
RisConFix: LLM-BASED AUTOMATED REPAIR OF RISK-PRONE DRONE CONFIGURATIONS

Liping Han

School of Computer Science
Nanjing University of Posts and Telecommunications
Nanjing, China
liping@njupt.edu.cn

Tingting Nie

School of Computer Science
Nanjing University of Posts and Telecommunications
Nanjing, China
nietingting0819@gmail.com

Le Yu

School of Computer Science
Nanjing University of Posts and Telecommunications
Nanjing, China
yulele08@njupt.edu.cn

Mingzhe Hu

School of Computer Science
Nanjing University of Posts and Telecommunications
Nanjing, China
hmz@njupt.edu.cn

Tao Yue

School of Computer Science and Engineering
Beihang University
Beijing, China
yuetao@buaa.edu.cn

December 9, 2025

ABSTRACT

Flight control software is typically designed with numerous configurable parameters governing multiple functionalities, enabling flexible adaptation to mission diversity and environmental uncertainty. Although developers and manufacturers usually provide recommendations for these parameters to ensure safe and stable operations, certain combinations of parameters with recommended values may still lead to unstable flight behaviors, thereby degrading the drone’s robustness. To this end, we propose a Large Language Model (LLM) based approach for real-time repair of risk-prone configurations (named RisConFix) that degrade drone robustness. RisConFix continuously monitors the drone’s operational state and automatically triggers a repair mechanism once abnormal flight behaviors are detected. The repair mechanism leverages an LLM to analyze relationships between configuration parameters and flight states, and then generates corrective parameter updates to restore flight stability. To ensure the validity of the updated configuration, RisConFix operates as an iterative process; it continuously monitors the drone’s flight state and, if an anomaly persists after applying an update, automatically triggers the next repair cycle. We evaluated RisConFix through a case study of ArduPilot (with 1,421 groups of misconfigurations). Experimental results show that RisConFix achieved a best repair success rate of 97% and an optimal average number of repairs of 1.17, demonstrating its capability to effectively and efficiently repair risk-prone configurations in real time.

1 Introduction

Drones have become widely used in diverse tasks, such as environmental monitoring and emergency response. Unlike conventional smart devices directly operated by humans, drones are controlled by flight control software that autonomously manages flight operations. To support diverse missions and operate under uncertain environmental conditions, modern flight control software (e.g., PX4 [1], and ArduPilot [2]) provide a large number of configurable

parameters governing multiple functionalities, for example, flight control (attitude, position, and power system regulation), mission execution (flight mode), hardware adaptation (sensor calibration, actuator mapping, and communication link configuration) etc. However, recent studies have shown that certain combinations of these parameters may induce undesirable flight behaviors, including unstable oscillations and even crashes. In this paper, we refer to this type of improper configuration as *risk-prone configurations*, which poses a severe threat to drone robustness. For example, inappropriate tuning of attitude controller gains may cause oscillations or delays in response, while suboptimal throttle and pitch limit settings can result in altitude divergence or sudden thrust loss.

To ensure configuration reliability, prior studies have primarily focused on detecting misconfigurations before deployment. For instance, LGDFUZZER [3] and ICSEARCHER [4] employ fuzzing and learning-guided search techniques to detect incorrect configurations. While these approaches have proven effective in detecting potential risks, they remain constrained to offline analysis or pre-deployment testing. In practice, however, it is nearly impossible to exhaustively capture all risk-prone configurations during testing. This limitation highlights the necessity of an online and adaptive mechanism capable of detecting and repairing risk-prone configurations in real time, thereby maintaining robust flight behavior during dynamic operations.

To fill this gap, we propose RisConFix, a Large Language Model (LLM) based automated repair framework for risk-prone drone configurations. RisConFix continuously monitors the drone’s operational state and automatically triggers a repair mechanism once abnormal flight behaviors are detected. The repair mechanism leverages an LLM to generate corrective configuration updates that restore flight stability in real time. Specifically, RisConFix consists of two main phases: 1) Runtime Anomaly Monitor, which continuously collects flight data (e.g., attitude, velocity, control outputs) and detects abnormal flight behaviors via a wireless communication protocol. 2) LLM-based Repair, which formulates the current configuration and flight state into structured prompts and queries an LLM to generate corrective configuration adjustments aimed at mitigating instability. To ensure the validity of each update, RisConFix operates as an iterative repair loop. It keeps monitoring the drone’s state after a fix is applied, and if anomalies persist, it automatically triggers the next repair cycle.

