

# Cryptoscope: Analyzing cryptographic usages in modern software

Micha Moffie, Omer Boehm, Anatoly Koyfman, Eyal Bin, Efrayim Sztokman, Sukanta Bhattacharjee, Meghnath Saha, and James McGugan

IBM Research

## Abstract

The advent of quantum computing poses a significant challenge as it has the potential to break certain cryptographic algorithms, necessitating a proactive approach to identify and modernize cryptographic code. Identifying these cryptographic elements in existing code is only the first step. It is crucial not only to identify quantum vulnerable algorithms but also to detect vulnerabilities and incorrect crypto usages, to prioritize, report, monitor as well as remediate and modernize code bases. A U.S. government memorandum require agencies to begin their transition to PQC (Post Quantum Cryptography) by conducting a prioritized inventory of cryptographic systems including software and hardware systems.

In this paper we describe our code scanning tool - *Cryptoscope* - which leverages cryptographic domain knowledge as well as compiler techniques to statically parse and analyze source code. By analyzing control and data flow the tool is able to build an extendable and querriable inventory of cryptography. Cryptoscope goes beyond identifying disconnected cryptographic API's and instead provides the user with an inventory of *cryptographic assets* - containing comprehensive views of the cryptographic operations implemented. We show that for more than 92% of our test cases, these views include the cryptographic operation itself, APIs, as well as the related material such as keys, nonces, random sources etc. Lastly, building on top of this inventory, our tool is able to detect and report *all* the cryptographic related weaknesses and vulnerabilities (11 out of 15) in CamBench - achieving state-of-the-art performance.

## 1 Introduction

The US National Security Memorandum [13] identifies the steps needed to address the risks posed by quantum computers and provides specific actions to be taken. Specifically, the memorandum requires inventoring cryptographic assets in deployed systems with the goal of identifying Quantum vulnerabilities and prioritizing the process of migrating the

systems to quantum-resistant cryptography. Addressing such a requirement, in organizations with large code bases is not an easy task. Not only are applications written using a plethora of programming languages and API's, importantly, the resulting inventory of cryptography must be unified, complete and consistent across all applications regardless of the implementation details. Figure 1 presents the expected input and output demonstrating the challenge.




Figure 1: Illustrating the expected input and output to clarify challenge: first, identify the implementation of cryptographic operations in source code across different programming languages in a generic manner, second, represent the complete operational semantics in a unified way.

The requirements layed out in the memorandum are not without merit, the arrival of large-scale quantum computing offers great promise to science and society, but brings with it a significant threat to our global information infrastructure. Public-key cryptography - widely used on the internet today - relies upon mathematical problems that are believed to be difficult to solve given the computational power available now. However, popular cryptographic schemes, used in public key encryption, digital signatures, key establishments, etc., that are based on these hard problems – including RSA and Elliptic

Curve Cryptography – will be easily broken by a quantum computer. This will rapidly accelerate the obsolescence of our currently deployed security systems and will have dramatic impacts on any industry where information needs to be kept secure.

The construction of an inventory of cryptographic operations (crypto assets) is essential to provide an organization with necessary information to support the process of migrating and modernizing cryptography to the quantum era. In particular, an inventory as shown in figure 2, would be able to support:




Figure 2: The use cases that are supported by a complete and unified organizational cryptographic inventory.

- Identification of existing cryptography across applications and continuous monitoring of cryptography usage within an organization
- Strengthen the ability to comply to different regulations and standards and support the enactment and enforcement of organizational wide cryptographic policies
- Assess and prioritize the different applications based on risk and locate risky application that should be mitigated
- Inform the process of application remediation with accurate findings (e.g. cryptographic use case, lines in code)
- Provide organizational wide view to support modernization and insights to enable cryptographic agility across the organization

The effectiveness of such an inventory depends mainly on the **quality** of cryptographic assets listed. An accurate, complete and concise expression of the identified cryptography must account for all the different aspects of a cryptographic operation. Consider data encryption; in this case the algorithm, operation, mode, as well as related information such as the IV, key and source of randomness are required. In essence, a complete crypto asset will convey to the user the cryptographic operation *semantics*. In addition, providing the evidences for these

findings - e.g. lines of code - is essential both for validating the results and for supporting next steps such as remediation. Importantly, incomplete or inaccurate representations of cryptographic operations semantics can result in a skewed view of the existing cryptography in the application as well as the organization as a whole, which could lead to inaccurate risk assessment, wrong prioritization and increased risk of continuously deployed weak cryptography.

In our work, we decouple the process of discovery (creating the inventory) from any specific use case. By providing as comprehensive a view as possible of the cryptographic usage in the application we expect to support a broad range of use cases. Such a separation allows for independent implementation of any one of those use cases regardless of the discovery process specific realization. Specifically, we model rules for vulnerability identification using generic cryptographic terms (based on the inventory) rather than specific language and library APIs. Thus enabling a single implementation of vulnerability identification to support a wide range of programming languages.

Our main contributions in this work are as follows: (1) A generic, language agnostic, mechanism to discover crypto-assets in source code, (2) providing the user with complete, unified cryptographic operational semantics. And, (3) a robust method to extract crypto related vulnerabilities and missuses on top of the crypto-inventory. We evaluate our approach on real world applications and crypto-related benchmark and show it is able to correctly discover crypto assets and accurately identify all crypto-related vulnerabilities and missuses - showcasing the cryptographic operation semantic completeness contained in the crypto-assets.

## 2 Overview

Implementing cryptographic algorithms and protocols often requires calling a few library API calls, usually in a predefined order, and provide specific parameters to those calls. These parameters, such as algorithm name, are often hard-coded in the code base. Often, programmers will wrap cryptographic API's in utility functions and expose a more convenient "internal" API to other modules in the code. In many of those cases, the "internal" API is parameterized to allow for more control by the calling modules. For example, the key or algorithm name could be provided by a module calling the 'internal' API. In such cases, it is essential to trace back, starting from the cryptographic API calls to the source of the cryptographic parameters (e.g. the call site to the 'internal' API) to be able to detect the exact cryptographic operation - and create a meaningful crypto-asset. Moreover, an additional complexity arises in cases where multiple calls to the 'internal' API exist - requiring us to trace the parameters back to multiple sources and possibly create multiple different crypto assets (differing only by the key size for example).

A straightforward method for identifying usage of cryptography is by simply identifying calls to standard cryptographic API's. This process is analogous to "grep" and results in low accuracy. For example, this method may identify the instantiation of an algorithm but would not be able to identify the key size it used or whether this algorithm was in fact used to perform decryption or encryption. More complex patterns could be introduced, however they will be limited to a predefined set of use cases and may not find all related API calls as only those specified within the pattern can be accounted for. Moreover, patterns, in addition to their modeling, also require maintenance and are likely to be programming language and cryptographic library API specific. These methods do not provide a generic, solid process to identify related API calls.

