

SoK: A Literature and Engineering Review of Regular Expression Denial of Service

Masudul Hasan Masud Bhuiyan*, Berk Çakar†, Ethan Burmane†
James C. Davis†, Cristian-Alexandru Staicu*

*CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security
†Electrical and Computer Engineering, Purdue University

Abstract

Regular expression denial of service (ReDoS) is an asymmetric cyberattack that has become prominent in recent years. This attack exploits the slow worst-case matching time of regular expression (regex) engines. In the past, problematic regular expressions have led to outages at Cloudflare and Stack Overflow, showing the severity of the problem. While ReDoS has drawn significant research attention, there has been no systematization of knowledge to delineate the state of the art and identify opportunities for further research.

In this paper, we describe the existing knowledge on ReDoS. We first provide a systematic literature review, dividing works into two classes: measurement studies and defenses. Then, our engineering review surveys the latest regex engines to examine whether and how ReDoS defenses have been realized. Combining our findings, we observe that (1) in the literature, almost no studies evaluate whether and how ReDoS vulnerabilities can be weaponized against real systems, making it difficult to assess their real-world impact; and (2) from an engineering view, many mainstream regex engines now have ReDoS defenses, rendering many threat models obsolete. The open challenges in ReDoS research are to evaluate the emerging defenses, and to support engineers in migrating to defended engines. To support these directions, we conclude by presenting the `wrk-redos` tool. This tool supports controlled measurements of ReDoS on a web service, and includes proof-of-concept Docker images that allow engineers to substitute different regex engines in their applications.

1 Introduction

Internet services, such as email servers and online banking, are of great importance to our society. Denial-of-service (DoS) attacks [6, 89, 106] aim to make them unavailable. Traditionally, DoS attacks were a symmetric battle of network resources: if attackers have more computation power and bandwidth than defenders, the attack will succeed. However, in recent years there has been significant progress in mitigating such attacks

thanks to advances in cloud computing and DDoS protection services, which affordably absorb huge amounts of malicious traffic [62]. To remain viable, attackers are seeking asymmetries to launch DoS attacks [75]. In these low-rate DoS attacks [104], attackers leverage some weakness in the system or network architecture to amplify their efforts, needing fewer resources to achieve the same effect [60].

One asymmetric DoS attack of recent interest is called Regular expression Denial of Service (ReDoS) [97]. ReDoS attacks exploit the fact that regular expression matches may have super-linear worst-case time complexity. ReDoS led to outages at Stack Overflow [113] and Cloudflare [7]. Bhuiyan *et al.* [57] reported that ReDoS is the fourth most common vulnerability in the npm package ecosystem. The security company Snyk reports that it is one of the fastest growing vulnerability classes [28]. In consequence, there has been much research into ReDoS, with ~35 top-tier papers since 2015 (Section 3).

This work systematizes the existing knowledge on ReDoS. Our goal was to contextualize prior work, assess the progress in the field, and identify future work opportunities. To this end, we conducted two complementary reviews: a literature review of the recent papers on ReDoS, and an engineering review of the current state of major regex engines.

Our systematization produced five major findings. In our review of the academic literature, we observed shortcomings and inconsistencies in threat models, ReDoS definitions, and attack evaluations. In our review of the regex engines, we note that four major engines have used three distinct algorithms to mitigate ReDoS, but these defenses do not always reduce the time complexity to linear. We invite the research community to greater conceptual consistency in future ReDoS research, and to focus research efforts on state-of-the-art ReDoS defenses. To support researchers, we introduce the `wrk-redos` tool, which provides a uniform evaluation environment and enables cross-engine comparisons as well.

Our primary contributions are:

- We systematize the academic ReDoS literature (Section 3).

- We review the current ReDoS posture of the major regular expression engines, *i.e.*, those of popular programming language runtimes (Section 4).
- Synthesizing these reviews, we present `wrk-redos`, a benchmarking tool that supports application developers in assessing their ReDoS risk as well as the potential benefit of changing regex engines (Section 5).

2 Background and Motivation

In this section, we describe regexes and regex engines, as well as regular expression denial of service (ReDoS).

2.1 Regexes and Regex Engines

Regular expressions (regexes) are a popular technology for string matching tasks. The basic regex operation can be stated as follows: *Does this regex describe this string?* Regexes began with Kleene’s “regular” notation, and over the decades various “extended” features have been introduced. The regular features — concatenation, disjunction, and repetition — can be modeled with traditional non-deterministic and deterministic finite automata (NFA, DFA). Many extended features cannot be. Details of regex notation are given elsewhere [71, 77].

Regexes are supported as a built-in feature by all mainstream programming languages [77] and are part of many other systems as well (*e.g.*, intrusion detection systems [126]). Regexes are evaluated using *regex engines*. As summarized by Davis [74], typical regex engine implementations can be modeled as either undertaking a backtracking, NFA-like simulation (Spencer-style) or a lockstep, DFA-like simulation (Thompson-style). Extended regex features are easy to implement in a backtracking engine, which often takes the form of a recursive descent parser [72]. They are difficult or impossible to implement in a Thompson-style engine that typically adheres more closely to an automaton formalism [64].

As an alternative, Brzozowski proposed a derivative-based approach to reasoning about regex matches [59]. This approach updates the regex (“computes the derivative”) based on the string prefix seen so far. Given a regex R and a character σ , the derivative is a new regex R' that matches all suffixes of strings matched by R that begin with σ . For example, the derivative of $R = ab^*$ with respect to $\sigma = a$ is $R' = b^*$.

2.2 Regex-Based Denial of Service (ReDoS)

2.2.1 Concept

Although the matching time of a regex engine has been a longstanding optimization target,¹ and linear-time algorithms are known, many regex engines have had implementations

¹The earliest mention of regex performance is Thompson (1968) [118].




Figure 1: Distribution of OWASP Top-10 and ReDoS CVEs per ecosystem, showing average prevalence per category. Data cover 2014-2023. For full methodology, see Appendix A.

with super-linear time complexity [64]. Regexes can thus become a vector for asymmetric denial of service attacks [65]. Because regexes are commonly used to process untrusted input, *e.g.*, for input sanitization, attackers can send relatively short strings to trigger large server-side slowdowns. The resulting ReDoS attack is an algorithmic complexity attack [66], wherein a regex engine’s evaluation of a regex takes super-linear time complexity in the length of the input.

Many regex engines exhibit slow worst-case match behavior under different circumstances. A naive Spencer-style engine (backtracking) can have worst-case polynomial or exponential time in the input length, even for regexes that use only regular features [64, 118], and this can be exacerbated by extended features. Although Spencer-style engines may contain optimizations such as caches [72], measurements have shown that many of these engines are susceptible to polynomial or exponential-time performance in the length of the input string [71]. A Thompson-style engine may exhibit slow match times as well, *e.g.*, due to nested quantifiers [123].

2.2.2 ReDoS in Practice

In recent years, ReDoS has become a common security concern. Two major web services had outages that resulted from slow regex behavior: Stack Overflow in 2016 [113] and Cloudflare in 2019 [7]. Since 2020, the security company Snyk has observed a notable rise in ReDoS vulnerabilities, especially in the JavaScript package ecosystem (npm) [28]. Grey literature resources such as GitHub’s security team give advice for repairing ReDoS vulnerabilities [18, 20, 54, 67].

For a sense of the formal disclosure of ReDoS vulnerabilities, we examined the National Vulnerability Database for CVE records pertaining to ReDoS. Following Hassan *et al.* [83], since 2014 we found that ~ 400 ReDoS CVEs have been disclosed across software in six major programming language ecosystems. As a reference point, we compared these results to CVEs related to the “OWASP Top-10”. Fig. 1 shows the result. Averaging over 2014-2023, the rate of ReDoS exceeds four of the OWASP Top-10 vulnerability types.

3 Academic Research on ReDoS

Contemporaneous with the increasing industry recognition of ReDoS, ReDoS has become a common subject of cybersecurity research. However, there has been no systematization of the resulting knowledge. We therefore conducted a systematic literature review of ReDoS papers published between 2015 and 2024 at leading conferences in computer security (S&P, USENIX, CCS, NDSS), software engineering (ICSE, FSE, ASE), and programming languages (PLDI, POPL, OOPSLA). Following the structured methodology outlined by Schloegel *et al.* [107], we identified relevant papers in conference proceedings via an initial keyword search, using the terms `ReDoS`, `denial-of-service`, `regex`, `regular expression`, `regular expression analysis`, and `regular expression execution`. This yielded 93 papers, which were further filtered via the following criteria:

- **Inclusion Criteria:** Papers that primarily address ReDoS, propose new attacks or defenses against ReDoS, or extensively study existing ReDoS attacks or defenses.
- **Exclusion Criteria:** Papers that focus on general denial of service or those that discuss regular expressions, without specifically addressing ReDoS.

To make informed inclusion/exclusion decisions, we reviewed the abstract, introduction, and evaluation sections of each paper. From this process, we identified 35 papers that met our inclusion criteria. Table 1 lists and systematizes them along our study dimensions. Additionally, we reviewed other closely related works that, while not meeting our strict inclusion criteria, are still highly relevant to ReDoS. For instance, papers such as [64, 84, 112] propose improved regex matching algorithms. Although mitigating ReDoS was not their primary focus, these works provide valuable insights and serve as foundational building blocks for ReDoS defenses, making them significant for academics and researchers in the field.

We begin by discussing the main existing research directions (Section 3.1), distinguishing between ReDoS measurements and defenses. We then explore the assumptions made about the attackers' capabilities or the underlying systems (Section 3.2), along with the definitions of ReDoS vulnerabilities or successful attacks provided in prior works (Section 3.3). Finally, we discuss how the studied papers were evaluated (Section 3.4).

3.1 Main Existing Research Directions

The horizontal split in Table 1 shows the considered measurement and defense papers. Measurement papers study to what degree open-source code or actual systems contain ReDoS vulnerabilities. Defenses, on the other contrary, aim to either remove ReDoS vulnerabilities or prevent exploitation. We discuss both these categories in detail below.

3.1.1 Measurements

Papers in this category study ReDoS vulnerabilities in various ecosystems. Nine papers focus on open-source libraries in `npm` [57, 114], `pip` [70, 127], or `Maven` [90, 127], and seven test live web applications [56, 114]. Additionally, 27 papers analyze ReDoS vulnerabilities using regular expression datasets [93, 110, 111, 121]. We categorize these studies by their detection techniques: pattern-based, semantics-based static, and dynamic detection, noting their strengths and weaknesses in speed, accuracy, and false positives/negatives.

Heuristic-Based Detection (3 studies) Heuristic-based approaches to ReDoS detection employ simple pattern-matching techniques to identify potentially vulnerable regular expressions. Studies by Kluban *et al.* [87, 88] and Davis *et al.* [68] utilize tools like `regexploit` [38], `redos-detector` [52], and `safe-regex` [35] to identify these vulnerabilities by searching for constructs such as infinite repeats (`a*b*a*`), branches (`a|b`), or nested quantifiers (`*`, `+`, `?`, `{n,m}`), which are often associated with ReDoS vulnerabilities. While these methods are fast, enabling the rapid analysis of large numbers of regular expressions, they typically focus on syntax rather than semantics, leading to potential accuracy issues. For instance, Parolini *et al.* [101] demonstrated that while tools like `regexploit` achieved low false positive and negative rates, others like `safe-regex` and `redos-detector` exhibited significantly higher false positive rates. This highlights the primary limitation of heuristic-based approaches, which often require further analysis to confirm vulnerabilities.

