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Abstract—Android’s communication model has a major security weakness: malicious apps can manipulate other apps into performing unintended operations and can steal end-user data, while appearing ordinary and harmless. This paper presents SEALANT, a technique that combines static analysis of app code, which infers vulnerable communication channels, with runtime monitoring of inter-app communication through those channels, which helps to prevent attacks. SEALANT’s extensive evaluation demonstrates that (1) it detects and blocks inter-app attacks with high accuracy in a corpus of over 1,100 real-world apps, (2) it suffers from fewer false alarms than existing techniques in several representative scenarios, (3) its performance overhead is negligible, and (4) end-users do not find it challenging to adopt.

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper targets a known vulnerability in the design of Android’s communication model [1], in which components in a single app or across multiple apps communicate by exchanging messages called intents. Inter-component communication (ICC) via intent exchange can expose a vulnerable surface to several security attacks, including intent spoofing [2], unauthorized intent receipt [2], and privilege escalation [3]. In these attacks, a malicious app sends and receives intents in a way that appears as if those are ordinary message exchanges.

A large volume of research has focused on ICC vulnerabilities in Android [2], [4]–[14]. However, existing detection techniques target only certain types of inter-app attacks [4]–[6], [15] and/or do not support compositional analysis of multiple apps [2], [12], [14]. The state-of-the-art techniques [4], [5], [15] employ data-flow analyses that rely on lists of frequently used Android API methods [16], but tend to overlook ICC vulnerabilities caused by custom methods. Moreover, these analyses [4]–[6] have been shown to experience scalability problems when applied on large numbers of apps [17]. Meanwhile, the runtime protection techniques suffer from acknowledged frequent “false alarms” [11], [15] because of the coarse granularity at which they capture ICC information. Additionally, these techniques assume a degree of expertise in Android security [8], [9], [11], [13]. While certain techniques [15], [17] combine vulnerability detection with runtime protection to aid ordinary end-users, they also suffer from potentially large numbers of false alarms.

We present SEALANT (Security for End-users of Android via Light-weight ANalysis Techniques), a technique that aims to enable ordinary end-users to protect against inter-app attacks. SEALANT identifies vulnerable ICC paths between a given set of apps, inspects each intent sent via those paths at runtime to detect potential attacks, and enables end-users to block the intent on-the-fly. SEALANT is distinguished from the existing research because (1) it simultaneously prevents multiple types of Android inter-app attacks—with the current implementation focusing on intent spoofing, unauthorized intent receipt, and privilege escalation, (2) it extends the detection coverage via a novel combination of static data-flow analysis and compositional ICC pattern matching, (3) it causes fewer false alarms than existing techniques through a finer-grained characterization of ICCs, (4) it supports compositional analysis scaling to a number of apps, and (5) it integrates static detection with runtime monitoring and control of vulnerable ICC paths.

SEALANT comprises two tools: (1) Analyzer identifies vulnerable ICC paths by performing static analysis on app bytecode; (2) Interceptor is an extension to the Android framework that manages inter-app intent exchanges. We elected to modify Android over two other alternatives—instrumenting the installed apps’ bytecode and acquiring administrator privileges, i.e., “rooting”—because (1) once our approach is applied to a device, it does not require altering any of the installed apps, and (2) rooting itself introduces serious vulnerabilities [18].

We have evaluated SEALANT in four different ways. (1) We assessed its effectiveness via comparative analysis against existing techniques. SEALANT suffered from fewer false alarms while blocking the same or greater number of vulnerable ICC paths. (2) We performed a case study targeting Analyzer’s ability to identify vulnerable ICC paths between a set of apps, and Interceptor’s ability to selectively block those paths. To this end, we used a test suite comprising 1,150 apps. The test suite includes apps previously identified as vulnerable [17], an open-source testing ground [19], externally developed real-world apps that implement inter-app attacks, and real-world apps randomly selected from publicly available sources [20], [21]. Analyzer was able to identify vulnerable ICC paths with high accuracy, while Interceptor was able to capture and block each identified path. (3) We evaluated SEALANT’s performance by measuring the analysis time of Analyzer on different numbers of apps, and the resource overhead imposed by Interceptor’s runtime intent inspections. Analyzer is scalable to a large number of apps, while Interceptor requires nominal additional resources. (4) We performed a user study and survey involving 189 Android end-users in employing SEALANT. Overall, the users were able to effectively use SEALANT to block vulnerable inter-app intent exchanges and did not find it burdensome to use.

The research we present in this paper is based on our prior work on inter-component communication in event-based...
systems (EBS) [22], [23]. While this paper focuses explicitly on Android, SEALANT can be expanded to other EBS (e.g., [24]–[28]) with certain modifications.

This paper makes four contributions: (1) SEALANT, a technique that enables Android users to protect their devices from multiple ICC vulnerabilities, with a proof-of-concept implementation focusing on intent spoofing, unauthorized intent receipt, and privilege escalation; (2) Analyzer, a tool that accurately finds vulnerable ICC paths between apps through a novel combination of data-flow analysis and compositional ICC pattern matching; (3) Interceptor, an Android framework extension that automatically detects malicious intents at runtime and enables users to block them; and (4) extensive evaluations of SEALANT that involve 1,150 Android apps, compare different systems (EBS) [22], [23]. While this paper focuses explicitly on Android, SEALANT can be expanded to other EBS (e.g., [24]–[28]) with certain modifications.

This paper makes four contributions: (1) SEALANT, a technique that enables Android users to protect their devices from multiple ICC vulnerabilities, with a proof-of-concept implementation focusing on intent spoofing, unauthorized intent receipt, and privilege escalation; (2) Analyzer, a tool that accurately finds vulnerable ICC paths between apps through a novel combination of data-flow analysis and compositional ICC pattern matching; (3) Interceptor, an Android framework extension that automatically detects malicious intents at runtime and enables users to block them; and (4) extensive evaluations of SEALANT that involve 1,150 Android apps, compare different systems (EBS) [22], [23]. While this paper focuses explicitly on Android, SEALANT can be expanded to other EBS (e.g., [24]–[28]) with certain modifications.