We are now ready to summarize the main requirements driving our design:

- Trace crypto-parameters back to detect hard coded values such as "AES/CBC/PKCS5Padding" or key size. Also, support tracing back to multiple different (e.g. call) sites, as these may represent different crypto assets
- Provide a method to identify related cryptographic API's in a generic manner

Reviewing those requirements, we find static analysis can provide much support. Specifically:

- Constant value analysis to identify hard coded values. For example, the size of the required key passed to the `KeyGenerator.init(..)` function).
- Program slicing allows us to isolate, based on a criteria, part of the program statements while preserving a subset of the program behaviour. Intuitively, it allows us to identify, for example, a set of statements that would result in a particular assignment of value to a crypto parameter - while ignoring all other statements. In turn, the crypto asset derived from this specific value, will relate to this particular slice. In the example above, one could imagine each call to the "internal" API as a different slice of the program - exhibiting a particular behaviour summarized in a separate crypto asset. A thorough explanation on program slicing can be found in [43].
- Identify related API calls by tracing cryptographic objects (on which methods are invoked) as well as cryptographic parameters (which may be a result of other cryptographic calls) by using data and control flow analysis.

In our design we make use of these exact static analysis algorithms to create program slices, identify related crypto API calls and find values of hard coded crypto parameters. We will provide more details in following sections.

Before we continue, we provide some background on the crypto assets defined in the CBOM (Cryptographic Bill of

Material) - the building blocks of the inventory - and discuss several important issues.

### Crypto Asset

The Cryptography Bill of Materials (CBOM) is part of CycloneDX v1.6 standard [26]. Its goal is to extend the Software Bill of Materials (SBOM) - which was originally designed to be used in application security and supply chain component analysis - with the ability to express cryptography. The CBOM includes a new component of type *crypto-asset* which includes a description of a usage of a cryptographic certificate, protocol or algorithm using terminology from the cryptography domain such as primitive, variant, mode, function etc. Specifically, a crypto asset will include:

- All relevant crypto properties as well as related crypto material (such as private/public/secret keys, initialization vector, salt, digest, signature and password) - if any.
- The relevant context and evidences for the cryptographic operation - API calls, relevant crypto parameters and their locations in the code.

Our modeling is consistent with the CBOM standard definition. Currently, Cryptoscope supports assets of type algorithm and related crypto material; protocols and certificates are left for a future release.

### Semantic completeness

While the CBOM defines a way to describe, and store cryptographic information it does not require nor define the expected completeness or semantics of a crypto asset. In fact, the user of the CBOM has the flexibility to use the CBOM to describe solely a primitive (algorithm) such as a signature, based, for example, on a single cryptographic API. Or, alternatively, describe a more semantically complete operation containing a primitive (e.g. encryption), variant (e.g. AES), mode (GCM), operation (decrypt), key size (256) and the initialization vector - by analyzing multiple related cryptographic API's. Although both cases can result in a valid and legal CBOM, its contents and quality can make a huge difference to downstream users; the more complete the description is - the better policy enforcement, vulnerability identification, and support for remediation would become.

### Language independence

Crypto assets are effectively language-independent since all the crypto properties and related crypto materials use terminology taken from the domain of cryptography. This is an important property as it (1) provides for a unified view regardless of the input programming language and (2) abstracts away implementation details allowing for later consumers e.g. policy enforcement tools or vulnerability detectors etc.

to focus on the cryptography. For example, insecure usage of SHA-1, a known vulnerable message digest algorithm, can be easily identified using a single check of the asset property "variant", rather than accounting for a particular programming language and specific library API implementations.

### Meaningfull crypto assets

To illustrate and clarify what a crypto asset is, we provide examples - code snippets - and discuss the expected results. As stated above, our goal is to discover cryptographic operations. Therefore, our guiding principal is to identify that a cryptographic action has actually been performed. Specifically, to obtain a meaningful expression of the usage of cryptography, we differentiate between "Usage of a cryptographic algorithm" and "Usage of cryptographic library API calls". For example, `cipher.getInstance("AES")` **will not** - by itself - be considered a crypto asset unless `cipher.doFinal()` is followed later in the code - resulting in encryption (or decryption) to be performed.

Moreover, since software is built in abstraction layers - each layer may abstract some of the crypto details - we identify the asset in one single layer. In particular, the cryptographic function calls identified as part of an asset will be those belonging to a standard library such as JCA [25] or BouncyCastle [24]. (These are also encoded in our Knowledge base.) Barring such a definition, the discovery process could theoretically identify crypto assets for the same crypto operation multiple times across different abstraction layers.

Consider the two code segments in listing 1 - the first contains a "sign" operation while the second is performing "key generation" operation (using JCA API's). Both of these **will** result in crypto assets:

```
Signature ecdsa = Signature.getInstance("
    SHA256withECDSA");
ecdsa.initSign(key);
ecdsa.update(cri.toByteArray());
ecdsa.sign();

KeyPairGenerator pairGen = KeyPairGenerator.
    getInstance("RSA");
pairGen.initialize(2048);
KeyPair keyPair = pairGen.generateKeyPair();
```

Listing 1: Code samples where JCA API's are called, a crypto operation is performed and a crypto asset will be created.

In contrast, listing 2 shows code snippets that **will not** contain crypto assets. The first snippet constructs a certificate from a certificate stream while the second snippet is reading an existing key from a key store. In both cases no cryptographic operations are involved as they have already been performed prior to the reading of the data.

```
CertificateFactory factory =
    CertificateFactory.getInstance("X.509");
```

```
factory.generateCertificate(
    certificateStream);

KeyStore k = KeyStore.getInstance("PKCS12");
PrivateKey tmpPrv = pkEntry.getPrivateKey();
```

Listing 2: Code samples where JCA API's are called - but no crypto is performed. No crypto asset will be created.

Listing 3 shows another example where code abstracting standard API calls and therefore **will not** result in crypto assets. As mentioned above, only standard crypto library API calls are identified. (Similarly, custom, homegrown, cryptographic implementations will not be identified in the current implementation.) Note, that the implementation of the `MyHash.sha256` method may contain an asset.

```
String text = "my bytes";
MyHash hash = new MyHash();
bytes digest = hash.sha256(text.getBytes());
```

Listing 3: Code sample where JCA API's are abstracted. No crypto asset will be created for the code shown.

## 3 Implementation

A high level overview of Cryptoscope is shown in figure 3 and is composed out of 4 stages. The discovery process begins with source code (and binaries) and ends with the discovered crypto-assets.




Figure 3: Crypto-asset discovery. The four stages of the static analysis pipeline: parsing the code, analyzing control and data flow, building slices based on crypto relevant criteria and finally constructing crypto assets for each slice.

