Breaking Type Safety in Go: An empirical study on the use of the unsafe package







Diego Elias Costa, Suhaib Mujahid, Rabe Abdalkareem, Emad Shihab



Data-driven Analysis of Software



The Go programming language = GO

- Major programming language
 - Clean syntax
 - C-like performance
 - Modern language features



- Go has a strong and static type-system
 - Type-safe by design

Go is memory-safe...

...unless you use the unsafe package

The unsafe package

Step around the type-safety of Go programs

```
import "unsafe"
```

```
// Pointer arithmetic - (C-style)
p = unsafe.Pointer(uintptr(p) + offset)
```

// Convert between two types (without compiler checks)
func Float64bits(f float64) uint64 {
 return *(*uint64)(unsafe.Pointer(&f))
}

The unsafe package

Pros

- Avoid compiler checks
- Low-level memory manipulation
- Interface with system calls

Cons

- Avoid compiler checks
- Risk of non-portability
- No guarantees of compatibility
- Easy to write bad code



Beware of the unsafe package!



Never use unsafe. Performance is never that critical. – Volker Nov 27 '15 at 10:31

First of all, unsafe is usually a bad idea. So is reflection, but unsafe is at least an order of magnitude worse.

Here is your example using pure reflection (<u>http://play.golang.org/p/jTJ6Mhg8q9</u>):

Beware of the unsafe package!



Studying breaking type-safety in Go



Studied projects

2590 most popular Go software projects





Do developers use unsafe?

24% of projects use unsafe in their code



Why developers use unsafe?



Consequences of unsafe

Deployment restriction (20 projects)

removed usage of package "unsafe" to allow Google App Engine compatibility #69

1 Closed jkearse3 wants to merge 1 commit into tidwall:master from jkearse3:gae-compatible

"I wanted to use this package within a Google App Engine project, and due to package "unsafe" being used, it is **not compatible**"

Consequences of unsafe

Deployment restriction (20 projects) Runtime errors (16 projects)

> Prometheus crashes and hangs on fatal error: found bad pointer in Go heap (incorrect use of unsafe or cgo?) #2263



Closed ichekrygin opened this issue on Dec 7, 2016 · 9 comments

Usafe use of unsafe that leads to data corruption #3

Closed rvasily opened this issue on Apr 26, 2018 · 3 comments

Consequences of unsafe

Deployment restriction (20 projects) Runtime errors (16 projects) Wrong API usage (13 projects)

invalid use of unsafe.Pointer #18

Closed Wessie opened this issue on May 1, 2015 · 2 comments

[security] incorrect unsafe usage potentially exposes prior request parameters #277

Closed cstockton opened this issue on Oct 21, 2017 · 5 comments

...and the list goes on

To summarize

Prevalence?

24% of projects use unsafe

Why?

System Integration

Performance Optimization Consequences?

Higher risk of

- Restrictions
- Runtime errors
- Bugs
- Breakages

Feedback from the Go Team

Other team members were more optimistic that developers would avoid or could implement their project without using package unsafe.

I think this result will justify spending more time on making package unsafe easier to use.

Matthew Dempsky, maintainer of the GO compiler

Impact on the GO Language

Wrong slice conversion

is one of the most common API misuses

New static analysis was released with Go 1.16

cmd/vet: warn about variables/values of type reflect.{Slice,String}Header #40701 Closed mdempsky opened this issue on Aug 11, 2020 · 21 comments

Language updates scheduled for Go 1.17

unsafe: add Slice(ptr *T, len anyIntegerType) []T #19367

() Open mdempsky opened this issue on Mar 2, 2017 · 105 comments

unsafe: add Add function #40481



To summarize



Impact on the GO Language

 Wrong slice conversion
 is one of the most

 common API misuses
 Language updates scheduled for Go 1.17

 Go 1.17
 unsafe: add Slice(ptr *T, len anyIntegerType) []T #19367

 Orem this issue on Aud function #40481

 Orem to speed this issue on Aud function #40481