In summary, this paper makes the following contributions:

- We propose RisConFix, an LLM-based method that automatically repairs risk-prone configurations of drone flight control software.
- We evaluate RisConFix with extensive experiments (1421 sets of risk-prone configurations in total), and experimental results show that RisConFix effectively and efficiently repairs risk-prone configurations in real time.
- We share our experiences and lessons learned.

The rest of this article is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces our proposed method for automatically repairing risk-prone configurations. Section 3 reports the empirical evaluation of RisConFix. Related work is reviewed in Section 4. Finally, Section 5 summarizes key insights and lessons learned from our study, and Section 6 concludes the paper.

2 Methodology

RisConFix is designed as an iterative process consisting of two key phases: *Anomaly Monitor*, which continuously monitors flight state; and *LLM-based Repair*, which is triggered upon anomaly detection to repair risk-prone configurations. Figure 1 illustrates the overall workflow of RisConFix, while Algorithm 1 details the step-by-step procedures for real-time risk-prone configurations repair. Below, we elaborate on each phase of RisConFix.




Figure 1: Overview of RisConFix.

2.1 Anomaly Monitor

As shown in Algorithm 1, to start a flight mission, one must configure the intended functionalities of the flight control software with a set of parameters $P_{initial}$, and upload a mission profile $F_{mission}$ that specifies the intended sequence of waypoints. During mission execution, RisConFix continuously collects flight data via a wireless communication protocol (i.e., MAVLink) and monitors the incoming data stream to detect whether the drone has entered an anomalous state. Below, we summarize the anomaly metrics employed in this study, which were derived from an analysis of the physical effects that different configurations impose on drone behavior [4]:

- **Deviation.** A flight is identified as a *Deviation* when the perpendicular distance (computed using Heron’s formula) between the drone’s position and the planned trajectory exceeds 10 meters for more than 10 consecutive instances.
- **Thrust Loss.** A *Thrust Loss* is detected when the MAVLink message contains the keyword *Potential Thrust Loss*, implying that the flight control software has detected possible propulsion failure or insufficient thrust generation.
- **Timeout.** A *Timeout* state is detected when the drone remains stationary (or moves only slightly, i.e., its velocity is below 1 meter per second and altitude variation is less than 0.2 meters) for more than 6 consecutive instances.
- **Crash.** A *Crash* is detected when the MAVLink message contains the keywords *SIM Hit ground* or *Crash*, and the impact velocity exceeds a predefined threshold. Such events indicate that the drone has collided with the ground at an unsafe speed.

2.2 LLM-based Repair

As shown in Lines 6-11 of Algorithm 1, once an anomaly is detected, the repair mechanism is automatically triggered. In Line 7, RisConFix queries the LLM to generate a set of corrective parameter values based on the detected anomaly type $anomaly_type$ and the current configuration values $P_{current}$. It is worth noting that the prompt design also incorporates the official recommended ranges for each parameter¹, which provides the LLM with essential domain knowledge to produce more effective configuration repairs.

Algorithm 1: LLM-based Real-Time Repair

Input: Initial parameter values $P_{initial}$, Mission profile $F_{mission}$, Predefined repair limit lm

Output: Repair record R

```

1  $P_{current} \leftarrow P_{initial}$ 
2  $repair\_count \leftarrow 0$ 
3  $monitor \leftarrow StartMission(P_{initial}, F_{mission})$ 
4 while  $monitor.is\_not\_land()$  and  $repair\_count < lm$  do
5    $anomaly\_type \leftarrow monitor.monitor\_anomaly()$ 
6   if  $anomaly\_type \neq NULL$  then
7      $P_{fix} \leftarrow repair.get\_fix(anomaly\_type, P_{current})$ 
8      $repair.upload\_params(P_{fix})$ 
9      $P_{current} \leftarrow P_{fix}$ 
10     $repair\_count \leftarrow repair\_count + 1$ 
11     $anomaly\_record.append(anomaly\_type)$ 
12  $result \leftarrow monitor.get\_final\_status()$ 
13  $StopMission()$ 
14  $R \leftarrow \{P_{initial}, result, anomaly\_record, repair\_count\}$ 
15 Return  $R$ 
```

