU, e.g. via worst-case performance [75, 51, 50, 90, 80], infinite recursion [49], and infinite loops [91, 45]. We are not aware of prior research work that incurs DoS using the file system, as do our ReadDoS attacks, though we have found a handful of CVE reports to this effect¹³.

Our work identifies and shows how to exploit and protect the most limited resource of the EDA: Event Handlers. Although we prove our point using previously-reported attacks such as ReDoS, the underlying resource we are exhausting is not the CPU but the small, fixed-size set of Event Handlers deployed in EDA-based services.

Practitioner awareness. The server-side EDA practitioner community is aware of the risk of DoS due to EHP on the Event Loop. A common rule of thumb is “Don’t block the Event Loop”, advised by many tutorials as well as recent books about EDA programming for Node.js [96, 47]. Wandschneider suggests worst-case linear-time partitioning on the Event Loop [96], while Casciaro advises developers to partition any computation on the Event Loop, and to offload computationally expensive tasks to the Worker Pool [47]. Our work offers a

more complete evaluation of EHP attacks, and in particular we extend the rule of “Don’t block the Event Loop” to the Worker Pool.

Future work. Automatically identifying modules with computationally expensive paths would permit detecting EHP vulnerabilities in advance. As future work, we believe that research into computational complexity estimation ([81, 66, 86]) and measurement ([87, 63, 46]) might be adapted to the Node.js context for EHP vulnerability detection.

10 Reproducibility

Everything needed to reproduce our results is available at <https://github.com/VTLeeLab/node-cure> — scripts for our analysis of the Snyk.io vulnerability database, links to our contributions to the Node.js community, and the source code for the *Node.cure* prototype.

11 Conclusion

The Event-Driven Architecture (EDA) holds great promise for scalable web services, and it is increasingly popular in the software development community. In this paper we defined Event Handler Poisoning (EHP) attacks, which exploit the cooperative multitasking at the heart of the EDA. We showed that EHP attacks occur in practice already, and as the EDA rises in popularity we believe that EHP attacks will become an increasingly critical DoS vector. The Node.js community has endorsed our expression of this problem, hosting our guide to avoiding EHP attacks on nodejs.org.

We proposed two defenses against EHP attacks, and prototyped the more promising: first-class timeouts. Our prototype, *Node.cure*, enables the detection and defeat of all known EHP attacks, with low overhead. Our findings can be directly applied by the EDA community, and we hope they influence the design of existing and future EDA frameworks.

Acknowledgments

We thank the reviewers for their helpful feedback, as well as Adam Doupe for his shepherding. Snyk.io was kind enough to provide a dump of their vulnerability database for *npm*, which C. Coghlan helped us analyze. J.D. Greef of Ronomon suggested the EHP attacks listed in the discussion. A. Kazerouni, S. Rahaman, and the Virginia Tech Systems Reading Group were helpful sounding boards for our ideas and manuscripts, as were M. Hicks, G. Wang, and D. Yao.

¹³For DoS by reading the slow file `/dev/random`, see CVE-2012-1987 and CVE-2016-6896. For a related DOS by reading large files, CVE-2001-0834, CVE-2008-1353, CVE-2011-1521, and CVE-2015-5295 mention DoS by memory exhaustion using `/dev/zero`.