Figure 1(a) and Listings 1 and 2 depict intent spoofing. Figure 1(a) shows component M1 from malicious app MalApp1 that can send an intent to component V2 from victim app VicApp1. Listing 1 shows where VicApp1’s vulnerability resides: V2 is designed to transfer money to a recipient specified by an incoming intent. Listing 2 illustrates how M1 of MalApp1 sends an explicit intent that specifies V2 as its destination component, along with the attacker’s account number as the recipient. This is an example of a vulnerable ICC path, from M1 to V2.

Figure 1(b) and Listing 3 illustrate unauthorized intent receipt. In Android, if an intent is broadcast without proper permission restrictions, a malicious component can receive it by declaring attributes matching those of the intent. Component V3 of VicApp2 from Figure 1(b) is designed to broadcast intents to components in the same app such as V4. Listing 3 shows V3’s code that broadcasts an implicit intent on a click event, with the action attribute ShowLocation and the location information. Although not an intended receiver, malicious component M2 of MalApp2 is able to eavesdrop by listening to ShowLocation intents and to obtain the user’s current location. This is another example of a vulnerable ICC path, from V3 to M2.

Figure 1(c) depicts privilege escalation. Component V6 of VicApp3 provides a sensitive API that is protected with permission P1. While component V8 of VicApp4 is granted P1, M3 of MalApp3 is not, which means that M3 is restricted to directly access the API of V6. Nonetheless, M3 can still invoke the API in an indirect way, via V8 which is not protected by any permissions and can be triggered by any component via an explicit intent. By triggering V8, M3 is able to access the sensitive API of V6 without acquiring P1. This is an example of a transitive vulnerable ICC path, from M3, via V8, to V6.

The above examples demonstrate that the attacks are administered in a way that does not differ from ordinary intent exchanges between apps. This makes the identification and restriction of inter-app attacks especially challenging. Moreover, since an ICC can be performed in an essentially invisible way (e.g., via sendBroadcast() or through transitive paths), it is difficult for end-users to recognize when the attacks are actually committed. An app developer’s caution may minimize the risk of the attacks, but it requires error-prone manual effort, while end-users may still download other unsafe apps.

Although security violations such as these have been studied in computer networks and distributed systems [24]–[29], those techniques cannot be directly applied to Android due to the specifics of its communication mechanism and features. For example, role-based access control [24], [25] has been applied in Android as a form of permission grants; however, it can be violated by privilege escalation attacks.

Encryption [26],
recognizes each instance of ICC as a relation and feeds the highlighted vulnerable ICC paths to files of the installed apps. SEALANT reports an ICC relation and uses static analysis to generate a list of vulnerable ICC paths between apps, and runs on a user’s computer or as an online service; (2) Interceptor extends Android to perform runtime monitoring and enable advanced ICC control such as blocking of specific ICCs identified by Analyzer. SEALANT’s overall process is as follows:

1) Analyzer processes the APK1 files of the installed apps and identifies the vulnerable ICC paths between them.
2) Analyzer can optionally contact expert users to confirm specific vulnerable paths that should be monitored.
3) Analyzer feeds the highlighted vulnerable ICC paths to the Interceptor in a pre-defined format (SEALANT List).
4) At runtime, whenever an intent is sent, Interceptor captures the information of the corresponding ICC path (e.g., sender’s name) from Android’s ActivityManager.
5) If the captured path information matches one of the vulnerable paths in the SEALANT List, Interceptor contacts the end-user to determine whether to propagate the intent.
6) Based on the end-user’s choice, Interceptor will instruct the ActivityManager either to block or to route the intent. We discuss Analyzer and Interceptor in more detail next.

A. Analyzer
Analyzer performs static analysis on APK files in four phases: (1) analyze target apps, (2) build ICC graph, (3) find vulnerable paths, and (4) generate SEALANT List. Analyzer is novel in that it returns multiple types of vulnerable ICC paths in a single pass and distinguishes different types of threats, which enables tailoring countermeasures. It does so by focusing, both, on the data-flow between components and on compositional patterns of ICCs derived from published literature [2]. This enables Analyzer to identify a larger number of vulnerable paths and path types than existing techniques (e.g., paths involving custom methods). Its summary-based model enables analyzing a number of apps at a time, as well as reusing prior analysis results when apps are installed, updated, or removed.

1) Analyze Target Apps: Analyzer extracts and summarizes each app’s architectural information by analyzing the APK file. The summary includes components, intents, intent filters, and permissions. Analyzer extracts each component’s name, package, permissions held or required, and exported status. To communicate across apps, an Android component must have its exported status set to true or contain an intent filter. Analyzer only considers exported components in creating ICC graphs. Analyzer extracts each intent’s attributes (i.e., target component, action, categories, and data) using string constant propagation [22]. If an attribute’s value cannot be determined, Analyzer conservatively assumes it to be any string.

Once extraction is completed, Analyzer examines each component’s vulnerability. A vulnerable component is the one containing an intra-component path between an ICC call method and a sensitive method. An ICC call method is a standard Android method for sending or receiving intents (e.g., startActivity()). A sensitive method is an Android API method that can access sensitive user information (e.g., getLastKnownLocation()) or trigger a sensitive operation (e.g., sendTextMessage()) [16], [31]. Analyzer identifies the relevant paths by employing static taint analysis that tracks data-flows between methods [32]. If the direction of an intra-component path is from an ICC call method to a sensitive method, Analyzer sets the component’s vulnerability type to Active, because the component is vulnerable to attacks such as intent spoofing and privilege escalation. If the intra-component path is from a sensitive method to an ICC call method, the vulnerability type is Passive, representing attacks such as unauthorized intent receipt. In Figure 1(b), for example, the vulnerability type of V3 is Passive, because the location data directs from getLastKnownLocation() to sendBroadcast(). If a component has multiple intra-component paths, Analyzer creates separate component models for each path.