Automata-based Static Analysis (6 studies) Automata-based static analysis is a powerful method for detecting problematic regular expressions without executing the program by reasoning about regex semantics. This approach, as explored in several studies [70, 86, 101, 103, 115, 121], models regex matching using automata, employing techniques such as pumping analysis, transducer analysis, adversarial automata construction, and NFA ambiguity analysis. Typically, a non-deterministic finite automaton (NFA) is constructed for each potentially vulnerable regex, enabling the evaluation of its worst-case time complexity. For instance, Kirrage *et al.* [86] and Rathnayake *et al.* [103] searched for attack string patterns in NFAs to detect exponential-time vulnerabilities by analyzing patterns in the form of (prefix, pumpable string, suffix). In a different approach, Turoňová *et al.* [121] used DFA simulation with NCAs and CSAs to detect ReDoS in non-backtracking engines. Parolini *et al.* [101] introduced "tree semantics" to represent the behavior of automata matching engines, offering a novel perspective on the matching process.

Despite their robustness, these static analysis methods can produce false positives and negatives due to performance trade-offs. Shen *et al.* [109] reported that RXXR2 [86, 103] exhibited a 39% false positive rate, while Rexploiter [131] had an 87% false negative rate. Although these static approaches

Table 1: Systematization of research papers on ReDoS vulnerabilities, categorized by vulnerability definition, threat model, and evaluation criteria. Columns Slowdown and Attack Simulation use \odot to indicate incomplete details: Slowdown lacks specific thresholds, and Attack Simulation lacks full details on attacker capabilities. \bullet indicates comprehensive coverage in the respective categories. The Measure QoS Degradation column assesses the impact on benign users alongside malicious scenarios. The symbol "-" denotes that the paper does not address the respective metric.

Paper	Threat Model				Vulnerability Definition			Evaluation		
	Application	Library	Code fragment	Arbitrary Number of Request	Slowdown	Number of instructions	Patterns	Attack Simulation	Measure QoS Degradation	Language
Su <i>et al.</i> [115]	-	-	\bullet	100kB	-	>10000	-	-	-	J, JS, Pe, P, C#, Ru, G
Davis <i>et al.</i> [68]	-	-	\bullet	-	-	-	\bullet	-	-	JS
Turoňová <i>et al.</i> [121]	-	-	\bullet	1.5K-9K	10s, 100s	-	-	-	-	R, P, Pe, Py, J, JS, C#
Liu <i>et al.</i> [93]	-	-	\bullet	128	-	10^5	-	-	-	J, JS, Py, R, P
Staicu <i>et al.</i> [114]	\bullet	\bullet	-	82K	5s	-	-	\odot	-	JS
Davis <i>et al.</i> [70]	-	\bullet	\bullet	100K-1M	10s	-	-	-	-	JS, Py
Siddiq <i>et al.</i> [111]	-	-	\bullet	-	1s	-	-	-	-	J
Shen <i>et al.</i> [109]	-	-	\bullet	128	-	10^8	-	-	-	J
Barlas <i>et al.</i> [56]	\bullet	-	-	-	1s	-	-	\odot	-	JS
Siddiq <i>et al.</i> [110]	-	-	\bullet	-	1s	10^8	-	-	-	J
Davis <i>et al.</i> [71]	-	-	\bullet	-	10s	-	-	-	-	J, JS, P, R, G, Pe, Ru, Py
Kluban <i>et al.</i> [87]	-	-	\bullet	-	-	-	\bullet	-	-	JS
Bhuiyan <i>et al.</i> [57]	-	\bullet	\bullet	-	2s	-	-	-	-	JS
Noller <i>et al.</i> [99]	-	-	\bullet	-	-	-	-	-	-	J
Wang <i>et al.</i> [127]	-	\bullet	\bullet	-	-	10^5	-	-	-	J, Py, C#, JS.
Rathnayake <i>et al.</i> [103]	-	-	\bullet	-	-	-	-	-	-	Py
McLaughlin <i>et al.</i> [95]	-	\bullet	\bullet	1M	10s	-	-	-	-	JS
Li <i>et al.</i> [90]	-	\bullet	\bullet	-	1s	-	-	-	-	J
Parolini <i>et al.</i> [101]	-	-	\bullet	128	-	10^{10}	-	-	-	J
Kirrage <i>et al.</i> [86]	-	-	\bullet	-	-	-	-	-	-	J
Wüstholtz <i>et al.</i> [131]	\bullet	-	\bullet	140K	\odot	-	-	\odot	-	J
Petsios <i>et al.</i> [102]	-	-	\bullet	-	\odot	-	-	-	-	P
Kluban <i>et al.</i> [88]	-	\bullet	-	-	-	-	\bullet	-	-	JS
Demoulin <i>et al.</i> [75]	\bullet	-	-	-	\odot	-	-	\bullet	-	JS
Chida <i>et al.</i> [61]	-	-	\bullet	-	-	-	\bullet	-	-	JS, Py
Bai <i>et al.</i> [55]	\bullet	-	-	50K	$\mu + 3\sigma$	-	-	\bullet	-	JS
Li <i>et al.</i> [91]	-	\bullet	\bullet	1M	10s	-	-	-	-	J
Davis <i>et al.</i> [69]	-	-	\bullet	-	-	-	-	-	-	JS, J, P, Py, R, G, Pe, Ru.
Li <i>et al.</i> [92]	-	-	\bullet	-	\odot	-	-	-	-	J
Hassan <i>et al.</i> [83]	-	-	\bullet	-	-	-	\bullet	-	-	P, Pe, JS, J, Py, R, C#
Davis <i>et al.</i> [73]	\bullet	\bullet	-	-	1s	-	-	\odot	-	JS
Davis <i>et al.</i> [72]	-	-	\bullet	10K-100K	\odot	-	-	-	-	N/A
Tandon <i>et al.</i> [117]	\bullet	-	-	-	-	-	-	\bullet	-	P
Weideman <i>et al.</i> [128]	-	-	\bullet	-	-	-	\bullet	-	-	J
Turoňová <i>et al.</i> [123]	-	-	\bullet	500K-50M	10s, 100s	-	-	-	-	C#

JavaScript: JS, Java: J, PHP: P, Python: Py, Ruby: R, Go: G, Perl: Pe, Rust: Ru

excel in early detection, they may struggle with complex, context-dependent vulnerabilities or produce false positives due to the over-approximation of program behavior.

Dynamic Analysis (4 studies) Dynamic approaches [56, 95, 102, 109] to detecting ReDoS vulnerabilities involve executing regular expressions with various inputs and analyzing their runtime behavior to identify potential issues. For instance, Shen *et al.* [109] developed ReScue, a tool that uses an evolutionary genetic algorithm to generate time-consuming strings capable of triggering ReDoS vulnerabilities. Similarly, Barlas *et al.* [56] and McLaughlin *et al.* [95] utilized dynamic analysis with fuzzing techniques, while Petsios *et al.* [102] introduced SlowFuzz, which uses automated fuzzing to find inputs causing worst-case algorithmic behavior.

Hybrid and Machine Learning Approaches (6 studies) Existing static analysis methods for detecting ReDoS vulnerabilities face a trade-off between precision and recall. For instance, Davis *et al.* [70] and Shen *et al.* [109] show low

F-1 scores of 44.94% and 3.57%, respectively [90]. To enhance precision, dynamic validation is often used, leading to hybrid approaches. Tools like NFAA [131], Revealer [93], ReDoSHunter [90], Badger [99], and RENGAR [127] combine static and dynamic analysis to reduce false positives. Hybrid methods, such as ReDoSHunter [90], integrate static and dynamic techniques to improve detection accuracy. Wang *et al.* [127] and Wüstholtz *et al.* [131] have also proposed hybrid approaches that leverage static analysis to refine dynamic testing. Similarly, Demoulin *et al.* [75] use semi-supervised learning to detect anomalies in resource utilization, triggering immediate alerts and mitigation strategies.

While dynamic and hybrid techniques are more precise, they tend to be slow. Parolini *et al.* [101] show that ReScue [109] and Rexploiter [131] are 2055x and 57x slower than RXXR2 [103]. Thus, despite their strengths, these methods exhibit slow execution time and incomplete coverage.

3.1.2 Defenses

Next we discuss the lower part of Table 1, consisting of proposals for preventing the exploitation of ReDoS vulnerabilities or repairing them automatically. We distinguish between solutions that introduce new matching algorithms, restrict resource consumption, or detect anomalies.

Better Regex Matching Algorithms (3 studies) Researchers have proposed developing new regex matching engines to address ReDoS vulnerabilities at a fundamental level. Davis *et al.* proposed memoization-based optimization to speed up matching by caching intermediate results [69, 72]. Turoňová *et al.* proposed novel counting automata matching algorithms that further optimize counter management during matching, which efficiently handle regexes with bounded repetitions [121, 123]. These new engines often use different matching algorithms or impose restrictions on regex features to improve performance, such as finite-state machine-based approaches instead of backtracking.

Limiting Resource Consumption (1 study) To mitigate ReDoS attacks, Davis *et al.* [73] propose using first-class timeouts as a defense against Event Handler Poisoning (EHP) in Node.js. Their prototype, `Node.cure`, effectively limits processing time with minimal performance overhead. Similar approaches have been adopted in other environments to curb backtracking and processing time. In PHP, the `pcre.backtrack_limit` and `pcre.recursion_limit` directives control the number of backtracks and recursions during regex matching [17]. Perl’s PCRE2 library allows setting evaluation limits via the `eval` function, with a default recursion depth limit of 10M. C# provides the `RegexOptions.MatchTimeout` property to specify a maximum regex processing duration in .NET. These strategies cap resources for regex matching to reduce ReDoS risks. However, they are often too coarse-grained, making it challenging to balance performance and avoid false positives with complex regex patterns and large datasets.

Anomaly Detection (2 studies) Machine learning (ML) techniques have emerged as powerful tools for defending against ReDoS attacks [55, 117]. Tandon *et al.* [117] use the Elliptic envelope model to analyze request features such as time, memory, and CPU cycles, providing an attack-agnostic defense. Similarly, Bai *et al.* [55] employ a feedback loop that adapts defensive measures based on real-time performance metrics to handle zero-day ReDoS attacks. However, these ML methods can have drawbacks, including false positives and negatives. For instance, Tandon *et al.* report a 1.3% false positive rate and a 0.4% false negative rate [117]. Additionally, these models are vulnerable to adversarial attacks [55], which can undermine their effectiveness and underscore the need for more robust solutions.

Automatic Repair (3 studies) Several studies have focused on automatically repairing vulnerable regex to mitigate

ReDoS (Regular Expression Denial of Service) attacks. Li *et al.* [92] and Chida *et al.* [61] have developed programming-by-example (PBE) frameworks for this purpose. FlashRegex [92] repairs or synthesizes regex from matching examples using PBE algorithms, but it struggles with advanced features such as lookarounds and backreferences [91]. To address these limitations, Li *et al.* [91] propose RegexScalpel, which uses a localize-and-fix approach to identify vulnerabilities with fine-grained patterns and apply predefined repair strategies. Despite these advances, these methods often rely on sufficient user-provided examples, which can lead to incomplete repairs and low recall [90, 91, 127]. Furthermore, existing tools may not effectively address certain complex regex patterns, underscoring the need for more comprehensive and robust solutions to fully resolve ReDoS vulnerabilities.