References

- [1] *2017 User Survey Executive Summary*. The Linux Foundation.
- [2] ab – apache http server benchmarking tool. <https://httpd.apache.org/docs/2.4/programs/ab.html>.
- [3] acmeair-node. <https://github.com/acmeair/acmeair-nodejs>.
- [4] Cylon.js. <https://cylonjs.com/>.
- [5] express. <https://github.com/expressjs/express>.
- [6] Gnu libc – posix safety concepts. https://www.gnu.org/software/libc/manual/html_node/POIX-Safety-Concepts.html.
- [7] Ibm node-red. <https://nodered.org/>.
- [8] iot-nodejs. <https://github.com/ibm-watson-iot/iot-nodejs>.
- [9] Koa. <https://github.com/koajs/koa>.
- [10] libuv. <https://github.com/libuv/libuv>.
- [11] Lokijs. <https://github.com/techfort/LokiJS>.
- [12] Node-oniguruma regexp library. <https://github.com/atom/node-oniguruma>.
- [13] Node security platform. <https://nodesecurity.io/advisories>.
- [14] Node.js. <http://nodejs.org/>.
- [15] Nodejs async hooks. https://nodejs.org/api/async_hooks.html.
- [16] Node.js foundation members. <https://foundation.nodejs.org/about/members>.
- [17] Node.js thread pool documentation. <http://docs.libuv.org/en/v1.x/threadpool.html>.
- [18] Node.js usage: Statistics for websites using node.js technologies. <https://trends.builtwith.com/framework/node.js>.
- [19] Regex.matchtimeout property. <https://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/system.text.regularexpressions.regex.matchtimeout>.
- [20] restify. <https://github.com/restify/node-restify>.
- [21] sails. <https://github.com/balderdashy/sails>.
- [22] Snyk.io. <https://snyk.io/vuln/>.
- [23] three.js. <https://github.com/mrdoob/three.js>.
- [24] Twisted. <https://twistedmatrix.com/trac/>.
- [25] Vert.x. <http://vertx.io/>.
- [26] webtorrent. <https://github.com/webtorrent/webtorrent>.
- [27] ws: a node.js websocket library. <https://github.com/websockets/ws>.
- [28] The Calendar and Contacts Server. <https://github.com/Apple/Ccs-calendarserver>, 2007.
- [29] Ubuntu One: Technical Details. <https://wiki.ubuntu.com/UbuntuOne/TechnicalDetails>, 2012.
- [30] New node.js foundation survey reports new “full stack” in demand among enterprise developers. <https://nodejs.org/en/blog/announcements/nodejs-foundation-survey/>, 2016.
- [31] The linux foundation: Case study: Node.js. https://www.linuxfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/LF_CaseStudy_NodeJS_20170613.pdf, 2017.
- [32] Microsoft’s Node.js Guidelines. <https://github.com/Microsoft/nodejs-guidelines>, 2017.
- [33] Random(4). <http://man7.org/linux/man-pages/man4/random.4.html>, 2017.
- [34] This is what node.js is used for in 2017 – survey results. <https://blog.risingstack.com/what-is-node-js-used-for-2017-survey/>, 2017.
- [35] Digital Transformation with the Node.js DevOps Stack. <https://pages.nodesource.com/digital-transformation-devops-stack-tw.html>, 2018.
- [36] Node.js at IBM. <https://developer.ibm.com/node/>, 2018.
- [37] Node.js v10.1.0: C++ Addons. <https://nodejs.org/api/addons.html>, 2018.
- [38] Node.js v10.1.0: N-API. <https://nodejs.org/api/n-api.html>, 2018.
- [39] Node.js v10.3.0 Documentation: crypto.randomBytes. https://nodejs.org/api/crypto.html#crypto_crypto_randombytes_size_callback, 2018.
- [40] ABDALKAREEM, R., NOURRY, O., WEHAIBI, S., MUJAHID, S., AND SHIHAB, E. Why Do Developers Use Trivial Packages? An Empirical Case Study on npm. In *Foundations of Software Engineering (FSE)* (2017).
- [41] ABLIZ, M. Internet Denial of Service Attacks and Defense Mechanisms. Tech. rep., 2011.
- [42] ALIMADADI, S., MESBAH, A., AND PATTABIRAMAN, K. Understanding Asynchronous Interactions in Full-Stack JavaScript. In *International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)* (2016).
- [43] BARRERA, D., KAYACIK, H. G., VAN OORSCHOT, P. C., AND SOMAYAJI, A. A methodology for empirical analysis of permission-based security models and its application to android. In *Computer and Communications Security (CCS)* (2010).
- [44] BRODU, E., FRÉNOT, S., AND OBLÉ, F. Toward automatic update from callbacks to Promises. In *Workshop on All-Web Real-Time Systems (AWeS)* (2015).
- [45] BURNIM, J., JALBERT, N., STERGIU, C., AND SEN, K. Looper: Lightweight detection of infinite loops at runtime. In *International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)* (2009).
- [46] BURNIM, J., JUVEKAR, S., AND SEN, K. WISE: Automated Test Generation for Worst-Case Complexity. In *International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)* (2009).
- [47] CASCIARO, M. *Node.js Design Patterns*, 1 ed. 2014.
- [48] CHADHA, G., MAHLKE, S., AND NARAYANASAMY, S. Accelerating Asynchronous Programs Through Event Sneak Peek. In *International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)* (2015).
- [49] CHANG, R., JIANG, G., IVANČIĆ, F., SANKARANARAYANAN, S., AND SHMATIKOV, V. Inputs of coma: Static detection of denial-of-service vulnerabilities. In *IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium (CSF)* (2009).
- [50] CROSBY, S. Denial of service through regular expressions. *USENIX Security work in progress report* (2003).
- [51] CROSBY, S. A., AND WALLACH, D. S. Denial of Service via Algorithmic Complexity Attacks. In *USENIX Security* (2003).
- [52] DAVIS, J., KILDOW, G., AND LEE, D. The Case of the Poisoned Event Handler: Weaknesses in the Node.js Event-Driven Architecture. In *European Workshop on Systems Security (EuroSec)* (2017).