By managing a summary-based model of each app, Analyzer is scalable to inspecting a number of apps in a single pass, as evaluated in Section V-C1. Furthermore, when apps are
TABLE I: Attributes of component and intent in ICC graph

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>component</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>The name of the component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pkg</td>
<td>The name of the package to which the component belongs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VulType</td>
<td>The type of vulnerability (i.e., Active, Passive, or null)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VulMeth</td>
<td>The name of the sensitive method (e.g., sendTextMessage())</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PermUse</td>
<td>The name of the permission that the component holds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PermReq</td>
<td>The name of the required permission to access the component</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intent</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>The name of the component to which the intent is directed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IntSec</td>
<td>The intent's attributes: action, category, data type, and data scheme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sender</td>
<td>The name of the component which sends the intent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SenderPkg</td>
<td>The name of the package to which the sender component belongs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

installed or updated subsequent to running Analyzer, Analyzer extracts only the architectural information from the newly updated apps and reuses the prior analysis results on the rest.

2) Build ICC Graph: With the extracted information, Analyzer builds an ICC graph based on the rules from Android’s API reference documentation [33]. It defines an edge as a tuple \(<s, r, i \rangle\), where \(s\) is a sender and \(r\) a receiver component, and \(i\) is an intent between them. Component and intent are entities that manage summarized information as shown in Table I.

Since the extraction of architectural information is performed in a conservative way (specifically, relying on attributes of intents), the set of edges may include false positives. However, this will not affect SEALANT’s runtime accuracy because no ICC instances to be routed via those edges will ever be visited.

3) Find Vulnerable Paths: Analyzer implements Algorithm 1 on the ICC graph to identify vulnerable paths. Analyzer marks an edge as vulnerable (1) if it has a vulnerable component at one or both ends, or (2) if it forms a particular compositional pattern. To find vulnerable transitive ICC paths, Analyzer recursively identifies a set of connected edges that can access a vulnerable component by calling the PathFinder method (Algorithm 2). \(x_y\) indicates attribute \(y\) of entity \(x\) (depicted in Table I), and \(x.y\) represents element \(y\) in edge \(x\).

Analyzer first parses edges into two sets: inter-app (IAC) for edges between components belonging to different apps, and inter-component (ICC) otherwise. Algorithm 1 iterates over each edge \(e\) in IAC ∪ ICC (lines 5-19) and considers four different cases that cover all types of vulnerable paths we target in this paper: the first two cases identify paths that involve vulnerable components; the latter two cases identify paths based on previously identified compositional patterns [2].

Case 1 (line 8) occurs when \(e\) directs to a receiver vertex whose vulnerability type is “Active”. If \(e\) is an IAC edge, Algorithm 1 determines the type of attack by calling ComposeCompare \((c_1, c_2, m)\) (line 10), a method that returns the type of attack by comparing the permissions of components \(c_1\) and \(c_2\), where \(m\) is a sensitive method that forms an intra-component path with an ICC call method within \(c_2\). If \(c_2\) holds a permission that \(c_1\) does not, and the permission is required to use \(m\) [31], ComposeCompare returns “privilege escalation”; otherwise, it returns “intent spoofing”. Once the type of attack is determined, Algorithm 1 adds \(\{e\}\) to the set VulPaths that contains all detected vulnerable ICC paths (line 10), and then calls PathFinder to identify transitive ICC paths (line 11).

As depicted in Algorithm 2, PathFinder iterates over each edge \(f\) in IAC ∪ ICC, to check if \(f\) connects to the previously identified edge’s sender component \(s\), and if \(f\)’s own sender is a newly visited component (line 2). If so, PathFinder appends \(f\) to the list of distinct connected edges \(E\) (line 3). If \(E\) contains an inter-app edge \((e \in IAC)\), PathFinder determines the type of attack by calling PermCompare, and adds \(E\) to VulPaths (line 5). PathFinder recursively identifies other components that are connected to a vulnerable component through edges in the ICC graph. It stops its processing when it visits all transitively connected components to the original edge’s receiver \(r\) or reaches an already visited component. When it finishes iterating, PathFinder removes the last element from \(E\) to enable correct exploration of additional transitive paths.

Case 2 (lines 12-13 in Algorithm 1) deals with the situation when the vulnerability of \(e\.sender\) is Passive and \(e \in IAC\), which may result in leaking sensitive information between apps through \(e\). If so, the type of attack is set to “unauthorized intent receipt” and \(\{e\}\) is added to VulPaths (line 13).

Case 3 (lines 14-17) occurs when edges \(e \in IAC\) and \(g \in ICC\) (\(e \neq g\)) both lead to the same receiver vertex. It represents a pattern of attack in which \(g\) is an intended access to \(r\) within an
app, but e may be a spoofed access from a malicious component across apps. In this case, the type of attack is set to “intent spoofing” and the edge (e) is added to VulPaths (line 17).

Case 4 (lines 18-19) occurs when edges e and g share the same sender and intent. If g represents an originally intended receipt within the app and e an unintended receipt across apps, Algorithm 1 will set the type of attack to “unauthorized intent receipt” and append (e) to VulPaths (line 19).

4) Generate SEALANT List: As the last step, Analyzer generates the SEALANT List based on VulPaths, the output from the previous phase. Analyzer first normalizes the output by checking for redundant paths. It then transforms the information about identified paths into a pre-defined format that is compatible with SEALANT’s Interceptor component.

B. Interceptor

Interceptor monitors and analyzes each instance of ICC. Whenever an ICC is requested, Interceptor checks whether it is specified in the SEALANT List. Interceptor’s ICC control strategy is distinguished from competing techniques due to its finer-grained characterization of ICC paths based on (1) sender, (2) receiver, and (3) intent. As evaluated in Sections V-A and V-B, this increases the accuracy in blocking ICCs.