Static Analysis (2 studies) Hassan *et al.* [83] and Weideman *et al.* [128] have developed static analysis methods for detecting ReDoS vulnerabilities. Weideman *et al.* define the necessary and sufficient conditions for exponential worst-case matching time by using prioritized NFAs (pNFAs) to evaluate ambiguity. Hassan *et al.* focus on identifying specific regex structures or "anti-patterns" that are prone to ReDoS vulnerabilities. These methods analyze regex patterns to uncover potential vulnerabilities early in the development process without requiring runtime execution. However, static analysis can face challenges with complex, context-dependent vulnerabilities and may generate false positives due to the over-approximation of regex behavior.

3.2 Threat Models

A realistic threat model is essential in any security study, as it provides a foundational framework for accurately simulating potential attack scenarios. This framework enables the identification of vulnerabilities that adversaries could exploit in real-world environments.

In the Threat Model columns of Table 1, we outline the granularity at which different threat models are defined. While most studies examine the exploitability of regular expressions in isolation, some extend their analysis to the surrounding context, such as within library code. However, only a few studies define threat models at the application level. This limitation can lead to false positives—vulnerabilities that may be exploitable in isolated regular expressions but remain unreachable in actual code or are deployed in systems with strict input restrictions or rate limiting.

Among the papers we reviewed, only 10 (28%) explicitly define a threat model, while the rest implicitly assume one. We identify four assumptions in the existing threat models:

- **Attacker Controls Input (35 studies):** The assumption that an attacker can control inputs to a vulnerable ReDoS (Regular Expression Denial of Service) location is crucial for exploitability, as highlighted in various studies [56, 83].

In real-world software, including web applications and systems, inputs often originate from untrusted sources, thereby increasing the potential for exploitation [102]. However, whether these inputs can reach the vulnerable regular expression depends on the surrounding code. All the reviewed papers, whether their threat models focus on the application [56, 75, 114, 131], library [57, 90, 95, 127], or code fragment level [68, 93, 121], assume that the attacker can manipulate the input to exploit the vulnerability in the regular expression. However, this assumption may not always be applicable. For instance, consider a library that only reads and parses a configuration file on a server, which is not controlled by an attacker. In such cases, the likelihood of an attacker being able to influence the input and exploit the ReDoS vulnerability is significantly reduced, if not eliminated.

- **Attacker’s Input Reaches Super-Linear Regex (34 studies):** This condition necessitates that the attacker’s input be matched against a specific type of regular expression. While all the papers considering threat models at the library and code fragment levels implicitly assume this condition, it is a significant assumption. With the exception of Barlas *et al.* [56], most studies presume this might be achievable in practice. In reality, achieving this could require the attacker to have access to detailed information about the server-side logic, API documentation, or the internal workings of the web service. Staicu *et al.* [114] incorporate web server implementations into their threat model and examine whether the input can trigger the vulnerability. However, this fingerprinting approach can be noisy, leading to both false positives and false negatives.
- **Use of Backtracking or Slow Regex Engine (33 studies):** This condition assumes the attacker has in-depth knowledge of the specific regex engine employed by the server. On one hand, it might be feasible to remotely determine the type of engine in use (e.g., PCRE, RE2), but pinpointing the exact version with its specific weaknesses can be quite challenging. On the other hand, assuming a slow or outdated engine might lead to inaccurate results, making the attack scenario unrealistic in many real-world situations. Except for Barlas *et al.* [56] and Turoňová *et al.* [121], all the studies make this assumption as part of their threat model.
- **Arbitrary Request Assumption (32 studies):** This condition represents a strong assumption that the attacker can repeatedly send requests with large input lengths without interference from other security mechanisms. Most studies, with the exceptions of [93, 101, 109], either disregard restrictions on request size and frequency or necessitate large inputs to trigger vulnerabilities. For context, the maximum size of HTTP header requests and responses in `nginx` and `Apache Tomcat` [5, 12] is 8K, which is significantly smaller than the input lengths assumed in most works. For

instance, Davis *et al.* [70] require input lengths of 100K-1M to trigger a 10-second slowdown, which would be impractical in real-world system settings. Furthermore, most studies fail to consider potential mitigation strategies employed by real-world systems, such as rate limiting [10], intrusion detection systems, or firewalls, which can significantly impede attacks. In realistic scenarios, attackers might face various system-imposed limitations, including bandwidth constraints or restrictions on the number of requests [10] they can send. As a result, the majority of studies, except for [93, 109, 115], assume in their threat models that attackers can perform requests unhindered, which may not reflect real-world conditions.

While the inclusion of a realistic threat model is essential for evaluating security findings accurately, many existing studies use simplistic threat models or do not explicitly define their threat models.

Finding 1. Existing ReDoS research often makes unrealistic strong assumptions about attacker capabilities and system configurations.

3.3 ReDoS Definitions

Most of the considered papers define a ReDoS vulnerability in terms of the slowdown that can be caused directly, with a limited number of number of characters. This variation is summarized under “Vulnerability Definition” in Table 1. Notably, there is no consensus on what constitutes a vulnerability. For instance, some studies establish thresholds for the number of allowed operations during matching that differ significantly. Liu *et al.* [93] and Wang *et al.* [127] use a threshold of 10^5 instructions, while Shen *et al.* [109] and Siddiq *et al.* [110] consider 10^8 instructions, and Parolini *et al.* [101] set it at 10^{10} instructions. Adding to the confusion, Sung *et al.* [116] define vulnerabilities at 10^6 and 10^7 instructions. It remains unclear why these values are deemed appropriate, as heavy CPU loads do not always indicate the presence of a vulnerability.

Moreover, the inconsistency extends to the measurement of introduced slowdowns. Various papers use different metrics to quantify slowdowns, further complicating the landscape and hindering comparability across studies. Turoňová *et al.* [121] measure slowdowns in 10s and 100s, Staicu *et al.* [114] in 5s, Davis *et al.* [70, 71] in 10s, Siddiq *et al.* [111], Li *et al.* [90] and Barlas *et al.* [56] in 1s, Bhuiyan *et al.* [57] in 2s. Meanwhile, McLaughlin *et al.* [95] use 10s, and Bai *et al.* [55] define a problematic slowdown as the average response time (μ) plus three times the standard deviation (3σ), to account for significant deviations from the norm. These excessively high thresholds likely miss many potential vulnerabilities that could cause significant issues under real-world conditions. In our experiments, we saw that under one-second slowdowns can be weaponized against a target server, with

modest attacker resources. Other papers rely on heuristics to define a vulnerability. For example, Davis *et al.* [68] utilize safe-regex [35], which uses simple static analysis rules to determine whether a regex is vulnerable. These tools are unsound and report both false positives and false negatives.

Finding 2. The research literature does not have consistent criteria for ReDoS vulnerabilities. Prior definitions may have both false positives and false negatives.

3.4 Evaluations

We carefully studied the evaluations of the papers in our dataset, as shown in the last three columns of Table 1. Our analysis reveals two key aspects regarding ReDoS research:

Language: Regular expression matching is comparatively slow in languages like JavaScript, Java, Python, and Ruby [71], leading to a significant amount of research focusing on detecting and defending ReDoS attacks in these languages. Reflecting this emphasis, 18 (52%) papers address JavaScript, 17 (50%) address Java, and 9 (26%) address Python, with JavaScript being particularly prominent.

Evaluation Methodology: Out of the reviewed studies, only 7 (18%), such as Demoulin *et al.* [75], Tandon *et al.* [117], and Staicu *et al.* [114], performed an end-to-end simulation to evaluate their proposed attack or defense methodologies. Moreover, only Bai *et al.* [55] measured the system’s performance degradation during an attack as perceived by benign users. The remaining 29 studies (82%) rely solely on theoretical or localized analysis, which might not capture real-world attack scenarios and defenses accurately, potentially overestimating the prevalence of ReDoS vulnerabilities.

Finding 3. Prior research rarely attempts to measure the success of a ReDoS attack, as perceived by benign users of the system.

4 ReDoS Mitigations in Regex Engines

In Section 3, we discuss many papers that measure ReDoS or propose defenses. They often assume that the matching of a regex engine can be modeled as a backtracking search (Section 3.2). However, it is unclear whether this assumption holds in practice, particularly in the context of modern regex engines.

In this section, we examine the regex engines of major programming languages to answer two questions: (1) *Do the measurements and assumptions in the academic literature accurately reflect the latest versions of these engines?* and (2) *What is the impact and adoption of ReDoS defenses proposed by the research community in real-world regex engines?*

We answer these questions in two ways. First, a systematic analysis was conducted on regex engines in nine popular

programming languages (Section 4.1). This analysis drew upon first-party sources such as source code, issue trackers, language documentation, blog posts from regex engine maintainers, and CVE reports. We also examined academic literature that describes regex engines. Second, it was measured whether super-linear regexes improve performance in the latest versions of these engines (Section 4.2).

4.1 Regex Engine Analysis

In this section, we begin by outlining the selection criteria used to choose the regex engines for our analysis. Then, for each engine, we examine the type and details of the ReDoS defense(s) implemented (if any), the update context of the defense (including the year of introduction), and the required lines of code (LOC) to implement it. Additionally, we assess whether the defense is enabled by default or requires developer intervention. Our results regarding the evaluation of ReDoS defenses in modern regex engines are summarized in Table 2.

Selection Criteria. Many modern programming languages have multiple implementations, runtime environments, engines, interpreters, or compilers that might use different regex engines. For instance, JavaScript has multiple engines for executing the source code, which can be used in different environments, such as V8 in Node.js and SpiderMonkey in Mozilla Firefox. To address this complexity, we applied the following criteria when selecting a specific regex engine for languages with multiple options:

1. We prioritized engines that are widely used in production environments and are likely to be targets of ReDoS attacks. This criterion ensures our analysis reflects real-world impact and relevance. As an illustrative example, Node.js is used as web server by 3.4% of all websites, and remarkably, it is used by 98.8% of all websites whose server-side programming language is known to be JavaScript [8, 24]. This makes V8 the most pertinent choice for our analysis. We focus on reference implementations for languages where comprehensive usage data is not readily available. Such implementations are typically mentioned in official documentation of programming languages and serve as the standard for the language (*i.e.*, CPython for Python).
2. Additionally, we only considered the implementations with publicly accessible source code. This allows for a thorough examination of the implementation details and recent modifications to the regex engine. For instance, in the case of Java, we selected OpenJDK, an open-source platform, over Oracle’s JDK.

An overview of our regex engine selections for this study and their rationale can be found in Appendix B.1.

Table 2: Summary of ReDoS defenses in the implementations of major programming languages.

Language (<i>Implementation</i>)	Nature of the Defense	Deployment Year	LOC to Implement	On by Default?	Current ReDoS-Safeness
JavaScript (<i>Node.js—V8</i> [2,25])	A Non-backtracking Engine: Thompson-style [118]	2020	1558 (10.6%)	✗	Partial
Ruby (<i>MRI/CRuby</i> [4])	A Non-backtracking Engine: Memoization [72], Resource Capping: Time-based	2022	1100 (4.7%)	✓	Partial
C# (<i>.NET</i> [26])	Resource Capping (Time); Derivative algo. [98]	2012, 2022	5417 (34.7%)	✗	Partial
Java (<i>OpenJDK</i> [13])	Caching	2016	1712 (35.5%)	✓	Partial
PHP (<i>Zend Engine</i> [15,16])	Resource Capping: Counters	–	–	✓	Partial
Perl (<i>perl5</i> [3])	Caching, Resource Capping: Counters	–	–	✓	Partial
Rust (<i>rustc</i> [27])	Thompson-style	–	–	✓	Safe
Go (<i>gc</i> [11])	Thompson-style	–	–	✓	Safe
Python (<i>CPython</i> [19])	–	–	–	✗	Not Safe

4.1.1 JavaScript (*Node.js—V8*)

Original Algorithm: The main JavaScript engine, V8, previously used a backtracking Spencer-style algorithm. It was highly optimized for common-case regexes [81]. It uses an explicit automaton representation, optimizing it and then rendering it as native machine code for execution [63].