In the first stage, source code is tokenized and parsed (using Antlr [28]) into an AST (Abstract Syntax Tree). The AST is used in the next stage to analyze the program blocks relationships and build in-memory data flow, control flow and call graphs. These constructs are further used in later stages.



Depending on the programming language, data types are identified in this stage (e.g. Java) or in the following stage (e.g. Python).

The Slicer performs backwards slicing on all statements in the code with matching slicing criterion<sup>1</sup> (encoded in the knowledge base.). The slicing criteria is defined as an API call which completes the sequence of crypto calls and is the one that performs the operation such as `Cipher.doFinal()`, or `signature.verify(sig)`<sup>2</sup>. The Slicer identifies all program statements that influence the selected slicing criterion. The collected statements are divided according to their context, i.e. the control flow that led to them, and are enriched with inferred values. Each such "contextual" set of statements along with their corresponding arguments values are used to construct a slice.

The last stage constructs crypto assets. Here, each slice is analyzed separately. The slice already includes - by definition - all the relevant pieces of information for the cryptographic operation and once crypto properties are collected (using our knowledge base) - a complete crypto asset can be constructed. Specifically, as mentioned above, the analysis is required to (1) identify values of the arguments of cryptographic API's and (2) 'string together' related API calls. To address the first we employ interprocedural constant value analysis to derive constant values. To address the second, we first define related API calls as follows: (I) A result of one API call is passed to (used by) another API call as a parameter. (II) API methods are called using the same instance/object. We then detect these two relationships on each slice by tracing data flowing through the program statements .

The resulting crypto asset contains all the information that was required for the execution of the cryptographic algorithm, e.g., an encryption algorithm that uses a cipher instantiation method, cipher initialization method, secret keys generation methods, and the actual encryption operation method. Similarly, a signature algorithm will include an instantiation using schema, the generated keys, and the actual sign or verify operations.

## Knowledge base

The knowledge base (KB) contains all the information required to support the various steps during the discovery process. Importantly, all the required information is described using cryptographic terms that are independent of the programming language or the specific cryptographic library being used.

At the heart of the KB lie the descriptions of cryptographic API calls from standard cryptographic libraries in different programming languages. The description includes the func-

<sup>1</sup>Note, the slicing is performed on high level code requiring some adjustments to the algorithms

<sup>2</sup>The slicing criteria can be defined differently, in some cases it will require forward slicing or both backwards and forward slicing.

tion signatures and the identification of the crypto relevant parameters. In addition, the KB includes the *association* between the cryptographic calls and their parameter values and the cryptographic properties - effectively encoding the relevant cryptographic operational semantics.

Consider the simple code segment in listing 4.

```
...  
Cipher c = Cipher.getInstance("AES/GCM/  
    NoPadding");  
...
```

Listing 4: A simple call to one of JCA's `Cipher.getInstance` API.

The `getInstance()` method of `Cipher` class in JCA [25] has the following alternatives:

- `getInstance(String transformation)`
- `getInstance(String transformation, Provider provider)`
- `getInstance(String transformation, String provider)`

Each one will be encoded separately in the KB. The first parameter in all the alternatives will be identified as crypto relevant and marked as a crypto parameter containing "transformation" semantics. Next, for each encoding of the transformation, e.g. "AES", "DES" or "AES/CBC/PKCS5Padding", we associate the API name and the value of its first parameter with a list of predefined crypto properties. For example, `getInstance("AES")` will be associated with "blockcipher" (primitive property), "AES" algorithm (variant property), "CBC" (mode property), "PKCS5" padding, as well as block size of 128 bits, and key size of 128 bits - all according to the documentation of the library. The `provider` parameter is an example of cryptographically irrelevant parameter and will be identified as such.

In addition, related crypto materials may be extracted from API's and parameters with in a similar fashion. Every type of related cryptographic material has its corresponding crypto semantic (e.g. a private key, an initialization vector, a seed, salt, etc.), and is analyzed and associated based on the API, parameter value (if any) and parameter semantics. Finally, as explained above, the function that completes the cryptographic operation (e.g. `Cipher.doFinal()`) will be marked as a criterion for the extraction of cryptographic relevant slices.

Importantly, the association described for the `getInstance()` method above, does **not** include all the information needed to describe the complete cryptographic operation - demonstrating the need to identify related API calls. Specifically:

- The actual operation, either "encrypt" or "decrypt" that is performed may be extracted from the information

associated with the value of the first parameter in the `init(...)` function executed on the same Cipher instance.

- The value of the initialization vector that was used (if any) for the "encrypt" operation may be extracted during the construction of the third parameter `ParameterSpec` of the `init(...)`, depending on functions used and parameter values being passed.

## 4 Evaluation

In this section we evaluate Cryptoscope and validate the following:

1. Cryptoscope is able to correctly and accurately identify the cryptography performed in real world applications.
2. The analysis runtime is reasonable; meaning, the tool would be able to scan hundreds of applications in a matter of hours.
3. The inventory of crypto assets can accurately convey the crypto *semantics* and support different use cases.

This section is split into two parts. The first part, addressing the discovery of cryptography, is presented in section 4.1 and addresses points (1) and (2). The second, in section 4.2 addresses points (3). Specifically, we implement one of the use cases, vulnerability detection, on top of the inventory and evaluate and compare its effectiveness against state-of-the-art vulnerability detection tools.

### 4.1 Discovery

#### 4.1.1 Experimental setup

As no standard benchmark exists for crypto discovery, we construct a data set we believe is representative of real world application. Specifically, we identify seven java, open source, real world applications that exhibit different cryptographic usage patterns. These open source projects, shown in table 1 have been chosen for their popularity as well as inclusion of a variety of cryptographic operations. The table includes indication of each projects popularity, measured by both stars and forks, as well as information showcasing activity (last modified<sup>3</sup>), size (number of java files) and the number of java files containing cryptography.

Next, we semi-automatically analyze the data set and create a reference inventory. This process effectively labels our data set with expected crypto-assets. For simplicity, an asset in our manually labeled inventory will include only the most important information and cryptographic properties as follows:

- API location (file name, line number).
- The API itself (e.g., `javax.crypto.Cipher.doFinal`)
- The cryptography algorithm being used (e.g., AES, 3DES, SHA-256, etc.)
- The cryptographic function (e.g. `keygen`, `digest`, `verify`)
- The mode, if applicable (e.g., CBC, GCM, ECB)
- The key size in bits, if applicable (e.g., 1024, 2048, 4096)

The process of labeling can be viewed as a 3 step process.