Interceptor resolves two challenging issues: (1) extracting each component’s information at runtime to effectively prevent malicious ICCs, while (2) minimizing the impact on Android’s functionality. Interceptor captures a sender component’s information by instrumenting the framework-level class of each type of component (e.g., Activity) in the Android framework, while it captures an intent’s and a receiver’s information by extending a core component that governs intent routing (i.e., ActivityManager). Interceptor minimizes the impact on Android by avoiding removal of standard components or modification of core methods (further discussed in Sections IV and V-C).

1) Interceptor’s Architecture: Interceptor extends the Android framework with four components, as depicted in Figure 3. Three components—Blocker, ChoiceDatabase, and ListProvider—are newly added, while one—ActivityManager—is a modification of an existing Android component.

Blocker interacts with end-users and performs Interceptor’s core functionalities: monitoring, matching, and blocking. Blocker directly communicates with ActivityManager to obtain the detailed information of each instance of ICC, and to possibly induce ActivityManager to block a particular instance of ICC. Blocker imports the SEALANT List from ListProvider, and refers to the previously made choices from ChoiceDatabase.

ActivityManager controls every instance of ICC processed through the Android framework, by collaborating with other Android components (e.g., PackageManager). We extended ActivityManager to capture the information of each ICC instance (sender and receiver components, and intent’s attributes), share the information with Blocker, and block a particular instance of ICC upon Blocker’s request.

ChoiceDatabase stores end-user choices (to block or route) for each vulnerable ICC path. Stored choices are automatically applied when the same ICC is requested, and can be removed upon end-user’s request. When a new SEALANT List is imported, ChoiceDatabase expunges only the choices that correspond to the updated or removed apps.

Finally, ListProvider imports and maintains the SEALANT List. When a SEALANT List is installed in the pre-defined space of the user device (e.g., external SD card), ListProvider imports it and maintains the specified information as a permanent condition until a new SEALANT List is introduced.

2) Interceptor’s Operation: Figure 3 illustrates the interaction among Interceptor’s four components. For clarity, the depicted six-step scenario is based on the example from Listings 1 and 2, but it is reflective of Interceptor’s operation in general.

1) When M1 of MalApp1 tries to send intent i by calling startActivity(), request is routed to ActivityManager.

2) ActivityManager extracts sender’s (i.e., M1’s) information and searches for components permitted to receive intent i. If a receiver is identified (i.e., V2 of VicApp1), ActivityManager passes the ICC information to Blocker.

3) After receiving information about the ICC, Blocker first examines ChoiceDatabase. If a choice for the ICC already exists, Blocker induces ActivityManager to act (block or route the ICC) without engaging the end-user.

4) In case no corresponding choice exists in ChoiceDatabase, Blocker scans the SEALANT List provided by ListProvider.

5) If the information about the requested ICC matches that in the SEALANT List, Blocker will give the user four options: (1) allow the ICC once, (2) block it once, (3) allow it always, and (4) block it always. If the user selects options (3) or (4), her choice will be stored in ChoiceDatabase.

6) If the end-user chooses to allow (resp. block) the requested ICC, Blocker will instruct ActivityManager to send intent i to V2 (resp. trap it).

3) Interceptor’s Strategy for Blocking ICCs: Interceptor is engaged between the times when an intent is first requested and when it is actually dispatched to its destination. Interceptor’s operation may thus cause a delay in processing intents, which may be exacerbated by the number of vulnerable ICC paths in the SEALANT List. However, since Android’s ICC is performed via asynchronous API calls, we hypothesize that this delay will not significantly impact the system’s operation. In Section V-C, we empirically evaluate Interceptor’s performance overhead.
In case when an end-user has blocked a requested ICC, the apps that are involved in the ICC will not get any response to their request back from the framework. Since Android implements ICCs asynchronously, those apps will simply “skip” the corresponding operation without causing runtime crashes.

To block a vulnerable transitive ICC, **Interceptor** begins by matching the first path of the vulnerable transitive ICC path and setting its `transitive_flag` to `true`. This flag is managed per each vulnerable transitive ICC path and remains `true` as long as the subsequently requested ICCs match the `ListProvider` `Interceptor` `Analyzer` `ListProvider` `Interceptor` `Analyzer` `V8` lifecycle. If the transitive ICC path `M3` is in the `SEALANT List`, if `M3` launches `V8` via an intent, **Interceptor** will set `transitive_flag` to `true`. Then, if `V8` launches `V6` via an intent, **Interceptor** will alert the user and reset the flag.

### IV. Implementation

We have implemented **SEALANT**’s **Analyzer** as a stand-alone Java application that receives as input a set of Android apps in APK files, and exports a `SEALANT List` in the pre-defined XML format. **Analyzer**’s implementation combines approximately 3,000 newly written LOC with three off-the-shelf tools. The tools are used in the first of **Analyzer**’s four phases (recall Section III-A). **Analyzer** integrates two static analysis tools, IC3 [34] and COVERT [7], to extract architectural objects from apps. We employed both tools because neither of them alone discovers all of the needed information: IC3 misses outbound intents in certain scenarios [34], while COVERT only returns coarse-grained intent information that excludes certain attributes (e.g., data type) [7]. **Analyzer** orchestrates the two tools together and combines their outputs in order to generate a more complete list of architectural objects. In identifying intra-component paths between ICC call methods and sensitive methods, **Analyzer** uses FlowDroid [32], a highly precise intra-component taint analysis tool for Android.

We implemented **SEALANT**’s **Interceptor** on top of Android Open Source Project (AOSP) 4.4.4 KitKat [35], which is the most popular version of Android [36] today. We directly modified the source code of several standard Android components including `ActivityManagerService`, `ActivityManagerNative`, and `IntentFirewall`. In total, we introduced about 600 LOC spread over 10 classes. To minimize the impact on the original functionality of Android, we did not remove any standard components or methods. Our modification was limited to parts of Android that are usually a layer beneath manufacturers’ customizations, and can easily be applied to Android versions 4.4 and later without significant changes. We were able to successfully run **Interceptor**’s system image, both, on the Android emulator [37] and on a Google Nexus 7 device.