- [53] DAVIS, J. C., COGLAN, C. A., SERVANT, F., AND LEE, D. The Impact of Regular Expression Denial of Service (ReDoS) in Practice: an Empirical Study at the Ecosystem Scale. In *The ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (ESEC/FSE)* (2018).
- [54] DE GROEF, W., DEVRIESE, D., NIKIFORAKIS, N., AND PIESSENS, F. Flowfox: A web browser with flexible and precise information flow control. *Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*.
- [55] DE GROEF, W., MASSACCI, F., AND PIESSENS, F. NodeSentry: Least-privilege library integration for server-side JavaScript. In *Annual Computer Security Applications Conference (ACSAC)* (2014).
- [56] DEBILL, E. Module counts. <http://www.modulecounts.com/>.
- [57] DESAI, A., GUPTA, V., JACKSON, E., QADEER, S., RAJAMANI, S., AND ZUFFEREY, D. P. Safe asynchronous event-driven programming. In *ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI)* (2013).
- [58] ENCK, W., OCTEAU, D., MCDANIEL, P., AND CHAUDHURI, S. A study of android application security. In *USENIX Security* (2011).
- [59] ENCK, W., ONGTANG, M., AND MCDANIEL, P. Understanding android security. *IEEE Security and Privacy* (2009).
- [60] FERG, S. Event-driven programming: introduction, tutorial, history. 2006.
- [61] FOUNDATION, A. S. The Apache web server.
- [62] FREES, S. *C++ and Node.js Integration*. 2016.
- [63] GOLDSMITH, S. F., AIKEN, A. S., AND WILKERSON, D. S. Measuring Empirical Computational Complexity. In *Foundations of Software Engineering (FSE)* (2007).
- [64] GOOGLE. Chrome v8: Google's high performance, open source, javascript engine. <https://developers.google.com/v8/>.
- [65] GUARNIERI, S., AND LIVSHITS, V. B. GATEKEEPER: Mostly Static Enforcement of Security and Reliability Policies for JavaScript Code. *USENIX Security* (2009).
- [66] GULWANI, S., MEHRA, K. K., AND CHILIMBI, T. SPEED: Precise and Efficient Static Estimation of Program Computational Complexity. In *Principles of Programming Languages (POPL)* (2009).
- [67] HARRELL, J. Node.js at PayPal. <https://www.paypal-engineering.com/2013/11/22/node-js-at-paypal/>, 2013.
- [68] HEUSER, S., NADKARNI, A., ENCK, W., AND SADEGHI, A.-R. Asm: A programmable interface for extending android security. In *USENIX Security* (2014).
- [69] JIN, X., HU, X., YING, K., DU, W., YIN, H., AND PERI, G. N. Code injection attacks on html5-based mobile apps: Characterization, detection and mitigation. In *Computer and Communications Security (CCS)* (2014).
- [70] KOLLER, R., AND WILLIAMS, D. Will Serverless End the Dominance of Linux in the Cloud? In *Hot Topics in Operating Systems (HotOS)* (2017), pp. 169–173.
- [71] LEKIES, S., STOCK, B., AND JOHNS, M. 25 million flows later: Large-scale detection of dom-based xss. In *Computer and Communications Security (CCS)* (2013).
- [72] LIN, Y., RADOI, C., AND DIG, D. Retrofitting Concurrency for Android Applications through Refactoring. In *ACM International Symposium on Foundations of Software Engineering (FSE)* (2014).
- [73] LISTON, T. Welcome To My Tarpit: The Tactical and Strategic Use of LaBrea. <http://www.threenorth.com/LaBrea/LaBrea.txt>, 2001.
- [74] LYONS, A., MCLEOD, K., ALMATARY, H., AND HEISER, G. Scheduling-Context Capabilities: A Principled, Light-Weight Operating-System Mechanism for Managing Time. In *European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys)* (2018).
- [75] MCILROY, M. D. Killer adversary for quicksort. *Software - Practice and Experience* 29, 4 (1999), 341–344.
- [76] NIKIFORAKIS, N., INVERNIZZI, L., KAPRAVELOS, A., VAN ACKER, S., JOOSEN, W., KRUEGEL, C., PIESSENS, F., AND VIGNA, G. You are what you include: Large-scale evaluation of remote javascript inclusions. In *Computer and Communications Security (CCS)* (2012).
- [77] O'DELL, J. Exclusive: How LinkedIn used Node.js and HTML5 to build a better, faster app. <http://venturebeat.com/2011/08/16/linkedin-node/>, 2011.
- [78] O'DELL, J. Exclusive: How LinkedIn used Node.js and HTML5 to build a better, faster app, 2011.
- [79] OJAMAA, A., AND DUUNA, K. Assessing the security of Node.js platform. In *7th International Conference for Internet Technology and Secured Transactions (ICITST)* (2012).
- [80] OLIVO, O., DILLIG, I., AND LIN, C. Detecting and Exploiting Second Order Denial-of-Service Vulnerabilities in Web Applications. *ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)* (2015).
- [81] OLIVO, O., DILLIG, I., AND LIN, C. Static Detection of Asymptotic Performance Bugs in Collection Traversals. In *Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI)* (2015).
- [82] PADMANABHAN, S. How We Built eBay's First Node.js Application. <https://www.ebayinc.com/stories/blogs/tech/how-we-built-ebays-first-node-js-application/>, 2013.
- [83] PAI, V. S., DRUSCHEL, P., AND ZWAENEPOEL, W. Flash: An Efficient and Portable Web Server. In *USENIX Annual Technical Conference (ATC)* (1999).
- [84] PARIAG, D., BRECHT, T., HARJI, A., BUHR, P., SHUKLA, A., AND CHERITON, D. R. Comparing the performance of web server architectures. In *European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys)* (2007), ACM.
- [85] PETER, S., BAUMANN, A., ROSCOE, T., BARHAM, P., AND ISAACS, R. 30 seconds is not enough! In *European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys)* (2008).
- [86] PETSIOS, T., ZHAO, J., KEROMYTIS, A. D., AND JANA, S. SlowFuzz: Automated Domain-Independent Detection of Algorithmic Complexity Vulnerabilities. In *Computer and Communications Security (CCS)* (2017).
- [87] PUSCHNER, P. P., AND KOZA, C. Calculating the Maximum Execution Time of Real-Time Programs. *Real-Time Systems* 1, 2 (1989), 159–176.
- [88] RAYMOND, E. S. *The Cathedral and the Bazaar*. No. July 1997. 2000.
- [89] SILBERSCHATZ, A., GALVIN, P. B., AND GAGNE, G. *Operating System Concepts*, 9th ed. Wiley Publishing, 2012.
- [90] SMITH, R., ESTAN, C., AND JHA, S. Backtracking Algorithmic Complexity Attacks Against a NIDS. In *Annual Computer Security Applications Conference (ACSAC)* (2006), pp. 89–98.
- [91] SON, S., AND SHMATIKOV, V. SAFERPHP Finding Semantic Vulnerabilities in PHP Applications. In *Workshop on Programming Languages and Analysis for Security (PLAS)* (2011), pp. 1–13.