1. *Filtering*. In this step we filter all files in each of the projects to identify those that have cryptographic operations in them. This process can be accomplished, with relatively high accuracy, by "grep"-ing crypto relevant imports such as `java.security` or `javax.crypto`
2. *LLM based labeling*. In this step we used LLM's, *ChatGPT-4o* [4] and *Mistral-Large-2407* [3], to assist with generating crypto-assets. The LLM was provided with a file suspected of containing cryptographic operations and was instructed to assess the file for the existence of crypto and produce a Json summary.
3. *Manual labeling*. This step consists of the review of the LLM output, identify missing or erroneous crypto assets and validating that each crypto asset is complete and accurate. It is important to note that this step was found to be essential. The LLM labeling was performed without any tuning and as such produced results which we often used as a starting point. In many cases crypto-assets were partially identified, contained inaccuracies or even completely missing.

Overall, creating a reference inventory is a labourious task due to the LLM's low reliability with regard to identifying all crypto assets, cryptographic APIs and related properties. We posit that the LLM's performance could be enhanced through more rigorous prompt engineering and/or fine-tuning. Moreover, manual labeling presented significant challenges as well. Labels were often refined during peer review processes and when our understanding of cryptography and APIs deepened. This peer reviewed, iterative labeling and refinement process increased our confidence in the quality of the labels.

Overall, at the end of the process our inventory contained 97 crypto-assets. Each asset represents cryptographic information contained within a single file; if, for example, a key is set outside the file and passed as a parameter, the key size property will not be present in the crypto-asset. Table 2 shows a breakdown of the cryptographic assets identified across the different projects.

<sup>3</sup>Reviewed at the end of December 2024

repository name	stars	forks	last modified	Java files	Java files with cryptography
Mastercard/client-encryption-java	117	71	1 month ago	86	6
Peergos/Peergos	2005	165	1 month ago	831	5
apache/httpcomponents-client	1467	973	2 days ago	775	5
andy-goryachev/PasswordSafe	18	0	1 year ago	689	7
hyperchain/javasdk	67	37	2 years ago	395	11
wultra/powerauth-crypto	56	22	2 months ago	102	9
hyperledger/fabric-sdk-java	1119	708	2 months ago	300	6

Table 1: Discovery reference open source projects. We provide the repository of each one of the reference projects, indication of its relevance (starts, forks and last modification date) as well as the number of overall java files containing cryptography.

name	sign	digest	encrypt	verify	tag	keygen	key-derive	decrypt	en-/de-capsulate	total
client-encryption-java		1	1			1		2	2	7
Peergos		4			3					7
httpcomponents-client		9								9
PasswordSafe	1	1	3	1		1		7		14
javasdk	7	5	4	3		7	2	6		34
powerauth-crypto	2	3	1	1	3	4	1	1		16
fabric-sdk-java	2	2		2		4				10
<b>total</b>	12	25	9	7	6	17	3	16	2	97

Table 2: Discovery reference open source crypto asset breakdown. The table shows the number of different types of crypto assets - based on the crypto function - across each of our projects.

#### 4.1.2 Methodology

We view the discovery task as a classification task and measure the true positive (TP) rate, false positive (FP) rate and false negative (FN) rate<sup>4</sup>. Using these results we can determine precision and recall.

Next, we describe the criteria we use to match Cryptoscope findings to our labels.

- **Exact Match.** An exact match occurs if all properties were found exactly as we expected in the label. specifically:
  - Identical code line numbers, API calls, cryptographic function, and cryptography algorithms.
  - Where applicable: Identical mode and/or key size<sup>5</sup>.
- **Partial Match.** A partial match occurs when the line and API call were correctly found but other crypto properties were missing or incorrect. (A partial match, albeit with incomplete or inaccurate properties, would be beneficial for the developer as it would allow her to manually

<sup>4</sup>We do not measure true negative as "everything" other than a crypto asset is considered a true negative

<sup>5</sup>Note: in cases where we could not label (manually resolve) a mode or keysize based on the single file, we assigned null. If in such case Cryptoscope was able to find these properties in another file, we considered this a match. This assumption was made to allow for reasonable labeling effort by avoiding analysing whole projects to manually find callers for each such asset.

inspect and address any missing or inaccurate crypto properties)

It is important to note that our evaluation is qualitative. A keen observer will notice that a single (reference) label, crypto asset, assigned to a set of API calls in a file, may in fact represent multiple assets in different execution paths. Consider for example a function implementing decryption. In our reference inventory, a label will reference API calls in the function body. However, if a parameter to the function represents a key or a mode the label will not contain related properties such as key size or mode (as this information is not available in the file). In contrast, when considering an entire project - as does Cryptoscope - multiple execution paths with calls to the decrypt function may be discovered - each with a specific key or mode. Thus, in our evaluation we try to match each label to at least a single asset, in a single execution path, Cryptoscope generates. Multiple matches to a single label may exist - in such a case, we essentially "collapse" a set of matches to a single label.

#### 4.1.3 Accuracy

The results of the evaluation are presented in table 3. The table shows, for each crypto function, the number of expected crypto assets, missed crypto assets (false negatives) as well as the number of matched and partially matched assets. In addition we provide the recall (based on full and partial matches) as well as false positives and precision.

crypto_function	no. crypto assets	false negative	match (partial)	recall (partial)	false positive	precision
digest	25	1	24	96%		100%
encrypt	9		7 (2)	78% (100%)		100%
decrypt	16		13 (3)	81% (100%)		100%
keygen	17	1	15 (1)	88% (94%)	2	88%
verify	7		7	100%		100%
sign	12		12	100%		100%
encapsulate	1		1	100%		100%
decapsulate	1		1	100%		100%
keyderive	3		3	100%		100%
tag	6		6	100%		100%
<b>total:</b>	97	2	89 (6)	92% (98%)	2	97%

Table 3: Crypto asset discovery coverage. Each line represents crypto assets of a specific crypto function. We present the number of false negative (misses), correct and partial matches, recall (based on the matches), false positive and precision.

Looking at the results, we can see that overall, Cryptoscope is able to correctly identify 92% of the assets and 98% if we allow partial matches - while keeping a very low false positive rate. A thorough analysis of the results reveals several reasons for misses or partial matches, chief among them are gaps in the data flow analysis. One example occurs when a value of an enumeration field is accessed and used as a parameter. Additionally, in our current implementation, we limit the static analysis to the application code. This means that dependent libraries are not analyzed and the analysis of the data flow in those paths is incomplete. This limitation is not inherent and can be removed, but will cost in increased run time. To summarize, overall, albeit the gaps that will be addressed in future versions, these results showcase the effectiveness of our tool and robustness of the design and implementation.

Lastly, Cryptoscope results show a very high precision rate. The two false positives occur when Cryptoscope assigns a crypto asset (key generation) to code effectively loading keys into memory. This is mainly a matter of definition: during the labeling process we took a very narrow view and assign key generation only when a key bytes are randomly generated (e.g. using `keyGenerator.generateKey()`). Although this behavior can easily be modified by adjusting the knowledge base, in practice, we believe this information might be very useful to developers to understand which keys and from where those keys are loaded into the application.