Since framework-level components in Android do not provide a user interface (UI), we also implemented an Android app that provides a UI to perform: (1) pushing the `SEALANT List` from an external SD card to **Interceptor**’s `ListProvider`, (2) removing the list from `ListProvider`, and (3) removing previous choices from **Interceptor**’s `ChoiceDatabase`.

Running **SEALANT** requires compiling **Interceptor**’s source code with the provided drivers, and installing the image files using the freely available Android debug bridge [38] and Fastboot [39]. This cost can be minimized by bundling **SEALANT** with Android. **SEALANT**’s code, required drivers, and compiled tools are available at http://softarch.usc.edu/sealant/.

### V. Evaluation

We evaluate **SEALANT** for effectiveness (Section V-A), accuracy (V-B), performance (V-C), and usability (V-D).

#### A. Effectiveness

To the best of our knowledge, two existing works share **SEALANT**’s goal of providing protection of end-users from inter-app attacks: SEPAR [15] (previously named Droid-Guard [17]) and XmanDroid [3], [11]. SEPAR identifies vulnerable surfaces of a set of apps via static analysis and uses dynamic memory instrumentation that hooks the method calls of target apps at runtime. For example, in the scenario from Figure 1(a), SEPAR would identify the vulnerability of `V2` and hook the `startActivity()` method that sends an intent to `V2`. XmanDroid is a technique that only targets `privilege escalation` attacks by leveraging an extension to Android. XmanDroid enables a user to pre-define a list of ICC restriction policies, and automatically blocks ICCs that match any of those policies.

An ideal comparison of **SEALANT** against these two techniques would have included executing their implementations in a controlled setting and/or on a set of real-world Android apps. However, the implementation of XmanDroid we obtained from its authors only runs on a prior version of Android (2.2.1), while the current prototype implementation of SEPAR is missing certain features covered by the underlying technique (e.g., the policy enforcement module). In Section V-B, we do evaluate **SEALANT** directly against one of the implemented features of SEPAR. We tried unsuccessfully to build an installation of XmanDroid on several recent versions of Android. Given the changes in Android since 2.2.1, continuing with this strategy proved impractical. For these reasons, we decided to analytically compare the three techniques, relying on the published algorithms of SEPAR [15] and XmanDroid [3], [11].

1) **Comparison with SEPAR**: A detailed comparison of **SEALANT** and SEPAR using probabilistic random variables to capture their respective operations can be found at http://softarch.usc.edu/sealant/. Here we provide a summary of that analysis. **SEALANT** raises fewer false inter-app attack alarms compared to SEPAR, because SEPAR does not support a finer-grained characterization of ICC paths (i.e., sender, receiver, and intent). For example, in the scenario depicted in Figure 1(a), whenever an explicit intent is routed to `V2`, SEPAR would raise an alarm, even if the intent was sent from the component in the same app (i.e., `V1`).

2) **Comparison with XmanDroid**: **SEALANT** suffers from fewer false negatives than XmanDroid. The detection mechanism of XmanDroid requires a user to explicitly specify policies
indicating the types of inter-app attacks she wishes to detect and ICC paths to monitor at runtime. This may omit critical inter-app attacks. Recall the privilege escalation attack scenario from Figure 1(c). When component M3 in MalApp3 requests an ICC to access V8 in VicApp4, XmanDroid inspects the permissions of MalApp3 and VicApp4 based on the pre-defined policies. Although a few general policies for XmanDroid have been proposed [11], they do not cover all vulnerability scenarios. In the above scenario, if a user-specified policy does not prohibit an ICC between an app with permission P1 and another app without it, XmanDroid will not raise an alarm. Since SEALANT inspects all ICC paths via static analysis to identify vulnerable paths, it does not suffer from this type of false negative.

SEALANT also suffers from fewer false positives than XmanDroid. XmanDroid finds ICCs that match policies specifying the sender and receiver permission combinations. However, this would also block safe ICCs initiated by a benign app with an identical set of permissions as a malicious app. Suppose that XmanDroid has a policy that would block ICCs between MalApp3 and VicApp4 in the scenario depicted in Figure 1(c), and the device had another app, BenignApp, which is confirmed as reliable and holds identical permissions to MalApp3. In that case, even if BenignApp initiated an ICC to a method of VicApp4 that does not require P1, XmanDroid would block that ICC. SEALANT would not trigger such a false alarm.

B. Applicability and Accuracy

We evaluated Analyzer’s accuracy in identifying vulnerable ICC paths by comparing its results against those of SEPAR [15], [17] and IccTA [4], [40], state-of-the-art tools for ICC vulnerability detection [5], [6], [32]. We evaluated Interceptor’s ability to block vulnerable ICC paths at runtime. We used a test suite of 1,150 Android apps in total.

1) Experimental Setup: To build our test suite, we first selected several real-world apps that are vulnerable to inter-app attacks. Among the apps that were previously identified [15] from repositories such as Google Play [20], F-Droid [41], MalGenome [21], and Bazaar [42], we selected 13 that are exposed to the three types of attacks SEALANT targets. We also included six apps from DroidBench 2.0 [19], an app collection for benchmarking ICC-based data leaks. Since several of the 19 vulnerable apps did not have readily available malicious apps targeting them, we built 25 malicious apps, each of which performed one inter-app attack. To mitigate internal threats to the validity of our results, we also asked 39 graduate students at University of Southern California (USC) to build sets of apps that implement inter-app attacks based on published literature [2], [11]. Each of those sets was either a pair of apps forming a simple path, or a trio of apps forming a transitive path. Each set consisted of at least one vulnerable app and at least one malicious app that exploits the vulnerable app. Without any intervention by the authors, the students built 41 distinct sets. This yielded 91 apps in total, of which 47 were new, while 42 were modified and 2 unmodified apps obtained from public sources [43], [44].