ReDoS Defense: In 2020, responding to ReDoS concerns, the V8 developers implemented an extra Thompson-style non-backtracking regex engine [58]. The new engine guarantees linear-time complexity for all supported regexes, but as a trade-off, it does not support E-regex features. For regexes that are not supported, the original engine serves as a fallback. This update was introduced in V8 version 8.8 (2020), but in Node.js, it remains an experimental feature that is not enabled by default and must be activated via a feature flag. Thus, some Node.js applications may not yet benefit from this feature. All E-regex features still use the backtracking engine.

Engineering Effort: The new engine is 1558 LOC. The original was 14741 LOC (excluding platform-specific assembly code). The effort was $\sim 10\%$ of the original.

4.1.2 Ruby (*MRI/CRuby*)

Original Algorithm: Ruby’s default regex engine is based on Onigmo [42], a fork of the Oniguruma [43] library, which is a Spencer-style backtracking regex engine.

ReDoS Defense: Until Ruby 3.2 (2022), Ruby’s port of Onigmo did not have built-in mitigations against ReDoS (issue 5820). In Ruby 3.2, the developers added two ReDoS defenses [22, 23]. First, based on a community proposal², Ruby implemented Davis *et al.*’s memoization technique for Spencer’s algorithm as a defense against ReDoS attacks [72]. Interestingly, the Ruby developers used full memoization rather than selective memoization despite the higher space complexity. Ruby does not apply memoization when E-regex features are encountered, instead offering a timeout like .NET. The memoization defense is on by default.

Engineering Effort: The relevant pull requests added a total of 1100 LOC, compared to the previous Ruby 3.1.6 engine’s footprint of 23384 LOC. The ratio is 5%.

²<https://bugs.ruby-lang.org/issues/19104>

4.1.3 C# (*.NET*)

Original Algorithm: The first two regex engines in .NET used backtracking algorithms [30, 31]. One was a simple opcode interpreter. The other used an optimized machine code representation like V8’s [29, 31, 82, 120].

ReDoS Defense: Similar to Ruby, in .NET v4.5 (2012), .NET introduced a *timeout mechanism* to prevent excessive backtracking [33]. The timeout is checked after at most $O(n)$ steps, where n is the length of the input, balancing fidelity with overhead [32, 119]. In .NET 7 (2022), Microsoft added a *nonbacktracking regex engine* [119]. This engine is based on work by Moseley *et al.* [98] and Saarikivi *et al.* [105], with its core algorithm using Brzozowski derivatives and guaranteeing linear-time matches. However, both the timeout mechanism and the non-backtracking engine are opt-in features.

Engineering Effort: The new engine comprises 5417 LOC. The existing .NET codebase for regexes was 15597 LOC (including multiple engines). Hence, the new engine expands the existing regex engine codebase by 35%. Microsoft researchers also created two research papers.

4.1.4 Java (*OpenJDK*)

Original Algorithm: OpenJDK Java’s previous regex engine implemented an NFA-based Spencer-style backtracking algorithm for regular expression matching [14].

ReDoS Defense: As of Java 22 (2024), OpenJDK Java’s regex engine does not document defenses against ReDoS. Despite the absence of official documentation, in the OpenJDK source code repository and issue tracker, we identified that some performance updates related to ReDoS issues were introduced in Java 9 (2016).³ The OpenJDK maintainers introduced a bounded caching mechanism, improving problematic behavior for some ReDoS scenarios. This ReDoS defense is enabled by default and affects all OpenJDK Java versions ≥ 9 .

Engineering Effort: Before the update, the regex-related codebase consisted of 4823 LOC. The memoization patch added 1712 lines (including empty lines and docstrings) to the Java 9 source code, which accounted for a 35% expansion.

³<https://github.com/openjdk/jdk/commit/b45ea89>

4.1.5 Other ReDoS-Vulnerable Engines

PHP (*Zend Engine*), Perl (*perl5*), and Python (*CPython*) are also known to be using Spencer-style backtracking regex engines [71, 77], which are vulnerable to ReDoS attacks. According to Davis *et al.* [72], PHP [17] and Perl utilize *counter-based caps* to prevent catastrophic backtracking as an alternative to .NET and Ruby’s *time-based caps*. Python has neither built-in engine optimizations against ReDoS vulnerabilities nor a native timeout-like mechanism for regex evaluations. We have not found any documented updates or defenses against ReDoS vulnerabilities for these languages since the analysis of Davis *et al.* [72] in 2021.

4.1.6 Other ReDoS-Safe Engines

Two major programming languages, Rust and Go, have regex engines that were developed with ReDoS safety in mind [21, 50]. These engines use an explicit automaton representation that is simulated with the Thompson algorithm [64]. They also do not support extended features such as lookahead assertions and backreferences. They, therefore, offer linear-time match guarantees in the length of the input and the automaton. Turoňová observed that the construction of the automaton might be slow or the memory footprint problematic if the regex uses counters (*i.e.*, bounded quantifiers) [122].

Although not included in our analysis, independent third-party regex engines such as RE2 (Google) [41] and Hyperscan (Intel) [125, 126] are well-known for their ReDoS resilience. RE2, a Thompson-style engine, incorporates DFA state caching optimizations [98]. While generally ReDoS-safe and non-backtracking, RE2 can, in rare cases, exhibit backtracking behavior [72]. Similarly, Hyperscan is another efficient, ReDoS-safe engine, utilizing hardware acceleration alongside Glushkov’s NFA construction [79]. Neither engine supports extended regex (E-regex) features.

Finding 4. Since 2016, four major programming language runtimes have adopted ReDoS defenses. These defenses rely on three distinct solutions: memoization, Thompson-style simulation, Brzozowski derivatives. Defenses support K-regexes and often supplement with timeouts for E-regexes. Patches comprise 5-35% of the existing LOC. Three engines require developers to opt-in to safety.

4.2 Updated Measure of ReDoS Vulnerabilities

As indicated in Table 2, several major regex engines have recently been updated to mitigate or eliminate ReDoS. None of the works evaluated in our literature review acknowledged this fact or assessed the effectiveness of these changes. We, therefore, wondered what proportion of ReDoS vulnerabilities have been addressed by state-of-the-art engines.

We answered this question through measurements on a sample from the Davis polyglot regex corpus, comprising




Figure 2: Performance of regex matching in old vs. latest engines, in different programming languages.

~6K super-linear regexes extracted from open-source repositories across many programming languages. We filtered this corpus for all regexes predicted to be super-linear by vuln-regex-detector [36]. We evaluated 500 random samples of exponential-time regex candidates (out of 3K examples) and 500 random samples of polynomial-time regex candidates (out of ~100K examples). For these regexes, we generated attack inputs using, again, the vuln-regex-detector tool by Davis *et al.* [70] (which relies on [103, 109, 128, 131]).

We evaluated each regex-input pair on the regex engines described in Table 2, comparing the performance of the engine version before any changes to that of the most recent version. Following one of the definitions described in Table 1, we define a regex’s behavior as:

- *Exponential*: The processing time exceeds five seconds with fewer than 500 pumps of an attack string.
- *High-Polynomial*: The processing time exceeds five seconds with 500 or more pumps of an attack string.
- *Low-Polynomial*: The processing time exceeds 0.5 seconds on an attack string but does not meet the exponential or high-polynomial behavior criteria.
- *Linear*: The regex matching never times out against an attack string.

Fig. 2 shows our results. For each engine, we depict the number of regexes that exhibited super-linear behavior (as a fraction of the predicted input) in the pre and post-ReDoS mitigation versions. Not all regexes were supported in all engines, so the candidate pool size is indicated for each engine. Observe that for the engines with mitigations, there is a substantial decrease in the number of viable super-linear regexes — in other words, these mitigations appear to be effective in addressing the common causes of super-linear behavior.

Finding 5. Exponential behavior is resolved in C# and JavaScript, but not in Ruby and Java. Polynomial behavior continues to manifest in JavaScript and Java.

5 Realistic Simulation of ReDoS Attacks

As shown in Section 3, academic work on ReDoS can benefit from more realistic threat models and availability-oriented

evaluations, to better communicate the ReDoS-associated risks. To this end, we present a framework for assessing the severity of vulnerable regular expressions via attack simulations. We first define the main considered use cases, the threat model and the ReDoS definition, then present `wrk-redos`, our prototype for performing measurements in the proposed framework.

Use Cases. As discussed in the introduction, developers are often overwhelmed by the number of *supposedly-vulnerable* regular expressions in their code base, in particular, in code they did not write, e.g., shipped with third-party dependencies. To confirm the severity of such security findings, we propose simulating actual ReDoS attacks and benchmark the corresponding degradation in quality of service, as perceived by concurrent users. In this way, developers can understand the attacker’s leverage in an asymmetric DoS, enabled by the problematic regular expression.

Considering the current state of regex engines discussed in Section 4, we note a second usage scenario for our framework. It can assist developers with understanding the effect of migrating their application to a different engine version, from a ReDoS resilience perspective. Concretely, developers can perform attack simulations before and after changing the runtime version and measure how the attacker’s advantage changes as a result of this migration. Since regex engine migration carries risks, notably that of semantic changes, `wrk-redos` can help engineers assess the risk-reward tradeoff here.

Threat Model. We assume that attackers and users can interact simultaneously with the target system via two endpoints: one that is benign and one that is vulnerable to ReDoS attacks. Attackers have limited bandwidth and know how to create ReDoS payloads, but we do not assume any special deployment features like redundancy or intrusion detection systems. This model restricts attackers from sending excessively large payloads and does not presume a specific regex engine type, which aligns more closely with realistic scenarios. Under this threat model, we propose an alternative definition for ReDoS vulnerabilities that we believe is more in line with the practitioners’ expectations:

Definition. *A problematic regular expression is considered a vulnerability if and only if it is accompanied by an attack simulation with the following characteristics:*

- **C1:** *The vulnerability is exercised in a realistically-deployed web application, e.g., in the cloud.*
- **C2:** *The attackers’ bandwidth is restricted to a reasonably low value, in line with the asymmetric setup.*
- **C3:** *The simulation shows that concurrent benign users experience dropped requests or extremely high latency.*

This definition has certain advantages over previous ones proposed in the literature. It discards minor slowdowns caused




Figure 3: Overview of `wrk-redos`, an attack simulation framework for realistic assessment of ReDoS findings.

by ReDoS issues, which cannot be leveraged for an asymmetric attack. It emphasizes the server’s QoS degradation, as perceived by benign users, instead of merely measuring the slowdown produced by individual payloads. Moreover, it requires critical availability consequences like dropped requests for an issue to be considered a vulnerability. We believe that this will help alleviate the security fatigue regarding ReDoS and prioritize harmful ReDoS issues. Most importantly, our definition mandates that the web application needs to be deployed in a setup that closely resembles a real production environment. In this way, certain deployment-time components such as the reversed proxy might absorb some of the malicious ReDoS traffic and inadvertently prevent the attack.