#### 4.1.4 Runtime

In this section we evaluate the performance of Cryptoscope in terms of execution time. Our experimental setup includes a 64-bit Windows 11 running on a Intel Core I9 machine with 64GB of RAM. All of our experiments have been executed on this machine, with the goal of validating a reasonable runtime. Note that there are no stringent requirements on the speed of Cryptoscope and we expect it to be executed offline most of the time.

Table 4 shows the run time of Cryptoscope for each project.

name	lines	runtime (sec.)
client-encryption-java	8531	18
Peergos	116297	40
httpcomponents-client	127045	36
PasswordSafe	109189	51
javasdk	63565	52
powerauth-crypto	14601	14
fabric-sdk-java	54832	215

Table 4: Discovery execution time. The table shows the number of lines in each project and Cryptoscope runtime measured in seconds.

The results show variations of scanning rates across different projects. This is due to the filtering Cryptoscope employs to speed up the scanning. The filtering process removes non-crypto related files from the analysis. The filtering method essentially builds a call graph, identifies nodes where crypto API's are being called and prunes all other branches (the pruning is done at a file level granularity). Overall, the average speed observed was about 1650 lines per second. We believe this rate would be more than sufficient to perform scanning of hundreds or thousands of applications in large organizations within a reasonable time frame.

## 4.2 Vulnerability detection

In this section we show how we apply the inventory to identify crypto related vulnerabilities and provide state of the art accuracy when compared to specialized vulnerability detection tools. We first provide a short review of our approach and then evaluate its effectiveness.

### 4.2.1 Approach

Cryptographic vulnerabilities are often caused by lack of thorough understanding of the cryptographic assumptions and



guarantees. Moreover, complex API's exacerbate the confusion and increase the likelihood of misuse. Common vulnerabilities include using insecure algorithms, insecure key generation or derivation as well as failure to provide sufficiently random nonces.

Identifying such vulnerabilities requires us to detect the cryptographic operation as well as all the related crypto material such as keys and nonces. This information is already captured by Cryptoscope and encoded in every one of the crypto-assets in the inventory. As a result, a relatively simple set of rules could be applied on each crypto-asset to identify vulnerabilities. Note, that one of the benefits of our approach is the fact that these rules are encoded using only information provided in the inventory. Since the crypto-assets are language independent - the rules detecting cryptographic vulnerabilities are therefore language agnostic as well. In essence, the process of vulnerability detection is decoupled from the discovery process.

The vulnerability analysis flow, shown in figure 4, uses the identified crypto assets and examines them for known vulnerabilities. The analysis is designed to be language-independent addressing only crypto vulnerabilities, so that a single analysis implementation will produce the same result over the usage of a broken cipher implemented in Java, Python, or other programming language. For example, it can assess the strength of a cipher based on its variant, its mode, the padding scheme, the key lengths, etc. Similarly, it can verify that the used algorithms are compliant with a given policy or if an algorithm is quantum-safe according to that policy e.g. by NIST [22] or the NSA [23] (i.e. CNSA 2.0 [2]).




Figure 4: vulnerability identification flow Crypto-asset discovery. The four stages of the static analysis pipeline: parsing the code, analyzing control and data flow, building slices based on crypto relevant criteria and finally constructing crypto assets for each slice.

Table 5 lists the main vulnerabilities identified by Cryptoscope. The table lists the related Mitre CWEs (Common Weakness Enumeration), the short descriptions as well as a

the logic used to identify it based on the crypto asset<sup>6</sup>. In addition, Cryptoscope is able to identify more than a dozen "code smells" and unwanted patterns (their descriptions and functionality are beyond the scope of the paper).

The vulnerabilities generated by Cryptoscope are associated with a given crypto asset and contain all the relevant information. Specifically, they contain a unique id, reference to documentation from a trusted source (e.g Mitre CWEs or FIPS guidelines), reference to related crypto material, and list of the source code evidences. A vulnerability evidence is a reference to a crypto finding: such as a crypto property, related crypto material, or an argument of a function call. The specific finding depends on the vulnerability type. Listing 5 shows an example of the output produced by Cryptoscope for a vulnerability caused by an unsafe algorithm which includes findings (evidences) of an API call - its location in the code and its argument value.

```
{
  "vulnerabilityId": "2",
  "classification": "cwe327",
  "vulnerabilityScore": "Major",
  "vulnerabilityDocumentationReference": "
    https://cwe.mitre.org/data/definitions/327.html",
  "debugMessage": "Use of broken or risky
    cryptographic algorithm: DES",
  "references": [
    {
      "type": "variant",
      "value": "DES",
      "context": {
        "type": "FUNCTION_CALL",
        "location": {
          "fileName": ".../crypto/CipherUtil
            .java",
          "line": 53,
          "startColumn": 36,
          "endColumn": 54
        }
      }
    }
  ]
}
```

Listing 5: A sample output from Cryptoscope showcasing a vulnerability in the code. The result identifies the specific CWE, crypto properties, and location in the code.

#### 4.2.2 Experimental setup

Our goal in this section is to compare the ability of Cryptoscope to find vulnerabilities with that of existing tools. To achieve this, we use 'CamBench' [35] - Cryptographic API

<sup>6</sup>Note, CWE759 is appropriate in the context of password hashing and storing

CWE	Short Description	Analysis
CWE259	Use of hardcoded password	Identify a password that is provided (as a parameter) to a crypto API function that has a (constant) value
CWE321	Use of hardcoded Cryptographic Key	Identify a key, iv or salt that is provided (as a parameter) to a crypto API function that has a (constant) value
CWE326	Inadequate encryption strength	Check private key field size for small keys (in asymmetric algorithms)
CWE327	Use of a broken or risky cryptographic algorithm	Identify weak and quantum unsafe algorithms in the asset variant, mode and key fields
CWE328	Use of weak hash	Identify weak algorithms in variant field - for assets with a hash primitive
CWE335	Incorrectly managed seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator	Identify a hardcoded (constant) seed that is provided (as a parameter) to a PRNG function
CWE338	Use of cryptographically weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator	Validate the randomizer API call is one of the cryptographically strong PRNGs.
CWE759	Use of a one-way hash without a salt	Identify assets with primitives of type hash that do not contain related crypto material of type salt
CWE780	Use of RSA Algorithm without OAEP	Validate algorithm and padding scheme in the variant and padding fields
CWE916	Use of Password Hash With Insufficient Computational Effort	Validate crypto API iteration parameter has a value larger than 1000

Table 5: The table shows the main vulnerabilities detected by Cryptoscope and the logic executed (on top of a crypto asset) to identify each one.