In total, this yielded 65 sets containing 135 apps, with 54 vulnerable ICC paths and 5 vulnerable transitive ICC paths. To ensure that inter-app attacks can be actually launched, we manually inspected the code of each set, and installed and ran the set on a Google Nexus 7. We confirmed that the attacks from the malicious apps were successfully launched and exploited the vulnerable apps by observing the apps’ behavior via the device’s UI and via logcat, a native Android tool for monitoring system debug outputs [45]. Our test suite also includes 12 “trick” apps containing vulnerable but unreachable components, whose identification would be a false warning. We divided this core test suite into three different groups, based on the type of attack to which a vulnerable app is exposed, as shown in Table II. Subsequently, we created an expanded test suite totaling 1,150 apps, by including another 1,015 apps randomly selected from Google Play [20] and MalGenome [21].

2) Evaluation of Analyzer: We evaluated SEALANT’s Analyzer for accuracy in identifying vulnerable ICC paths as compared to SEPAR and IccTA. We used our core test suite to measure all three approaches’ (1) precision, i.e., identified ICC paths that were actually vulnerable, and (2) recall, i.e., the ratio of identified to all vulnerable ICC paths. As depicted in Table II, Analyzer detected vulnerable ICC paths with 100% precision and 95% (56 of 59) recall. It was unable to correctly extract intent information in three cases due to the inaccuracies inherited from IC3 [34] and COVERT [7] (recall Section IV). Analyzer correctly ignored all “trick” cases with unreachable vulnerable paths. SEPAR had 50% precision and 8% recall. This is primarily because SEPAR was designed (1) to identify vulnerable components or interfaces rather than specific ICC paths between them and (2) to return an ICC path only when both sender and receiver contain sensitive Android API methods [16], hampering its applicability in cases such as privilege escalation via a transitive ICC. IccTA had 100% precision and 8% recall. Since it targets a single type of attack (privacy leaks), IccTA also returned an ICC path only when it involved sensitive API methods [16]. Although SEALANT outperformed SEPAR and IccTA in our evaluation, it is important to note that SEPAR and IccTA support both intra- and inter-app analysis and may detect additional vulnerabilities that SEALANT does not.

We then used our expanded test suite of 1,150 apps (9,964 components, 20,787 ICC paths). We created 23 non-overlapping bundles, each comprising 50 apps randomly selected from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attack Type of Test Suite</th>
<th>Number of Apps</th>
<th>Vulnerable ICC Paths Identified</th>
<th>ICC Paths (Precision / Recall)</th>
<th>Blocked ICC Paths (Precision / Recall)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MalApp3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicApp4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MalApp5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicApp6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MalApp7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicApp8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MalApp9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicApp10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MalApp11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicApp12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MalApp13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicApp14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MalApp15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicApp16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MalApp17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicApp18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MalApp19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicApp20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MalApp21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicApp22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MalApp23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicApp24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MalApp25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicApp26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MalApp27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicApp28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MalApp29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicApp30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MalApp31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicApp32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MalApp33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicApp34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MalApp35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicApp36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MalApp37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicApp38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MalApp39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicApp40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MalApp41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicApp42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is = intent spoofing. UIR = unauthorized intent receipt. PE = privilege escalation.
the suite. We created 50-app bundles because this number is higher than the recently cited number of apps an average smartphone user regularly uses each month [46]. We ran all three tools on each bundle and manually checked if each identified ICC path is indeed vulnerable. Analyzer flagged 86 ICC paths, with 93% precision. The six false-positives were caused by IC3’s inaccuracy in identifying intents and COVERT’s omission of intent attributes in certain scenarios. SEPAR and IccTA were unable to analyze the bundles on four different hardware configurations. SEPAR’s logs indicated that it was unable to generate flow-analysis results in some cases, while it did not return any vulnerabilities in other cases. IccTA invariably crashed; it was unable to analyze more than one app at a time in more than 75% of our attempts.

3) Evaluation of Interceptor: We evaluated Interceptor’s accuracy in detecting and blocking malicious ICCs at runtime. To monitor all ICCs exchanged on a device, we integrated a logging module that outputs information of each ICC instance via logcat [45] into ActivityManager (recall Section III). We installed the 135 apps in our core test suite on a Google Nexus 7 with Interceptor set up, ran Analyzer on the device, and provided the resulting SEALANT List to Interceptor.

To run test scripts that trigger ICCs, we used monkeyrunner [47], an Android tool for running test suites. We designed each script to trigger one type of vulnerable ICC in the SEALANT List as well as various benign ICCs. We configured the scripts to choose to block an ICC when Interceptor prompts for a blocking choice. We repeated executing each script until we accumulated 30 blocked ICCs. At the end of each test script execution, we manually inspected the logs in order to measure (1) precision, i.e., if all blocked ICCs corresponded to vulnerable paths specified in the SEALANT List, and (2) recall, i.e., if Interceptor allowed any ICC attempts over the vulnerable paths. Interceptor was able to block vulnerable ICCs in the core test suite with perfect precision and recall (see Table II).

C. Performance

1) Evaluation of Analyzer: To evaluate the performance of Analyzer, we used a PC with an Intel dual-core i5 2.7GHz CPU and 4GB of RAM. We divided our expanded test suite into four categories with different numbers of apps (25, 50, 75, and 100). For each category, we created ten different bundles randomly selected from the 1,150 apps, and ran Analyzer on each bundle. On average, extracting architectural information from each app took 77.95s and identifying vulnerable ICC paths took 1.08s per app. While the extraction is relatively time-consuming, in scenarios where an app is newly installed or updated, Analyzer reuses the previously extracted app models to minimize the execution time. It performs the extraction only on the new app, and then runs the vulnerable path identification over all apps.

We evaluated Interceptor’s detection operation which sequentially matches an ICC to each path in its list. The above numbers were selected because they reflect (in fact, surpass) those found in the real-world: an average user regularly uses about 30 apps per month [46], and around 10% of Android apps are vulnerable to inter-app attacks [17]. To trigger a large number of ICCs on the test devices, we used Monkey [49], which generates pseudo-random streams of user- and system-level events on a target device. We used the same seed value in Interceptor and AOSP so that Monkey would generate identical event sequences in both environments. We injected 5,000 events in each environment and measured the time it took to process each event. We repeated this five times to mitigate the impact of conditions such as battery-status changes.