Simulation Framework. Considering the criteria we established for a successful attack, we propose `wrk-redos` a simulation tool that measures the effectiveness of ReDoS attacks leveraging a target regular expression. Figure 3 depicts how `wrk-redos` operates. `wrk-redos` takes the user’s simulation configuration, such as attack bandwidth and window, measurement bandwidth, and experiment duration. It then launches two concurrent workloads: (i) a benign one that is triggered first and continuously benchmarks the target server, i.e., sends high-bandwidth measurement requests, (ii) a malicious one that sends ReDoS payloads in a restricted time window, at a predefined rate. `wrk-redos` communicates with these processes, manages the data configuration, and gathers output metrics, such as throughput, latency, and errors for benign users. Adopting a remote benchmarking approach, `wrk-redos` highlights the attack’s impact on benign users (C3), measuring the system’s capability to handle both legitimate and malicious traffic concurrently. Nonetheless, to comply with the other two simulation characteristics in the definition above, users of `wrk-redos` must ensure that they configure attacks with sufficiently low bandwidth (C2) and that the target application is deployed under realistic conditions (C1). Similar to related work such as Rampart [96], Shan *et al.* [108], and Olivo *et al.* [100], our framework performs short attack bursts and observes the server’s behavior before and after the attack. This method enables asymmetric attacks, similar to low-rate denial of service and Shrew attacks [132], both known to bypass existing DoS defenses. Moreover, `wrk-redos` utilizes `wrk2` [39], a popular HTTP

benchmarking tool [76, 78, 80, 85, 94, 124] to simulate both benign and malicious traffic. This allows us to maximize the amount of traffic sent from one machine and reuse a mature measurement infrastructure adopted both by practitioners and academics. `wrk2` follows standards set in benchmarking literature to ensure accurate, stable, and relevant measurements.

6 Experiments

To illustrate the utility of `wrk-redos`, we analyzed previously reported ReDoS vulnerabilities in open-source libraries by conducting equivalent attacks of varying intensities. We selected ten libraries from the `npm` and `PyPI` ecosystems, all with reviewed vulnerability reports in the GitHub Advisory Database. These libraries were chosen based on their severity scores and available proof-of-concept payloads. Details about the tested libraries and their versions—eight libraries with over 850,000 weekly downloads and seven with more than 3.5 million—these libraries are still susceptible to security issues. We used both Heroku’s basic `dyno` (512 MB memory, 1 CPU) and an AWS EC2 instance (1 GB memory, 1 CPU) to set up our sample applications. The EC2 instance ran custom Docker applications to implement the second use case described in Section 5, which involved replacing Python’s `re` module with `RE2` and Node.js’s `regex` engine with `RE2`, instead of the default `V8` engine. However, we could not perform the same measurements for `django-intcomma` due to a stack overflow caused by `RE2`’s internals. This setup enabled us to simulate and measure the impact of migrating to a ReDoS-safe engine, comparing ReDoS resilience and performance before and after the engine swap. We created Express and Flask applications to process user input through these vulnerable libraries, with dedicated API endpoints for each. Malicious payloads were sent via headers to test the servers’ vulnerability to attacks.

Table 3 presents the results of our simulation experiments using three payload sizes (25, 1000, and 5000 characters), with an attack burst lasting 10 seconds at a rate of 100 *req/s*, and a measurement window of 60 seconds at the same rate. We calculate and list various metrics that demonstrate the resilience of the target systems under these attacks. As the intensity of the attack increases, we observe a consistent rise in latency metrics (average and tail). Additionally, the last two columns of the table show the number of timeouts and failed requests with the 5000-character payload when `RE2` was enabled in both Node.js—`V8` and Python. Despite `charset` having a high severity score of 7.5, its impact on performance metrics such as average and median latencies was minimal, with increases only in the millisecond range except for some outliers at the 99.99th percentile ($p_{99.99}$). Conversely, `semver`, with a lower severity score of 5.3, seriously reduced server throughput to less than 10% with an input size of 5000 characters and significantly increased the

average latency of benign requests for 1000 characters. These observations suggest that the severity scores provided in advisory databases might not consistently reflect their effect on a system’s vulnerability to DoS attacks. Additionally, different advisory databases may assign varying severity scores to the same vulnerability, as seen with `node-email-check`, where GitHub Advisory Database rates it as a high vulnerability (7.5), whereas Snyk.io considers it medium severity (5.3). Interestingly, `celo` exhibited a complete server shutdown with an input length of only 25 characters but showed no adverse effects with larger inputs of 1000 and 5000 characters. This resilience at larger sizes can be attributed to the input restriction implemented in the `celo` library, as discussed in Appendix B.3. Although this check prevents large-payload attacks, smaller, targeted inputs exploiting the vulnerable expression can still cause significant damage.

Let us now consider the case of `django-truncate` in more detail. Figure 4 illustrates the throughput and latency of the Django application under various attack scenarios. In Django version 3.2, the method `django.utils.text.Truncator` is vulnerable to ReDoS, when used with `html=True`. In our setup, malicious data is sent by including it in an HTTP header—a common method for data transmission to the server—to exploit this vulnerability. The graph depicts the server’s response to different simulated attack scenarios with payloads of lengths 25, 1000, 5000, and 10000. We observe an increase in both average and median latency as the payload sizes increase from 25 to 1000, indicating a degradation in server performance during the attack. Moreover, with a payload of 5000, there is a significant reduction in server throughput, approximately to 10%, which signifies a substantial impact of the attack. However, this throughput rebounds to baseline levels shortly after the cessation of the attack. Conversely, the 10000 payload scenario deviates from the expected outcome, exhibiting no discernible effect on server performance. This anomaly arises because the payload size exceeds Heroku’s header limit, resulting in a rejection of the malicious requests by the server’s infrastructure. Thus, despite the attacker dispatching larger payloads, the server remains unaffected, due to an intrinsic safeguard against excessively large payloads within the platform. This supports our claim that ReDoS findings should be evaluated in realistic scenarios, where such complexities are considered.

6.1 Analysis of Simulation Results

When simulating attacks like ReDoS, it is essential to employ a multi-faceted measurement strategy that goes beyond single metrics such as tail latency. This avoids the oversimplification trap of a single viewpoint, as discussed below.

Detailed Analysis of Metrics. Let us consider the case of `semgrep` in Table 3 to illustrate how relying solely on tail latency can sometimes paint an incomplete picture of an attack’s true impact. With input sizes of 25 versus 1000, the

Table 3: Performance metrics for 10 NPM and PyPI libraries at input sizes 25, 1000, and 5000. Metrics include 99.99th percentile latency ($p_{99.99}$), mean (\bar{x}), median (p_{50}), timeout requests ($N_{u\rightarrow sw}$), and failed requests (N_{failed}).

Library	Input size = 25				Input size = 1000				Input size = 5000				Input size = 5000 (RE2)	
	$p_{99.99}$	\bar{x}	$N_{u\rightarrow sw}$	N_{failed}	$p_{99.99}$	\bar{x}	$N_{u\rightarrow sw}$	N_{failed}	$p_{99.99}$	\bar{x}	$N_{u\rightarrow sw}$	N_{failed}	$N_{u\rightarrow sw}$	N_{failed}
black	561.49	128.66	0	0	178.27	132.70	3401 (75.5%)	50	777.65	136.52	3251 (72.2%)	50	247 (13.7%)	0
celo	173.76	124.52	3401 (75.5%)	50	412.93	111.14	3401 (75.5%)	50	151.77	128.00	3301 (73.3%)	50	0	0
django-truncate	438.82	113.41	0	0	479.60	154.64	0	0	12801.15	2615.76	0	0	n/A	N/A
django-intcomma	426.59	111.62	0	0	189.72	122.68	0	0	7332.25	1121.46	0	0	N/A	N/A
semgrep	9644.78	1675.03	0	0	459.06	120.57	3301 (73.3%)	50	543.81	139.27	3396 (75.4%)	50	0	0
charset	574.81	129.82	0	0	483.45	129.83	0	0	5496.47	134.67	0	0	0	0
node-email-check	342.45	137.12	3301 (73.3%)	50	487.60	133.98	0	0	621.69	117.48	0	0	0	0
cookiejar	704.84	122.32	0	0	185.87	118.65	0	0	5238.85	847.67	0	0	0	0
lodash	437.11	112.79	0	0	539.86	129.12	0	0	197.13	126.80	0	0	0	0
semver	652.86	110.85	0	0	1407.34	164.78	0	0	10154.02	1797.97	0	0	0	0




Figure 4: Throughput and latency for benign users for `django-truncate` library at payload sizes 25, 1000, 5000, and 10000.

data suggests a disproportionate effect on server performance at smaller input sizes. Initially, it appears more disruptive due to higher latency spikes. Yet, this view does not investigate the server’s ability to recover quickly once the attack ceases, which is crucial for assessing the system’s resilience. Appendix B.4 discuss that the server quickly stabilizes post-attack at small payloads, but larger inputs cause continuous server downtime until manual intervention. Even though the reported tail latency is lower due to incomplete data, the actual impact is significantly more severe since the server remains non-operational.

Effects of Payload Size. We note that there is often a key threshold beyond which increasing the payload size has no additional negative impact. For instance, comparing input sizes of 1000 and 5000 for `semgrep` in Table 3 shows negligible differences in the observed metrics. This indicates that once a payload is sufficiently large to overwhelm the server, further increases do not exacerbate the attack’s effect.

Setting Appropriate Bandwidth. When evaluating the severity of a ReDoS exploit, it is crucial to ensure that the simulation itself does not inadvertently launch a traditional DoS attack on the server. This can be avoided by properly setting the attack bandwidth in the benchmarking tool; otherwise, the results fail to show the effect of the ReDoS payload, but of the high-bandwidth traffic. Figure 5 illustrates this issue, showing the consequences of running `wrk-redos` at an attack




Figure 5: Throughput and latency for benign users at 500 req/s bandwidth. The increasing latency and fluctuating throughput indicate bandwidth exceeding server capacity, leading to an inadvertent DDoS attack.

rate of 500 requests per second, which exceeds the server’s capacity. This is indicated by the fluctuations in throughput and the increase in latency even before the actual attack begins. As a result, the observed performance degradation can be attributed mainly to the high traffic volume, instead of the ReDoS payloads. Therefore, it is essential to calibrate both the benign and attack bandwidths to accurately assess the impact of a ReDoS attack.

Stable Measurement Conditions. Preparing and calibrating the system before conducting attack simulations is essential. This involves stabilizing both throughput and latency with benign loads to ensure that the baseline performance

is reliable and reflective of typical operational conditions. `wrk-redos` facilitates this by simulating benign conditions, at first, to verify the system’s stability before launching the attack simulation, helping to ensure that the subsequent measurements accurately reflect the attack’s impact.

7 Discussion

7.1 Future Work for Research and Practice

In our literature review, we found that academic research on ReDoS involves inconsistent (or absent) definitions, attack success criteria, and threat models. We recommend that future ReDoS research adopt consistent definitions and attack success criteria. With respect to threat models, we believe that assumptions about the attacker are generally reasonable. For example, it seems reasonable to assume that the attacker’s input can reach the regex, since regexes are commonly used for input sanitization and processing. However, the research literature’s assumptions about the defender’s system are out of date. In our engineering review, we showed that the state-of-the-art regex engines employ three distinct algorithms to mitigate the risk of ReDoS by reducing the worst-case time complexity. Few papers acknowledge this change.

In future ReDoS studies, researchers should communicate their findings more effectively. First, they should make realistic assumptions about the underlying system, and clearly state them when reporting vulnerabilities. For example, in a default setup, an Express instance accepts at most 8KB-large headers or GET parameters, and 100KB POST JSON payloads. Thus, concerns about 1MB payloads require justification. Such reports can be facilitated and accompanied by `wrk-redos` simulations.