Misuse Detection Tool Benchmark Suite for Java - as a third-party benchmark that enables us to evaluate Cryptoscope and compare its capabilities to existing tools. CamBench, an active project aims to address the differences, strengths, and weaknesses of previously developed benchmarks for crypto misuse detectors e.g. CryptoAPI-Bench [1], MuBench [5], OWASP Benchmark [27] etc., and combines both synthetic and real-world examples. Cambench-Real [36] covers 20 distinct GitHub projects and contains both secure and insecure API usages. In particular, it contains 15 vulnerabilities spanning 10 repositories<sup>7</sup>.

The benchmark was used to compare CogniCrypt [16], CryptoGuard [32], SpotBugs plugin [6], and SonarQube [39]. We extend the analysis by adding Cryptoscope into the comparison. Table 6 shows the extended table as presented in [36] with an additional column for Cryptoscope (right most column). Note, the ID column, uniquely identifies an API call within a repository.

### 4.2.3 Accuracy

The authors of Cambench split the vulnerabilities into two subsets. In the first subset, our tool outperformed the other tools by finding eight out of eight vulnerabilities, giving Cryptoscope the only perfect score.

In the second subset, only CogniCrypt was able to find all vulnerabilities. In this subset Cryptoscope was able to identify

<sup>7</sup>These repositories are real world applications that are mostly still in active use. Since some of the vulnerabilities may still persist in these projects, we are disguising specific identifying details, especially regarding the vulnerabilities, beyond what can be found in the original benchmark.

3 vulnerabilities while missing 4 instance, all of type "*Usage of string for sensitive information*". The vulnerability manifests when sensitive information resides in memory more (time) than required. In java, this may occur if sensitive information is stored in a String (instead of char[]). Since java Strings are immutable and can't be overwritten - the sensitive information resides in memory until it is reclaimed by the garbage collector. We consider this vulnerability a security vulnerability rather than a cryptographic one and as such is not within our threat detection scope. Note, that a cryptographic asset was identified in all these cases (without a vulnerability). To summarize, Cryptoscope was able to correctly identify all crypto related vulnerabilities.

## 5 Related work

In this section, we focus on related art that is applicable to discovery of cryptography as well as vulnerability and misuse identification (in the context of software applications). Works related to network monitoring, cipher suites, network protocols, certificates, etc. [15, 30, 40–42] do not relate directly to our work.

It is important to note the distinctions between discovery and vulnerability/misuse detection. The majority of works do not make such a differentiation as creating an inventory was not a goal by itself. Indeed, the process of vulnerability or misuse detection implicitly detected crypto elements. However, consider the following differences between discovery and vulnerability/misuse detection tools.

- In cases where there are no vulnerabilities in the code,

ID	CogniCrypt	CryptoGuard	FindSecBugs	SonarQube	Cryptoscope
<i>Insecure Key</i>					
68-1	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
129	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓
129-1	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓
148	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓
<i>Insecure Encryption Algorithm</i>					
68	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓
146	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
<i>Insecure Initialization Vector</i>					
71-1	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
<i>Insecure Message Digest</i>					
34-2	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
<b>Total subset (8)</b>	6	6	2	3	8
<i>Insecure Mac Algorithm</i>					
110	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓
<i>Insecure Password-based Encryption</i>					
72	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓
<i>Insecure Signature Algorithm</i>					
45	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓
<i>Usage of String for Sensitive Information</i>					
33	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
45-1	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
99	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
151	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
<b>Total all (15)</b>	13	6	2	3	11

Table 6: This table extends the table in [36] by adding a column for Cryptoscope on the right. The table shows which vulnerabilities were discovered by each one of the tools.

vulnerability/misuse detectors will result in an empty set. Essentially no crypto will be identified by the vulnerability identification tools.

- Whenever a vulnerability is identified all the information that pertains to the vulnerability is provided. However, there is no requirement or need to provide complete information about the cryptographic operations. For example, consider a case where a vulnerability related to a hard coded IV is discovered and identified. Such a result can provide very limited information about the cryptographic operation as a whole, including for example the algorithm, key, mode, function etc.

## 5.1 Crypto discovery

Most of the work related to crypto discovery and cryptographic inventory has been performed by the industry. InfoSecGlobal ‘AgileScan’ [11] and SandboxAQ AQtive Guard [34] provide methods to discover cryptography in applications. The former is able to identify cryptographic objects such as certificates, keys and crypto libraries that are used. The latter monitors applications during run time for

known API calls to cryptographic libraries. Both, to the best of our knowledge, are not able to collect enough semantics to construct a complete crypto asset.

The Wind River open source crypto detector [33] scans code looking for keywords such as “RSA”, known usage patterns such as API calls, data type declarations or `#include` statements to construct a list of cryptographic occurrences. CodeQL [10] is a static analysis engine. It allows users to query code represented in a relational database. CodeQL collects information, for each source code, such as the abstract syntax tree, bindings and type information as well as data and control flow. The work described in [8] builds on top of CodeQL to discover and generate an inventory (in the form of a CBOM) for open-source git hub projects. The work in [38] lays out some of the processes used to generate the CBOM. The process builds on CodeQL results and in particular the text snippets found. It then uses regular expressions to identify algorithm names, key sizes, block cipher mode etc., which are encoded in a structure. Next, a CBOM component is constructed using all the properties that were matched or could have been derived. Finally, there is a process for merging overlapping components when necessary.

The goal and approach of the latter work has a few similari-

ties to our own, however, there are a few points we believe our contributions address. First, the work describes in [38] uses regular expressions which contain language-specific statements (in fact, library-specific). Instead, Cryptoscope separates the algorithm from the meta-data. (The meta-data resides in the knowledge base which may be augmented without changing the code.) Secondly, Cryptoscope leverages control and data dependencies to detect and relate cryptographic API's. Without it, we believe inaccuracies may fall if code is complex and interleaves multiple types of cryptography that can not be correctly separated using regular expressions. Lastly, it is not clear what contexts are accounted for in [38] - which may impede the ability to relate cryptographic components across the code - and provide a complete description of the cryptographic operation. Such a case may occur, for example, when a key is generated in one method/file and used during decryption in another method/file.

An additional effort, closely related to our own, is a plugin to sonar cube [14]. This plugin can identify cryptographic assets within source code and create a CBOM. It operates on a rule-based system, where specific rules are established to recognize cryptographic APIs and their properties. Additionally, related cryptographic APIs can be detected by defining extra dependent rules, which is similar to outlining various patterns of sequences for cryptographic APIs. Note, a unique set of detection rules is required for each programming language as well as additional set of dependent rules for each crypto library. These are the specific limitations that Cryptoscope addresses by (1) utilizing data and control flow analysis and (2) storing all cryptography-related information separately in the knowledge base (KB).