Table IV describes the results we obtained. The difference in mean execution times was less than 1ms, and in maximum execution times under 40ms. Differences of this degree are negligible because the threshold at which an end-user begins noticing slowdown in mobile app response is 100-200ms [50]. Interceptor introduces low overhead because it simply extends an existing operation that AOSP already regularly performs to match a requested ICC with the list of paths on the device [35].

D. Usability

When an intent exchange matches a vulnerable ICC path, SEALANT requires the end-user to either block or allow the exchange in order to secure her device. To assess how challenging such choices are for end-users, we conducted a user study and a survey, guided by two hypotheses:

- H1: The intent-exchange control choices SEALANT requires an end-user to make are not more difficult than the choices required of end-users by “stock” Android.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Apps</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Number of Components</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>553.5</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Number of ICCs</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>701.5</td>
<td>1110.5</td>
<td>1690.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Analyzer Time (Sec.)</td>
<td>22.17</td>
<td>32.24</td>
<td>107.27</td>
<td>118.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercepter</td>
<td>25.51</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>81.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOSP</td>
<td>25.20</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>45.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>35.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III shows the average numbers of components and ICCs in each category. Since our approach manages an individual summary-based model of each app, the analysis time scales linearly with the number of apps.

2) Evaluation of Interceptor: To evaluate Interceptor’s impact on performance, we measured the differences in execution times between Android with Interceptor and without it (in the remainder of this section, referred to as “Interceptor” and “AOSP” [35], respectively). We configured the two environments to be highly similar and to reasonably reflect the real-world. We employed the Google Nexus 7 in both environments and configured both to use Android KitKat 4.4.4. We installed the 50 most popular third-party apps [48] on the devices.

To observe Interceptor’s worst-case performance overhead, we manually created a SEALANT List that would induce the longest execution time. The list contained 10 paths (amounting to 20% of the installed apps), none of which matched the actual ICC paths between the 50 installed apps. This maximized the overhead of Interceptor’s detection operation which sequentially matches an ICC to each path in its list. The above numbers were selected because they reflect (in fact, surpass) those found in the real-world: an average user regularly uses about 30 apps per month [46], and around 10% of Android apps are vulnerable to inter-app attacks [17]. To trigger a large number of ICCs on the test devices, we used Monkey [49], which generates pseudo-random streams of user- and system-level events on a target device. We used the same seed value in Interceptor and AOSP so that Monkey would generate identical event sequences in both environments. We injected 5,000 events in each environment and measured the time it took to process each event. We repeated this five times to mitigate the impact of conditions such as battery-status changes.

Table IV describes the results we obtained. The difference in mean execution times was less than 1ms, and in maximum execution times under 40ms. Differences of this degree are negligible because the threshold at which an end-user begins noticing slowdown in mobile app response is 100-200ms [50]. Interceptor introduces low overhead because it simply extends an existing operation that AOSP already regularly performs to match a requested ICC with the list of paths on the device [35].
We sent out 200 survey requests and received 155 valid responses (78%); 45 people did not respond or only partially completed the survey. We sent requests to known e-mail lists and contacts, and allowed them to self-select. The respondents had used a mobile device for 51 months on average. 138 (89%) named Android as their primary mobile platform or had experience using it. The survey covered a range of age groups and occupations. 11 respondents (7%) were aged 18-24, 46 (30%) were 25-34, 37 (24%) were 35-44, 35 (22%) were 45-54, and 26 (17%) were 55+. Respondents included 46 students (30%), 27 medical doctors (17%), 20 business people (13%), 11 housewives (7%), 10 software engineers (7%), 9 professors (6%), 5 retailers (3%), 5 lawyers (3%), and 22 others (14%).

More detailed information about the user study and survey is available at http://softarch.usc.edu/sealant/.

2) Results: We evaluate hypotheses H1 and H2 using the user study and survey data. For simplicity, we refer to the user study participants and survey respondents as “participants”.

H1 – We compared (1) the difficulty perceived by participants in making their choices, (2) the confidence participants had in their choices, and (3) the time it took to make choices for native-Android dialogs (Type 1-3) and SEALANT dialogs (Type 4).

Table V presents the data we obtained. A comparison of the mean degrees of difficulty showed that they did not differ significantly between the two groups of scenarios (Student’s t-test; p-value 0.928 for user study and 0.972 for survey). A comparison of the mean degrees of confidence yielded the same conclusion (Student’s t-test; p-value 0.853 for user study and 0.646 for survey). Finally, the median response time was significantly lower for Type 4 than for Type 1-3 scenarios (the Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon test; p-value 0.000). These results support the conclusion that SEALANT’s intent-exchange control choices are not more difficult than those of stock Android.

H2 – We measured the proportion of instances in which a participant elected to block an intent exchange and prevent an attack in a Type 4 scenario. In general, users may deliberately allow vulnerable intent exchanges (e.g., a user trusts both apps). However, in our study, unbeknownst to the users, we only included paths actually leading to exploits, allowing us to know the correct behavior. Recall that one half of the apps in the Type 4 scenarios came from reliable and the other half from unreliable sources. In the combined Type 1 (credible apps) and Type 2 (uncredible apps) scenarios, participants chose to cancel installation 51% of the time. That tendency, halting an on-going activity to avoid security threats, was much higher for Type 4 scenarios. The 34 user study participants chose intent blocking 70% of the time, while 155 survey participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialog Type</th>
<th>User Study</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulty</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 1-3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = not confident at all, 7 = fully confident. Response time values are in seconds. The Type 1-3 row presents merged data from Type 1 through Type 3 rows.

- H2: A non-expert user can make intent-exchange control choices that prevent an inter-app attack most of the time.

1) Experimental Setup: Our user study and survey were designed to simulate situations in which users make choices reflective of daily Android use (e.g., whether to install an app after being shown the list of permissions it requires). Among those choices, we also inserted choices required by SEALANT. We asked the participants how difficult it was to make each choice and how confident they were in making the choice.