- [92] STAIKU, C.-A., AND PRADEL, M. Freezing the web: A study of redos vulnerabilities in javascript-based web servers. In *27th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 18)* (Baltimore, MD, 2018), USENIX Association.
- [93] STAIKU, C.-A., PRADEL, M., AND LIVSHITS, B. Synode: Understanding and Automatically Preventing Injection Attacks on Node.js. In *Network and Distributed System Security (NDSS)* (2018).
- [94] TRIPP, O., PISTOIA, M., COUSOT, P., COUSOT, R., AND GUARNIERI, S. Andromeda : Accurate and Scalable Security Analysis of Web Applications. In *International Conference on Fundamental Approaches to Software Engineering (FASE)* (2013), pp. 210–225.
- [95] VASILAKIS, N., KAREL, B., ROESSLER, N., DAUTENHAN, N., DEHON, A., AND SMITH, J. M. BreakApp: Automated, Flexible Application Compartmentalization. In *Network and Distributed System Security (NDSS)* (2018).
- [96] WANDSCHNEIDER, M. *Learning Node.js: A Hands-on Guide to Building Web Applications in JavaScript*. Pearson Education, 2013.
- [97] WELSH, M., CULLER, D., AND BREWER, E. SEDA : An Architecture for Well-Conditioned, Scalable Internet Services. In *Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP)* (2001).