Figure 2 illustrates a shortened example prompt provided to the LLM. In prompt, $\{error_type\}$ represents the detected anomaly category, while $\{param_info_str\}$ encapsulates the official recommended ranges for each parameter, along with its step size and current configuration values. With this prompt, the LLM infers potential causes of the anomaly and generates corrective configurations (in JSON format), specifying the parameters to be updated and their recommended values (an example response is shown in Figure 3). The generated configurations are then uploaded to the flight control software (Line 8), and the *Anomaly Monitor* module continuously validates the effectiveness of the applied updates. If

¹The recommended range for each parameter is retrieved from the official documentation provided by the flight control software developers.

Prompt Example (shortened)

You are an experienced drone flight control engineer specializing in ArduCopter parameter tuning and flight stability optimization.

****Task Objective:****

Analyze the potential parameter-related causes of instability observed during a recent simulation flight, and propose parameter adjustments within the allowed modification range to improve the drone's stability, safety, and control precision in subsequent flights.

****Input Information****

1. Anomaly Type: `{error_type}`

Anomaly type definitions:
(Omitted for brevity)

2. Adjustable Parameter Information:

Below is the list of flight controller parameters that can be modified, including their `allowed range [min, max]`, `step size`, and `current value`:
`{param_info_str}`

****Your Tasks:****

1. Analyze the possible causes of the issue (`{error_type}`) based on the current parameters.
2. Identify the key parameters that cause unstable or abnormal flight.
3. Propose new parameter values within the allowed range to improve control precision, flight stability, and responsiveness.
4. Modify the necessary parameters, ensuring that the changes do not exceed the permitted range or step limits.
5. Output only one valid JSON object containing the modified parameter names and their new values.

****Output Format Requirements****

- Strictly output in `JSON format`, for example:

```
{{
  "ATC_RAT_PIT_P": 0.12,
  "ATC_RAT_PIT_I": 0.06
}}
```

- Do not include any explanations, comments, units, or additional text.

Now, directly output the JSON result:

Figure 2: Shortened example of an LLM prompt. Red text indicates prompt variables, the remaining text forms the static prompt template, and blue text marks the key elements.

anomalous behaviors persist after reconfiguration, the repair mechanism iteratively triggers subsequent repair cycles. This process continues until the mission is completed, that is `monitor.is_not_land()` is FALSE, or a predefined repair limit lm is reached (Lines 4-11). When the iterative process no longer meets its continuation conditions, the mission is terminated, and the repair outcome is recorded. This record includes whether the mission passed or failed, the anomalies detected, and the total number of repair iterations triggered during the flight (Lines 12-15).

Figure 4 shows a comparison before and after the repair operation. The upper subfigure shows the flight trajectory with the original configurations, where the drone exhibits noticeable oscillations throughout the mission. In contrast, the lower subfigure depicts the trajectory after applying the response configuration in Figure 3 upon first detection of an anomaly. Obviously, the drone experienced slight instability at the beginning of the mission (bottom of the subfigure), then the subsequent trajectory became smoother. This demonstrates that the proposed RisConFix can effectively enhance flight robustness in real time.




Figure 3: Example model response.




Figure 4: Comparison of flight trajectories before and after applying the proposed method. The upper subfigure illustrates the flight trajectory with the original configuration, while the lower one presents the trajectory after applying the configuration update shown in Figure 3.

3 Empirical Evaluation

3.1 Research Questions

To evaluate RisConFix, we design the following research questions (RQs):

RQ1 - To what extent can RisConFix successfully repair risk-prone configurations that lead to anomalous drone behaviors?