The study included 34 participants, all graduate students at USC, recruited via an e-mail list. The students’ majors spanned engineering, communication, business, and social work. The background survey showed that the participants had used a mobile device for 59 months on average. 25 of the participants (74%) reported Android as their primary mobile platform or had experience using it. The survey covered a range of age groups and occupations. 11 respondents (7%) were aged 18-24, 46 (30%) were 25-34, 37 (24%) were 35-44, 35 (22%) were 45-54, and 26 (17%) were 55+. Respondents included 46 students (30%), 27 medical doctors (17%), 20 business people (13%), 11 housewives (7%), 10 software engineers (7%), 9 professors (6%), 5 retailers (3%), 5 lawyers (3%), and 22 others (14%).

More detailed information about the user study and survey is available at http://softarch.usc.edu/sealant/.
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 chose blocking 68% of the time. Participants were thus able to make intent-exchange choices that did not lead to inter-app attacks at a much higher rate than their “average” behavior.

E. Threats to Validity

Our user study participants were students. To address any resulting bias, we additionally conducted the survey whose respondents spanned a variety of ages and occupations. The survey merely emulated a mobile environment, possibly influencing the participants’ choices. As a mitigation, we carefully described each scenario to provide the participants with the context they would have had if they had used an actual device. We also separately analyzed the user study and survey results, and both support our conclusions. Lastly, the participants elected to allow a fair portion (≈30%) of the vulnerable ICCs in cases we designed blocking to be the appropriate choice. While we consider the users’ choices to block the rest ≈70% of ICCs that would otherwise have remained uncaught without SEALANT as a positive result, this indicates that improvements may be possible with regards to how SEALANT presents the vulnerable ICCs to end-users.

VI. RELATED WORK

Approaches that target Android’s vulnerabilities use program analysis, ICC analysis, and/or policy enforcement.

Program analysis is employed by several approaches [2], [23], [32], [51]–[63]. ComDroid [2] categorizes vulnerabilities in inter-app communication and detects vulnerabilities in target apps via static analysis. FlowDroid [32] provides intra-component taint-flow analysis. CHEX [12] leverages data-flow analysis to discover component hijacking vulnerabilities. Unlike SEALANT, these techniques mainly focus on individual apps.

ICC analysis is the focus of another body of research [4]–[7], [14], [34], [64]–[74]. Epicca [14] and IC3 [34] statically extract information from Android apps for ICC-aware analyses. DidFail [5] uses taint-flow analysis to locate sensitive inter-app data-flows, but targets only Activity components and neglects intents’ data scheme. AmanDroid [6] identifies privacy leaks by tracking components interactions, but has been shown to work incorrectly on Content Provider components and certain ICC methods. IccTA [4] is a taint-flow analysis targeting privacy leaks. While instrumenting source code to resolve the connections between components does improve its precision, it does not target other types of inter-app attacks. COVERT [7] introduces a compositional analysis of inter-app vulnerabilities, especially against permission leakage. It does not target other types of inter-app attacks or handle intents’ data scheme. These approaches detect but do not protect against ICC vulnerabilities.

Policy enforcement in Android is explored via (1) app code instrumentation [8], [17], [75]–[81], (2) Android framework extension [9]–[11], [13], [54], [82]–[86], and (3) dynamic memory instrumentation [15], [87]. Aurasium [76] enforces arbitrary policies by interposing code into the target app. DroidForce [8] enforces custom data-centric policies by instrumenting an app’s bytecode. While rewriting apps can be effective, incomplete implementations of bytecode rewriting results in a number of potential attacks [88]. Since repackaging assigns a different signature to a target app, it can also no longer be updated by the original issuer. Saint [9] extends Android to enable control of an app’s behavior via app provider’s policies. XmanDroid [11] also extends the monitoring mechanism of Android to prevent app-level privilege escalation attacks based on permission-based policies. ASM [89] provides an API that enables enforcement of app-specific security requirements. End-users typically lack expertise in devising policies and have to rely on general policies written by experts. By contrast, SEALANT provides finer-grain protection by automatically generating and enforcing what amounts to target-specific policies for a set of apps. DeepDroid [87] provides enterprise policy enforcement by applying dynamic memory instrumentation (i.e., rooting) to Android’s runtime environment. SEPAR [15] automatically synthesizes security policies, which it also enforces through dynamic memory instrumentation. Rooting may introduce vulnerabilities and compatibility issues on custom ROM [18].

VII. CONCLUDING REMARKS

SEALANT is an integrated technique that monitors and protects ICC paths through which Android inter-app attacks can take place. SEALANT’s combination of static and dynamic analysis improves upon existing techniques in automatically identifying the vulnerable ICC paths between a set of apps, monitoring each instance of ICC to detect potential attacks, and empowering end-users to stop the attacks. Our evaluation demonstrates SEALANT’s effectiveness, efficiency, accuracy, scalability, and usability. Notably, we have shown that SEALANT outperforms existing alternatives in blocking inter-app attacks and can be applied in real-world scenarios, with a negligible performance overhead and a minor adoption barrier.

Several avenues of future work remain. Analyzer shares two limitations of static-analysis tools it leverages (i.e., IC3, COVERT, and FlowDroid). First, reflective calls are resolved only when their arguments are string constants. To this end, we will explore reflection analysis techniques [90]. Second, incomplete models of native methods and dynamically loaded code can cause unsoundness in our results. This can be remedied by leveraging additional sources of vulnerabilities [91] and dynamic analysis techniques [54], [92]. Inter-app attacks can also be launched via covert channels in the Android core system components and via kernel-controlled channels (e.g., confused deputy attacks over a local socket connection or collusion attacks over the file system). We can counter such attacks by combining our solution with kernel-level solutions (e.g., SELinux [93] and FlaskDroid [10]). Another direction for our work is to feed end-users’ choices into a statistical model, to provide more specific guidance. Eventually, we can incorporate these techniques in designing applications [94], [95].
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