## 5.2 Crypto vulnerability detection

In this section we review related work addressing crypto vulnerability (misuse) detection. These examples are provided as background for section 4.2. A more thorough review can be found here [31].

Previous research shows that crypto is often used in an insecure way [7,9,18,21]. One such problem is the choice of an insecure parameter, like an insecure block mode, for crypto primitives like encryption. Many tools exist to identify these misuses such as CryptoREX [45], CryptoLint [9], CrySL [17], CogniCrypt [16], and Cryptoguard [32].

The authors of LICMA [44] present 6 rules (5 in Python) aimed at finding vulnerabilities. These rules require the identification of the API and the parameter(s) to the API. To this aim, static analysis, specifically backward slicing is used starting from the relevant API parameters and going backward to determine if the value of a parameter was hardcoded, assigned locally or globally, and if possible provide the value. To the best of our knowledge the authors are able to trace parameters across function boundaries - but due to the underlying parser - are not able to trace parameters across file boundaries.

Similarly, TaintCrypto [31] makes use of data flow and taint flow analysis to identify vulnerabilities using rules that can be modeled as DFAs (Deterministic Finite Automata). It is important to note that TaintCrypt works on C/C++ only and requires a configuration identifying sources, sinks and filters (which may not be trivial to identify). Moreover, the majority of the vulnerabilities addressed are aimed at the implementation of the crypto itself, while only a few are aimed at the API usages.

CryptoLint [9] is a light-weight static analysis tool designed to identify common cryptographic API misuse in Android applications that may lead to vulnerabilities such as weak encryption modes, insecure randomness, or improper key derivation. In particular, the tool scans for vulnerabilities defined in six rules. cryptoLint [9] also suggests remediation measures to help address the widespread issues identified.

CrySL [17], a definition language that enables cryptography experts to specify the secure usage of the cryptographic libraries that they provide. CrySL combines the generic concepts of method-call sequences and data-flow constraints with domain-specific constraints related to cryptographic algorithms and their parameters, return values, and state transitions, ensuring that developers adhere to secure coding practices. CogniCrypt [16] is a compiler that translates the CrySL [17] rule set into a context and flow-sensitive static analysis program for Java or Android apps able to check (and also provides actionable guidance) for violations of the CrySL encoded rules.

The work described in [20] addresses both the detection of crypto misuse as well as remediation. CDRep addresses 7 vulnerabilities, in machine language (java byte code). The process to identify a vulnerability involves a starting point (e.g. the getInstance instruction) as well as a process detecting data dependencies (e.g. of the parameters of the instruction). In cases where the parameter can be resolved to a value (e.g. constant) a vulnerability can be identified.

A different approach, using instrumentation of java JCA classes to log parameters of relevant Crypto APIs calls is presented in [29]. Once the execution of the program is complete, and the parameters are logged, a checker reviews the logs and enforces rules. The vulnerabilities covered by this approach can be extended to include rules that track behaviour across multiple executions of the program, such as reuse of key/iv. The work presented in [19] also employs static analysis to identify and monitor Crypto API calls as well as file and network I/O API calls during run time. They are collecting the calls, parameter values and return values to detect, using a set of rules, whether cryptography was improperly employed on data sent to the network or stored on disk.

CRYScanner [12] combines both static and dynamic analysis perspectives. It uses an online logger, CRYLogger [29] and an offline checker, CrySL and CogniCrypt [16]. The tool runs in two stages, the runtime stage to collect logs and the offline stage to analyze these logs. It supports several popular



Java cryptographic libraries and leverages domain-specific knowledge to pinpoint misuse patterns effectively.

To summarize, we can identify two characteristics most works exhibits: first, vulnerability identification rules are language specific and are therefore not applicable across different languages. Second, most vulnerabilities are detected by identifying parameter values of select crypto API's (during run time or using static analysis data tracing) without an explicit aim - nor success - of understanding the complete cryptographic operation. CRYLogger [29] and CRYScanner [12] are in fact, dividing the vulnerability/misuse detection into separate stages, however, they also are not providing a generic expression of the used cryptography.

## 6 Conclusion and Future work

In this paper we present Cryptoscope - an industrial grade tool for discovering cryptography in applications. Organizations will be able to deploy Cryptoscope on large code bases and will be provided with a fast, accurate, high level and comprehensive view of the cryptographic operations performed in the code. Moreover, Cryptoscope covers a large set of crypto related vulnerabilities and detects with high accuracy more cryptographically related vulnerabilities than any other tool we are aware of.

Next, we plan to progress in two main directions. First, we plan to make use of Cryptoscope to set the stage for remediation suggestions. By building on top of the results generated by Cryptoscope we would be able to pinpoint locations in the code where vulnerable or misused cryptography exists and utilize this information to inform the process of remediation whether it is LLM- or rule-based. Second, we are looking to expand the support to additional common programming languages, such as Python, Go, C etc..

## Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge the help given by the authors of Cambench [36] and in particular Dr. Anna-Katharina Wickert for providing us access to the git repositories that were used to produce the evaluation metrics.

## References

- [1] Sharmin Afrose, Sazzadur Rahaman, and Danfeng Yao. Cryptoapi-bench: A comprehensive benchmark on java cryptographic api misuses. In *2019 IEEE Cybersecurity Development (SecDev)*, pages 49–61, 2019.
- [2] The National Security Agency. Announcing the commercial national security algorithm suite 2.0. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [3] Mistral AI. Mistral-large-2407, large language model. <https://mistral.ai/>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [4] Open AI. Chatgpt-4o, large language model. <https://openai.com/>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [5] Sven Amann, Sarah Nadi, Hoan A. Nguyen, Tien N. Nguyen, and Mira Mezini. Mubench: a benchmark for api-misuse detectors. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories, MSR '16*, page 464–467, New York, NY, USA, 2016. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [6] Philippe Arteau. The spotbugs plugin for security audits of java web applications. <https://find-sec-bugs.github.io/>. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [7] Alexia Chatzikonstantinou, Christoforos Ntantogian, Georgios Karopoulos, and Christos Xenakis. Evaluation of cryptography usage in android applications. In *Proceedings of the 9th EAI International Conference on Bio-Inspired Information and Communications Technologies (Formerly BIONETICS), BICT'15*, page 83–90, Brussels, BEL, 2016. ICST (Institute for Computer Sciences, Social-Informatics and Telecommunications Engineering).
- [8] Daniel Cuthbert, Mark Carney, Benjamin Rodes, and Niroshan Rajadurai. The magnetic pull of mutable protection: Worked examples in cryptographic agility. In *Blackhat - Europe*, 2023. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [9] Manuel Egele, David Brumley, Yanick Fratantonio, and Christopher Kruegel. An empirical study of cryptographic misuse in android applications. In *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer & Communications Security, CCS '13*, page 73–84, New York, NY, USA, 2013. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [10] Github. Codeql - discover vulnerabilities across a codebase. <https://codeql.github.com/>. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [11] Infosec Global. Agilesec analytics. <https://www.infosecglobal.com/products/agilesec-analytics>. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [12] Sylvain Guilley. Keynote talk #1 : Cryscanner: Finding cryptographic libraries misuse. In *2021 8th NAFOS-TED Conference on Information and Computer Science (NICS)*, pages xxiii–xxiii, 2021.
- [13] The White House. National security memorandum on promoting united states leadership in quantum computing while mitigating risks to vulnerable cryptographic systems. Accessed: 2025-01-08.