From a software engineering perspective, we recommend that developers should always critically assess any ReDoS vulnerability reported by code scanners. As mentioned in Section 7.2, current ReDoS code scanners are imprecise. Developers should ask: if a purported vulnerability is reachable; what is a realistic attack payload size and rate; what is the maximum triggered slowdown; and whether other defenses such as rate limiting can be introduced or tuned. Our `wrk-redos` tool can support simulations against the target system.

7.2 Pushback from Engineering Community

From many perspectives, ReDoS is an important class of cybersecurity vulnerability. ReDoS has led to outages of major web services; dozens of research papers have been given on the topic; and major programming language runtimes have integrated defenses. However, we acknowledge that there has been some pushback from practitioners about the severity of ReDoS. Engineers at GitHub consider it a low severity vulnerability, “not particularly serious, but easy to create by accident, obscure to understand, and sometimes tricky to fix” [54].

More strident voices argue that ReDoS vulnerabilities are “malicious noise” [129] and just lead to security fatigue [130]. Several ReDoS CVE advisories have been disputed by the maintainers (*e.g.*, CVE-2023-39663, CVE-2022-42969, CVE-2019-11391), indicating disagreement between maintainers and reporters about the risks.

We suggest that both views can be true. ReDoS can comprise a real and severe vector for asymmetric DoS attacks, as indicated by the actions of major software vendors to mitigate it. ReDoS vulnerability reports can also be mere noise distracting engineers from more serious matters. We suggest that the blame for both perspectives may lie with the cybersecurity research community. As noted in Section 3, researchers have performed large-scale measurements of ReDoS as well as producing new and more effective detectors for vulnerable regexes. Their measurement instruments have been integrated into popular security scanners, *e.g.*, the integration of `safe-regex` into `eslint`. However, the resulting scanners analyze only the regex, without considering reachability constraints as well as other input constraints. When academics apply these tools, they filter false positives based on the regex’s context. When practitioners do so, they may make much ado about nothing. This possibility suggests that empirical studies of academic tool uptake would be of interest, as well as prompting the research community to reflect on access controls for research tooling.

8 Conclusions

In this work, we perform a multi-faceted study of the recent academic work on ReDoS and the new engineering realities in the mainstream programming languages, after initial fixes were deployed in most of them. We report on concrete examples of language runtimes that adopted defenses, which appear to be motivated by academic research. When studying the efficacy of these defenses, we find that they mitigate most ReDoS payloads, but they still leave significant space of maneuver for the attackers. By surveying the academic work on ReDoS, we find that many papers in this domain use weak definitions and strong threat models, often considering any slowdown caused by regular expression matching as a security vulnerability. We argue that any notion of denial of service only makes sense in the context of a concurrent system, in which the payloads can be triggered remotely. We propose a new framework for evaluating ReDoS findings, in which attacker capabilities are restricted according to the asymmetric setup, and problematic regular expressions are used as part of a simulated attack to show that they can cause significant QoS degradation. Finally, we propose `wrk-redos`, a simulation tool that we believe will empower researchers to perform more security-oriented evaluations and, thus, put back DoS into ReDoS.

The call for papers states that an extra page is allotted to discuss ethics considerations and compliance with the open science policy. This page contains that content.

9 Ethics Considerations

In our judgment, this work presents an acceptable ethical risk-reward tradeoff. Specifically:

- The literature review (Section 3) and engineering review (Section 4) describe and systematize only publicly-available resources.
- Any measurement tool such as `wrk-redos` (Section 5) poses dual use dilemmas: good actors can use it to improve systems, and bad actors can use it to calibrate attacks. We believe that the potential benefit for the community outweighs the risk of misuse.
- In our evaluation of `wrk-redos` (Section 6.1), we only rely on known/patched vulnerabilities, and we only simulate ReDoS attacks against web servers that we control.

10 Compliance with Open Science Policy

An artifact accompanies this paper at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/wrk-DoS-0627>. The artifact includes (1) the dataset of super-linear regexes and attack inputs, and (2) the source code and usage manual for `wrk-redos`.

References

- [1] 2024 State of the Java Ecosystem Report | New Relic. <https://newrelic.com/resources/report/2024-state-of-the-java-ecosystem>.
- [2] About Node.js. <https://nodejs.org/en/about>.
- [3] About Perl. <https://www.perl.org/about.html>.
- [4] About Ruby. <https://www.ruby-lang.org/en/about/>.
- [5] core - Apache HTTP Server Version 2.2. <https://httpd.apache.org/docs/2.2/mod/core.html#limitrequestfieldsize>.
- [6] Denial of Service | OWASP Foundation. https://owasp.org/www-community/attacks/Denial_of_Service.
- [7] Details of the cloudflare outage on july 2, 2019. <https://blog.cloudflare.com/details%2dof%2dthe%2dcloudflare%2doutage%2don%2djuly%2d2%2d2019>.
- [8] Distribution of Web Servers among websites that use JavaScript. https://w3techs.com/technologies/segmentation/pl-js/web_server.
- [9] Distribution of Web Servers among websites that use JavaScript. https://w3techs.com/technologies/segmentation/pl-js/web_server.
- [10] HTTP Routing | Heroku Dev Center. <https://devcenter.heroku.com/articles/http-routing>.
- [11] Introduction to the Go compiler. <https://go.dev/src/cmd/compile/README>.
- [12] Module ngx_http_core_module. http://nginx.org/en/docs/http/ngx_http_core_module.html#large_client_header_buffers.
- [13] OpenJDK. <https://openjdk.org/>.
- [14] Pattern (Java Platform SE 8). <https://docs.oracle.com/javase/8/docs/api/java/util/regex/Pattern.html>.
- [15] PHP: General Information. <https://www.php.net/manual/en/faq.general.php>.
- [16] PHP: History of PHP. <https://www.php.net/manual/en/history.php.php>.
- [17] PHP: Runtime Configuration - Manual. <https://www.php.net/manual/en/pcre.configuration.php>.
- [18] Preventing regular expression denial of service (ReDoS). <https://www.regular-expressions.info/redos.html>.
- [19] Python Developer's Guide. <https://devguide.python.org/>.
- [20] ReDoS | tutorials & examples. <https://learn.snyk.io/lesson/redos/>.
- [21] Regexp package - Go. <https://pkg.go.dev/regexp>.
- [22] Ruby 3.2 changes. <https://rubyreferences.github.io/rubychanges/3.2.html#regexp-redos-vulnerability-prevention>.
- [23] Ruby 3.2.0 Released. <https://www.ruby-lang.org/en/news/2022/12/25/ruby-3-2-0-released/>.
- [24] Usage Statistics and Market Share of Node.js. <https://w3techs.com/technologies/details/ws-nodejs>.
- [25] V8 JavaScript engine. <https://v8.dev/>.
- [26] What is .NET? <https://dotnet.microsoft.com/en-us/learn/dotnet/what-is-dotnet>.
- [27] What is rustc? <https://doc.rust-lang.org/rustc/>.
- [28] ReDoS vulnerabilities in npm spikes by 143% and XSS continues to grow. <https://snyk.io/blog/redos%2dvulnerabilities%2din%2dnpm%2dspikes%2dby%2d143%2dand%2dxss%2dcontinues%2dto%2dgrow/>, February 2019.
- [29] Compilation and Reuse in Regular Expressions - .NET. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/dotnet/standard/base-types/compilation-and-reuse-in-regular-expressions>, September 2021.
- [30] Regular Expression behavior - .NET. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/dotnet/standard/base-types/details-of-regular-expression-behavior>, September 2021.
- [31] Backtracking in .NET regular expressions - .NET. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/dotnet/standard/base-types/backtracking-in-regular-expressions>, August 2023.

- [32] Best Practices for Regular Expressions in .NET - .NET. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/dotnet/standard/base-types/best-practices-regex>, October 2023.
- [33] What's new in .NET Framework - .NET Framework. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/dotnet/framework/whats-new/>, June 2023.
- [34] C# Language Specification. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/dotnet/csharp/language-reference/language-specification/introduction>, March 2024.
- [35] Davisjam/safe-regex. <https://github.com/davisjam/safe-regex>, August 2024.
- [36] Davisjam/vuln-regex-detector. <https://github.com/davisjam/vuln-regex-detector>, August 2024.
- [37] Dotnet/runtime. <https://github.com/dotnet/runtime>, August 2024.
- [38] Doyensec/regexploit. <https://github.com/doyensec/regexploit>, August 2024.
- [39] Giltene/wrk2. <https://github.com/giltene/wrk2>, August 2024.
- [40] Golang/go. <https://github.com/golang/go>, August 2024.
- [41] Google/re2. <https://github.com/google/re2>, September 2024.
- [42] K-takata/onigmo. <https://github.com/k-takata/onigmo>, May 2024.
- [43] Kkos/oniguruma. <https://github.com/kkos/oniguruma>, June 2024.
- [44] Nodejs/node. <https://github.com/nodejs/node>, August 2024.
- [45] Openjdk/jdk. <https://github.com/openjdk/jdk>, August 2024.
- [46] Perl/perl5. <https://github.com/perl/perl5>, August 2024.
- [47] Php/php-src. <https://github.com/php/php-src>, August 2024.
- [48] Python/cpython. <https://github.com/python/cpython>, August 2024.
- [49] Ruby/ruby. <https://github.com/ruby/ruby>, August 2024.
- [50] Rust-lang/regex. <https://github.com/rust-lang/regex>, August 2024.
- [51] Rust-lang/rust. <https://github.com/rust-lang/rust>, August 2024.
- [52] Tjenkinson/redos-detector. <https://github.com/tjenkinson/redos-detector>, May 2024.
- [53] V8/v8. <https://chromium.googlesource.com/v8/v8.git>, August 2024.
- [54] Kevin Backhouse. How to fix a redos. <https://github.blog/2023-05-09-how-to-fix-a-redos/>, May 2023.
- [55] Zhihao Bai, Ke Wang, Hang Zhu, Yinzi Cao, and Xin Jin. Runtime Recovery of Web Applications under Zero-Day ReDoS Attacks. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1575–1588. IEEE, May 2021.
- [56] Efe Barlas, Xin Du, and James C. Davis. Exploiting input sanitization for regex denial of service. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 883–895. ACM, May 2022.
- [57] Masudul Hasan Masud Bhuiyan, Adithya Srinivas Parthasarathy, Nikos Vasilakis, Michael Pradel, and Cristian-Alexandru Staicu. SecBench.js: An Executable Security Benchmark Suite for Server-Side JavaScript. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 1059–1070. IEEE, May 2023.
- [58] Martin Bidlingmaier. An additional non-backtracking RegExp engine · V8. <https://v8.dev/blog/non-backtracking-regexp>, January 2021.
- [59] Janusz A. Brzozowski. Derivatives of Regular Expressions. *Journal of the ACM*, 11(4):481–494, October 1964.
- [60] Enrico Cambiaso, Gianluca Papaleo, and Maurizio Aiello. Taxonomy of Slow DoS Attacks to Web Applications. In Sabu M. Thampi, Albert Y. Zomaya, Thorsten Strufe, Jose M. Alcaraz Calero, and Tony Thomas, editors, *Recent Trends in Computer Networks and Distributed Systems Security*, volume 335, pages 195–204. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012. Series Title: Communications in Computer and Information Science.
- [61] Nariyoshi Chida and Tachio Terauchi. Repairing DoS Vulnerability of Real-World Regexes. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 2060–2077. IEEE, May 2022.

- [62] Cloudflare. Distributed denial-of-service (ddos) protection. <https://www.cloudflare.com/ddos/>, 2024. Accessed: 2024-09-04.
- [63] Erik Corry, Christian Plesner Hansen, and Lasse Reichstein Holst Nielsen. Irregexp, Google Chrome’s New Regexp Implementation.
- [64] Russ Cox. Regular Expression Matching Can Be Simple And Fast. <https://web.archive.org/web/20240529192558/https://swtch.com/~rsc/regexp/regexp1.html>, January 2007.
- [65] Scott Crosby. Denial of service through regular expressions. In *USENIX Security work in progress report*, volume 28, 2003.
- [66] Scott A Crosby and Dan S Wallach. Denial of service via algorithmic complexity attacks. In *12th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 03)*, 2003.
- [67] James Davis. The Regular Expression Denial of Service (ReDoS) cheat-sheet. <https://levelup.gitconnected.com/the%2dregular%2dexpression%2ddenial%2dof%2dservice%2dredos%2dcheat%2dsheet%2da78d0ed7d865>, June 2020.
- [68] James Davis, Gregor Kildow, and Dongyoon Lee. The Case of the Poisoned Event Handler: Weaknesses in the Node.js Event-Driven Architecture. In *Proceedings of the 10th European Workshop on Systems Security*, pages 1–6. ACM, April 2017.
- [69] James C. Davis. Rethinking Regex engines to address ReDoS. In *Proceedings of the 2019 27th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, pages 1256–1258. ACM, August 2019.
- [70] James C. Davis, Christy A. Coghlan, Francisco Servant, and Dongyoon Lee. The impact of regular expression denial of service (ReDoS) in practice: an empirical study at the ecosystem scale. In *Proceedings of the 2018 26th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, pages 246–256. ACM, October 2018.
- [71] James C. Davis, Louis G. Michael Iv, Christy A. Coghlan, Francisco Servant, and Dongyoon Lee. Why aren’t regular expressions a lingua franca? an empirical study on the re-use and portability of regular expressions. In *Proceedings of the 2019 27th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, pages 443–454. ACM, August 2019.
- [72] James C. Davis, Francisco Servant, and Dongyoon Lee. Using Selective Memoization to Defeat Regular Expression Denial of Service (ReDoS). In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1–17. IEEE, May 2021.
- [73] James C. Davis, Eric R. Williamson, and Dongyoon Lee. A Sense of Time for JavaScript and Node.js: First-Class Timeouts as a Cure for Event Handler Poisoning. In *27th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 18)*, pages 343–359, 2018.
- [74] James Collins Davis. *On the impact and defeat of regular expression denial of service*. PhD thesis, Virginia Tech, 2020.
- [75] Henri Maxime Demoulin, Isaac Pedisich, Nikos Vasilakis, Vincent Liu, Boon Thau Loo, and Linh Thi Xuan Phan. Detecting asymmetric application-layer denial-of-service attacks in-flight with finelame. In *Proceedings of the 2019 USENIX Conference on Usenix Annual Technical Conference, USENIX ATC ’19*, page 693–707, USA, 2019. USENIX Association.
- [76] Haoran Ding, Zhaoguo Wang, Zhuohao Shen, Rong Chen, and Haibo Chen. Automated verification of idempotence for stateful serverless applications. In *17th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 23)*, pages 887–910, 2023.
- [77] Jeffrey E. F. Friedl. *Mastering Regular Expressions*. Programming. O’Reilly, Beijing Boston Farnham Sebastopol Tokyo, third edition edition, 2006.
- [78] Alexander Fuerst, Ahmed Ali-Eldin, Prashant Shenoy, and Prateek Sharma. Cloud-scale VM-deflation for running interactive applications on transient servers. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Symposium on High-Performance Parallel and Distributed Computing*, pages 53–64. ACM.
- [79] V M Glushkov. The Abstract Theory of Automata. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 16(5):1–53, October 1961.
- [80] Paulo Gouveia, João Neves, Carlos Segarra, Luca Liechti, Shady Issa, Valerio Schiavoni, and Miguel Matos. Kollaps: decentralized and dynamic topology emulation. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth European Conference on Computer Systems*, pages 1–16. ACM.
- [81] Jakob Gruber. Speeding up V8 regular expressions · V8. <https://v8.dev/blog/speeding-up-regular-expressions>, January 2017.

- [82] David Gutierrez. Regular Expression performance. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/archive/blogs/bclteam/regular%2dexpression%2dperformance%2ddavid%2dgutierrez>, November 2004.
- [83] Sk Adnan Hassan, Zainab Aamir, Dongyoon Lee, James C. Davis, and Francisco Servant. Improving Developers’ Understanding of Regex Denial of Service Tools through Anti-Patterns and Fix Strategies. In *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1238–1255. IEEE, May 2023.
- [84] Lukáš Holík, Juraj Síč, Lenka Turoňová, and Tomáš Vojnar. Fast Matching of Regular Patterns with Synchronizing Counting. In Orna Kupferman and Pawel Sobocinski, editors, *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures*, pages 392–412, Cham, 2023. Springer Nature Switzerland.
- [85] Pierre Jacquet, Thomas Ledoux, and Romain Rouvoy. CloudFactory: An open toolkit to generate production-like workloads for cloud infrastructures. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Cloud Engineering (IC2E)*, pages 81–91. IEEE.
- [86] James Kirrage, Asiri Rathnayake, and Hayo Thielecke. Static Analysis for Regular Expression Denial-of-Service Attacks. In Javier Lopez, Xinyi Huang, and Ravi Sandhu, editors, *Network and System Security*, pages 135–148, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013. Springer.
- [87] Maryna Kluban, Mohammad Mannan, and Amr Youssef. On Measuring Vulnerable JavaScript Functions in the Wild. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM on Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 917–930. ACM, May 2022.
- [88] Maryna Kluban, Mohammad Mannan, and Amr Youssef. On Detecting and Measuring Exploitable JavaScript Functions in Real-world Applications. *ACM Transactions on Privacy and Security*, 27(1):1–37, February 2024.
- [89] Sunil Kumar, Mandeep Singh, Monika Sachdeva, and Krishan Kumar. Flooding based ddos attacks and their influence on web services. *IJCSIT) International Journal of Computer Science and Information Technologies*, 2(3):1131–1136, 2011.
- [90] Yeting Li, Zixuan Chen, Jialun Cao, Zhiwu Xu, Qiancheng Peng, Haiming Chen, Liyuan Chen, and Shing-Chi Cheung. ReDoSHunter: A Combined Static and Dynamic Approach for Regular Expression DoS Detection. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pages 3847–3864, 2021.
- [91] Yeting Li, Yecheng Sun, Zhiwu Xu, Jialun Cao, Yuekang Li, Rongchen Li, Haiming Chen, Shing-Chi Cheung, Yang Liu, and Yang Xiao. RegexScalpel: Regular expression denial of service (ReDoS) defense by Localize-and-Fix. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, pages 4183–4200, Boston, MA, August 2022. USENIX Association.
- [92] Yeting Li, Zhiwu Xu, Jialun Cao, Haiming Chen, Tingjian Ge, Shing-Chi Cheung, and Haoren Zhao. FlashRegex: Deducing anti-ReDoS regexes from examples. In *Proceedings of the 35th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, pages 659–671, Virtual Event Australia, December 2020. ACM.
- [93] Yinxi Liu, Mingxue Zhang, and Wei Meng. Revealer: Detecting and Exploiting Regular Expression Denial-of-Service Vulnerabilities. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1468–1484. IEEE, May 2021.
- [94] Pascal Maissen, Pascal Felber, Peter Kropf, and Valerio Schiavoni. FaaSdom: A benchmark suite for serverless computing. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM International Conference on Distributed and Event-based Systems*, pages 73–84.
- [95] Robert McLaughlin, Fabio Pagani, Noah Spahn, Christopher Kruegel, and Giovanni Vigna. Regulator: Dynamic Analysis to Detect ReDoS.
- [96] Wei Meng, Chenxiong Qian, Shuang Hao, Kevin Borgolte, Giovanni Vigna, Christopher Kruegel, and Wenke Lee. Rampart: Protecting web applications from {CPU-Exhaustion}{Denial-of-Service} attacks. In *27th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 18)*, pages 393–410, 2018.
- [97] MITRE. Cwe-1333: Inefficient regular expression complexity. <https://cwe.mitre.org/data/definitions/1333.html>, 2024. Accessed: 2024-09-04.
- [98] Dan Moseley, Mario Nishio, Jose Perez Rodriguez, Olli Saarikivi, Stephen Toub, Margus Veanes, Tiki Wan, and Eric Xu. Derivative based nonbacktracking real-world regex matching with backtracking semantics. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 7(PLDI), June 2023.
- [99] Yannic Noller, Rody Kersten, and Corina S. Păsăreanu. Badger: complexity analysis with fuzzing and symbolic execution. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*, pages 322–332. ACM, July 2018.

- [100] Oswaldo Olivo, Isil Dillig, and Calvin Lin. Detecting and exploiting second order denial-of-service vulnerabilities in web applications. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 616–628, 2015.
- [101] Francesco Parolini and Antoine Miné. Sound static analysis of regular expressions for vulnerabilities to denial of service attacks. *Science of Computer Programming*, 229:102960, July 2023.
- [102] Theofilos Petsios, Jason Zhao, Angelos D. Keromytis, and Suman Jana. SlowFuzz: Automated Domain-Independent Detection of Algorithmic Complexity Vulnerabilities. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 2155–2168. ACM, October 2017.
- [103] Asiri Rathnayake and Hayo Thielecke. Static Analysis for Regular Expression Exponential Runtime via Substructural Logics (Extended), August 2017. arXiv:1405.7058 [cs].
- [104] Vinicius De Miranda Rios, Pedro R. M. Inacio, Damien Magoni, and Mario M. Freire. Detection and Mitigation of Low-Rate Denial-of-Service Attacks: A Survey. *IEEE Access*, 10:76648–76668, 2022.
- [105] Olli Saarikivi, Margus Veanes, Tiki Wan, and Eric Xu. Symbolic Regex Matcher. In Tomáš Vojnar and Lijun Zhang, editors, *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, pages 372–378, Cham, 2019. Springer International Publishing.
- [106] Monika Sachdeva, Gurvinder Singh, Krishan Kumar, and Kuldeep Singh. Ddos incidents and their impact: A review. *Int. Arab J. Inf. Technol.*, 7(1):14–20, 2010.
- [107] Moritz Schloegel, Nils Bars, Nico Schiller, Lukas Bernhard, Tobias Scharnowski, Addison Crump, Arash Ale-Ebrahim, Nicolai Bissantz, Marius Muench, and Thorsten Holz. Sok: Prudent evaluation practices for fuzzing. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P)*, 2024.
- [108] Huasong Shan, Qingyang Wang, and Calton Pu. Tail attacks on web applications. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1725–1739, 2017.
- [109] Yuju Shen, Yanyan Jiang, Chang Xu, Ping Yu, Xiaoxing Ma, and Jian Lu. ReScue: crafting regular expression DoS attacks. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM/IEEE International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, pages 225–235. ACM, September 2018.
- [110] Mohammed Latif Siddiq, Jiahao Zhang, Lindsay Roney, and Joanna C. S. Santos. Re(gExlDoS)Eval: Evaluating Generated Regular Expressions and their Proneness to DoS Attacks. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM/IEEE 44th International Conference on Software Engineering: New Ideas and Emerging Results*, pages 52–56. ACM, April 2024.
- [111] Mohammed Latif Siddiq, Jiahao Zhang, and Joanna Cecilia Da Silva Santos. Understanding regular expression denial of service (redos): Insights from llm-generated regexes and developer forums. In *Proceedings of the 32nd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Program Comprehension, ICPC '24*, page 190–201, New York, NY, USA, 2024. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [112] Randy Smith, Cristian Estan, and Somesh Jha. XFA: Faster signature matching with extended automata. In *2008 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (sp 2008)*, pages 187–201. IEEE. ISSN: 1081-6011.
- [113] stackstatus. Outage Postmortem - July 20, 2016. <https://stackstatus.tumblr.com/post/147710624694/outage-postmortem-july-20-2016>, July 2016.
- [114] Cristian-Alexandru Staicu and Michael Pradel. Freezing the Web: A Study of ReDoS Vulnerabilities in JavaScript-based Web Servers. In *27th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 18)*, pages 361–376, 2018.
- [115] Weihao Su, Hong Huang, Rongchen Li, Haiming Chen, and Tingjian Ge. Towards an effective method of ReDoS detection for non-backtracking engines. In *33rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 24)*, pages 271–288, Philadelphia, PA, August 2024. USENIX Association.
- [116] Sicheol Sung, Hyunjoon Cheon, and Yo-Sub Han. How to Settle the ReDoS Problem: Back to the Classical Automata Theory. In Pascal Caron and Ludovic Mignot, editors, *Implementation and Application of Automata*, volume 13266, pages 34–49. Springer International Publishing, 2022. Series Title: Lecture Notes in Computer Science.
- [117] Rajat Tandon, Haoda Wang, Nicolaas Weideman, Shushan Arakelyan, Genevieve Bartlett, Christophe Hauser, and Jelena Mirkovic. Leader: Defense Against Exploit-Based Denial-of-Service Attacks on Web Applications. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses*, pages 744–758. ACM, October 2023.