- [14] IBM. Sonar cryptography plugin. <https://github.com/IBM/sonar-cryptography>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-01-19.
- [15] Kali. Ike scan - discovers ike hosts. <https://www.kali.org/tools/ike-scan/>. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [16] Stefan Krüger, Sarah Nadi, Michael Reif, Karim Ali, Mira Mezini, Eric Bodden, Florian Göpfert, Felix Günther, Christian Weinert, Daniel Demmler, and Ram Kamath. Cognicrypt: Supporting developers in using cryptography. In *2017 32nd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*, pages 931–936, 2017.
- [17] Stefan Krüger, Johannes Späth, Karim Ali, Eric Bodden, and Mira Mezini. Crysl: Validating correct usage of cryptographic apis, 2017.
- [18] David Lazar, Haogang Chen, Xi Wang, and Nickolai Zeldovich. Why does cryptographic software fail? a case study and open problems. In *Proceedings of 5th Asia-Pacific Workshop on Systems, APSys '14*, New York, NY, USA, 2014. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [19] Yong Li, Yuanyuan Zhang, Juanru Li, and Dawu Gu. icryptotracer: Dynamic analysis on misuse of cryptography functions in ios applications. In Man Ho Au, Barbara Carminati, and C.-C. Jay Kuo, editors, *Network and System Security*, pages 349–362, Cham, 2014. Springer International Publishing.
- [20] Siqi Ma, David Lo, Teng Li, and Robert H. Deng. Cdrep: Automatic repair of cryptographic misuses in android applications. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM on Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security, ASIA CCS '16*, page 711–722, New York, NY, USA, 2016. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [21] Sarah Nadi, Stefan Krüger, Mira Mezini, and Eric Bodden. "jumping through hoops": Why do java developers struggle with cryptography apis? In *2016 IEEE/ACM 38th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 935–946, 2016.
- [22] National Institute of Standards and Technology. Nist - national institute of standards and technology. <https://www.nist.gov/>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [23] National Security Agency. Nsa - national security agency. <https://www.nsa.gov/>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [24] The Legion of the Bouncy Castle Inc. Bouncycastle: Cryptography for java. <https://www.bouncycastle.org/>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [25] Oracle. Java cryptography architecture (jca). <https://docs.oracle.com/javase/8/docs/technotes/guides/security/crypto/CryptoSpec.html>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [26] OWASP. Authoritative guide to cbom. [https://cyclonedx.org/guides/OWASP\\_CycloneDX-Authoritative-Guide-to-CBOM-en.pdf](https://cyclonedx.org/guides/OWASP_CycloneDX-Authoritative-Guide-to-CBOM-en.pdf). Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [27] OWASP Foundation. OWASP Benchmark. <https://owasp.org/www-project-benchmark/>, 2020. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [28] Terence Parr. Antlr (another tool for language recognition). <https://www.antlr.org/index.html>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [29] Luca Piccolboni, Giuseppe Di Guglielmo, Luca P. Carloni, and Simha Sethumadhavan. Crylogger: Detecting crypto misuses dynamically. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1972–1989, 2021.
- [30] Qualys. Qualys certificate inventory. <https://www.qualys.com/apps/certificate-inventory/>. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [31] Sazzadur Rahaman, Haipeng Cai, Omar Chowdhury, and Danfeng Yao. From theory to code: Identifying logical flaws in cryptographic implementations in c/c++. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 19(6):3790–3803, 2022.
- [32] Sazzadur Rahaman, Ya Xiao, Sharmin Afrose, Fahad Shaon, Ke Tian, Miles Frantz, Murat Kantarcioglu, and Danfeng (Daphne) Yao. Cryptoguard: High precision detection of cryptographic vulnerabilities in massive-sized java projects. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS '19*, page 2455–2472, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [33] Wind River. Crypto detector. <https://github.com/Wind-River/crypto-detector>. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [34] SandboxAQ. Aqive guard: Discover. <https://www.sandboxaq.com/solutions/security/discover>. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [35] Michael Schlichtig, Anna-Katharina Wickert, Stefan Krüger, Eric Bodden, and Mira Mezini. Cambench – cryptographic api misuse detection tool benchmark suite, 2022.
- [36] Michael Schlichtig, Anna-Katharina Wickert, Stefan Krüger, Eric Bodden, and Mira Mezini. Cambench - cryptographic api misuse detection tool

- benchmark. <https://github.com/CROSSINGTUD/CamBench>, 5 2022. "accepted at the MSR 2022 Registered Reports Track as a In-Principal Acceptance (IPA)".
- [37] US Homeland Security. The menlo report: Ethical principles guiding information and communication technology research. [https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/CSD-MenloPrinciplesCORE-20120803\\_1.pdf](https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/CSD-MenloPrinciplesCORE-20120803_1.pdf), 2012. Accessed: 2025-01-19.
- [38] Standard seruciry research. cryptobom forge tool. <https://github.com/Santandersecurityresearch/cryptobom-forge/tree/dev>. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [39] Sonar Source. Sonar qube, a static analysis tool designed to detect coding issues. <https://www.sonarsource.com/>. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [40] SSHScan. Sshscan - sshscan is a testing tool that enumerates ssh ciphers. <https://github.com/evict/SSHScan>. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [41] sshscan. sshscan - utility for inspecting or auditing an ssh server. <https://github.com/adedayo/sshscan>. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [42] TestSSL. Testing tls/ssl encryption. <https://testssl.sh/>. Accessed: 2025-01-08.
- [43] Mark Weiser. Program slicing. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Software Engineering*, ICSE '81, page 439–449. IEEE Press, 1981.
- [44] Anna-Katharina Wickert, Lars Baumgärtner, Florian Breitfelder, and Mira Mezini. Python crypto misuses in the wild. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM / IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement (ESEM)*, ESEM '21, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [45] Li Zhang, Jiongyi Chen, Wenrui Diao, Shanqing Guo, Jian Weng, and Kehuan Zhang. CryptoREX: Large-scale analysis of cryptographic misuse in IoT devices. In *22nd International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses (RAID 2019)*, pages 151–164, Chaoyang District, Beijing, September 2019. USENIX Association.