- [118] Ken Thompson. Programming Techniques: Regular expression search algorithm. *Communications of the ACM*, 11(6):419–422, June 1968.
- [119] Stephen Toub. Regular Expression Improvements in .NET 7. <http://devblogs.microsoft.com/dotnet/regular-expression-improvements-in-dotnet-7>, May 2022.
- [120] Stephen Toub. Performance Improvements in .NET 8. <https://devblogs.microsoft.com/dotnet/performance-improvements-in-net-8/#regex>, September 2023.
- [121] Lenka Turoňová, Lukáš Holík, Ivan Homoliak, Ondřej Lengál, Margus Veanes, and Tomáš Vojnar. Counting in regexes considered harmful: Exposing ReDoS vulnerability of nonbacktracking matchers. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, pages 4165–4182, Boston, MA, August 2022. USENIX Association.
- [122] Lenka Turoňová, Lukáš Holík, Ivan Homoliak, Ondřej Lengál, Margus Veanes, and Tomáš Vojnar. Counting in regexes considered harmful: Exposing {ReDoS} vulnerability of nonbacktracking matchers. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, pages 4165–4182, 2022.
- [123] Lenka Turoňová, Lukáš Holík, Ondřej Lengál, Olli Saarikivi, Margus Veanes, and Tomáš Vojnar. Regex matching with counting-set automata. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 4(OOPSLA):1–30, November 2020.
- [124] Vivek Unnikrishnan. Benchmarking microservices: effects of tracing and service mesh. <https://open.bu.edu/handle/2144/47469>, 2023.
- [125] Xiang Wang. Introduction to Hyperscan. <https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/developer/articles/technical/introduction-to-hyperscan.html>.
- [126] Xiang Wang, Yang Hong, Harry Chang, KyoungSoo Park, Geoff Langdale, Jiayu Hu, and Heqing Zhu. Hyperscan: A fast multi-pattern regex matcher for modern CPUs. In *16th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 19)*, pages 631–648, Boston, MA, February 2019. USENIX Association.
- [127] Xinyi Wang, Cen Zhang, Yeting Li, Zhiwu Xu, Shuailin Huang, Yi Liu, Yican Yao, Yang Xiao, Yanyan Zou, Yang Liu, and Wei Huo. Effective ReDoS Detection by Principled Vulnerability Modeling and Exploit Generation. In *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 2427–2443. IEEE, May 2023.
- [128] Nicolaas Weideman, Brink van der Merwe, Martin Berglund, and Bruce Watson. Analyzing Matching Time Behavior of Backtracking Regular Expression Matchers by Using Ambiguity of NFA. In Yo-Sub Han and Kai Salomaa, editors, *Implementation and Application of Automata*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 322–334. Springer International Publishing, 2016.
- [129] William Woodruff. ReDoS “vulnerabilities” and misaligned incentives. <https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=34161221>, December 2022.
- [130] William Woodruff. ReDoS "vulnerabilities" and misaligned incentives. <https://blog.yossarian.net/2022/12/28/ReDoS%2dvulnerabilities%2dand%2dmisaligned%2dincentives>, December 2022.
- [131] Valentin Wüstholtz, Oswaldo Olivo, Marijn J. H. Heule, and Isil Dillig. Static Detection of DoS Vulnerabilities in Programs that use Regular Expressions (Extended Version), January 2017. arXiv:1701.04045 [cs].
- [132] Wu Zhijun, Li Wenjing, Liu Liang, and Yue Meng. Low-Rate DoS Attacks, Detection, Defense, and Challenges: A Survey. *IEEE Access*, 8:43920–43943, 2020.

Outline of Appendices

The appendix contains the following material:

- Methodology and additional information about ReDoS in practice (Appendix A)
- Other figures with explanations (Appendix B)

A ReDoS in Practice

This is an expanded version of the study sketched in Section 2.

A.1 Methodology

A.1.1 ReDoS in the National Vulnerability Database

We performed a comprehensive analysis of NVD data from 2014 to 2023, focusing on CVEs associated with OWASP Top-10 and ReDoS-related vulnerabilities, using the classifications available on the OWASP website⁴. To ensure that ReDoS CVEs were accurately identified, we employed a systematic two-stage keyword search:

- **Stage one keywords:** regex, regular expression, regexp
- **Stage two keywords:** algorithm, backtrack, uncontrolled, repetition, repeat, infinite, denial of service, dos, infinite loop, algorithmic complexity

This method effectively identified mislabeled ReDoS CVEs, with our checks confirming no false positives in the sampled data. We further categorized the CVEs by their respective ecosystems, using specific keywords for each:

- **npm:** npm, node.js, nodejs, javascript, js
- **PyPI:** pypi, python, pip, django, flask
- **Gems:** rubygems, ruby, gems, rails
- **Maven:** maven, java, spring
- **Packagist:** packagist, composer, php, laravel
- **Cargo:** cargo, rust, crates.io, rust-lang

Our verification of a sample from each ecosystem showed no false positives, confirming the accuracy of our categorization.

⁴<https://owasp.org/www-project-top-ten/>

A.2 Results

A.2.1 ReDoS in the National Vulnerability Database

Our analysis of CVE data from the NVD over the past 10 years has provided insights into the incidence of OWASP Top-10 and ReDoS-related CVEs. These trends are illustrated in Fig. 6, with a specific focus on ReDoS-related CVEs presented separately in Fig. 7. Additionally, we explored the distribution of OWASP Top-10 and ReDoS CWEs across different ecosystems, as shown in Fig. 1. This visualization also includes the average occurrence of each CWE type throughout all ecosystems.




Figure 6: Number of OWASP Top-10 and ReDoS-related CVEs (2014-2023).




Figure 7: Number of ReDoS-related CVEs (2014-2023).

B Other Tables and Figures

B.1 Reg Engine Selection Summary

Table 4 provides a comprehensive overview of programming language, hence the regex engine implementations selected for our ReDoS defenses review (Section 4). For each programming language considered in our study, we list the chosen implementation, its alternatives, and the rationale behind our selection. In summary, this table reflects our effort to analyze the most relevant and widely-used regex engines in production environments, focusing on reference implementations

Table 4: Regex engine implementations selected for evaluating ReDoS defenses

PL	Selected Impl. of the PL [Source Code]	Other Alternatives	Reason for Selection
JavaScript	Node.js—V8 [44, 53]	Deno, Bun, SpiderMonkey, JavaScriptCore	Dominates server-side JavaScript usage (98.8% market share) [9]
Ruby	MRI/CRuby [49]	JRuby, Rubinius, mruby, RubyMotion	Reference implementation [4]
C#	.NET [37]	Mono	Reference implementation [34]
Java	OpenJDK [45]	Amazon Corretto, Azul Zulu, Liberica JDK, Eclipse Adoptium...	Most widely used JDK of 2024 with a 20.8% usage rate [1]
PHP	Zend Engine [47]	HHVM, PeachPie, Quercus, Parrot	Standard PHP interpreter is driven by the Zend Engine [15, 16]
Perl	perl5 [46]	N/A (for Perl 5)	Only implementation for Perl 5 [3]
Rust	rustc [51]	mrustc, gccrs	Official and only fully functional compiler for Rust [27]
Go	gc [40]	gccgo, gofrontend, TinyGo, GopherJS, yaegi	Official compiler included in Go releases [11]
Python	CPython [48]	PyPy, Stackless Python, MicroPython, CircuitPython, IronPython, Jython	Reference implementation [19]

PL: Programming Language, Impl.: Implementation (runtime environment, engine, interpreter, or compiler)

or those with significant usage rate compared to alternatives where possible.

B.2 Overview of Libraries and Associated Vulnerabilities

In Table 5, we present a detailed list of ten libraries from npm and PyPI, highlighting their respective versions, associated Common Vulnerabilities and Exposures (CVEs), programming languages, and severity ratings. This selection includes libraries widely used across the ecosystem.

Table 5: Overview of npm and PyPI libraries used in the study, including their versions, associated CVEs, programming languages, and severity scores.

Library	Version	CVE	Language	Severity
black	24.1.0	CVE-2024-21503	Python	5.3
celo	1.0.0a5	CVE-2022-42966	Python	5.9
django-truncate	3.2.0	CVE-2023-43665	Python	5.9
django-intcomma	3.2.0	CVE-2024-24680	Python	5.9
semgrep	1.23.0	CVE-2023-32758	Python	7.5
charset	1.0.0	CVE-2017-16098	Nodejs	7.5
node-email-check	1.0.0	CVE-2023-39619	Nodejs	7.5
cookiejar	2.1.3	CVE-2022-25901	Nodejs	5.3
lodash	4.17.16	CVE-2020-28500	Nodejs	5.3
semver	5.1.1	CVE-2022-25883	Nodejs	5.3

B.3 Email Validation in Celo Library

Figure 8 shows the email validation code from the Celo library, which sanitizes input by ensuring the email length is greater than 5 and less than 61 characters. While this approach effectively filters out malicious inputs longer than 61 characters, it does not prevent Regular Expression Denial of Service (ReDoS) attacks with smaller inputs.

B.4 Impact of ReDoS Attacks in Semgrep Library

Figure 9 illustrates the effect of ReDoS attack Semgrep library, using input sizes of 25 and 1000 characters. For an input size of 25, the throughput decreases to almost 10%, but it recovers immediately once the attack ceases. However, with an input size of 1000, the server fails to recover within the experiment

```

1 function validateEmail (email) {
2     if (typeof email === 'string' && email.
      length > 5 && email.length < 61 &&
      validateRegex.test(email)) {
3         return email.toLowerCase();
4     } else {
5         return false;
6     }
7 }

```

Figure 8: Email validation code snippet from Celo library window, demonstrating a significant vulnerability to larger ReDoS attacks.




Figure 9: Server throughput over time for input sizes of 25 and 1000 using the Semgrep library.