RQ2 - How efficient is RisConFix in completing the repair process, as measured by the number of iterations needed to restore stable flight?

3.2 Evaluation Metrics

To answer RQ1 and RQ2, we define below two evaluation metrics:

Repair Success Rate (RSR). *RSR* quantifies the proportion of cases in which repair operations are triggered and the risk-prone configuration is ultimately repaired successfully. A case is considered successfully repaired if it meets two criteria: 1) RisConFix actively triggers the repair operation (i.e., generates a targeted fix for the detected anomaly); and 2) The generated configuration(s), when applied, completely resolve the detected anomaly without introducing new anomalies. The calculation of *RSR* is as follows:

$$RSR = \left(\frac{NRC}{TTC} \right) \times 100\% \quad (1)$$

where *NRC* denotes the number of successfully repaired configuration instances, and *TTC* represents the total number of experimented configuration instances.

Average Number of Repairs (ANR). *ANR* quantifies the average number of repair attempts required for each risk-prone configuration to be ultimately repaired successfully. A valid repair attempt is defined as: RisConFix actively triggers a repair operation (i.e., generates a targeted fix for the detected anomaly). For each successfully repaired case, we count the number of repair attempts until a successful repair is achieved. The calculation of *ANR* is as follows:

$$ANR = \frac{TRA}{NRC} \quad (2)$$

where *TRA* is the total number of repair attempts for all successfully repaired cases.

3.3 Experiment Setups and Benchmark Dataset

To evaluate the effectiveness of RisConFix, we conducted experiments with ArduPilot [2], an open-source drone flight control software that is widely adopted in both commercial and research applications [5]. For our evaluation dataset, we utilized the benchmark dataset from [6], which contains 1,421 distinct misconfigurations. Each case in the dataset is a set of potentially risk-prone configurations that may lead to abnormal or unstable flight behaviors. To select a suitable LLM for our task, we conducted preliminary experiments comparing multiple state-of-the-art models. Based on rigorous pre-experimental evaluation, we selected DeepSeek and Qwen as our models due to their superior performance in generating corrective parameter values. For the predefined repair limit, we set $lm = 5$. This means that if the number of repair iterations exceeds five, the mission will be marked as a failure, and the anomaly corresponding to the fifth repair attempt will be returned.

3.4 Experiment Results

3.4.1 Effectiveness (RQ1)

Table 1 summarizes the executed mission results and repair involvement statistics. The mission was executed 1,421 times (i.e., using the 1,421 sets of misconfigurations) on each model. With DeepSeek, there were 1,419 executions passed and 2 failed. For the passed missions, repair attempts were triggered in 1,380 (1,148+231+1) cases, i.e., 1,148 cases were fixed with one repair attempt, 231 with two attempts, and only 1 mission required three repairs. Additionally, 39 passed missions did not involve any repairs. For the two failed missions, no repair attempts were triggered. We further checked the execution logs and found that the total mission execution times of these two cases surpasses a predefined limit, and therefore failed. In summary, the repair success rate *RSR* is **97%** (1,380/1,421), indicating that RisConFix can effectively repair risk-prone configurations.

In contrast, for Qwen, it had 1,210 passed missions but a relatively higher number of failed cases (i.e., 211). For the passed missions, repairs were triggered in 1,171 cases (309+172+237+214+239) across multiple repair attempts (up to 5 times), and not triggered in 39 cases. Notably, for failed missions, repairs were triggered in 209 cases, implying that Qwen attempted repairs in most of its failed missions but still could not achieve success. This indicates that the repair effectiveness of Qwen is less favorable compared to DeepSeek. Nevertheless, we still achieved an **82%** (1,171/1,421) repair success rate on Qwen. Overall, RisConFix achieved an average repair success rate of **90%** across both models, indicating that RisConFix can effectively repair risk-prone configurations on the fly and substantially enhance flight robustness.

Table 1: Summary of mission results and repair involvement statistics

LLMs	Results	Counts	Repairs	Counts	
DeepSeek	Passed	1,419	Triggered	1 time	1,148
				2 times	231
				3 times	1
	Failed	2	Not Triggered		39
			Triggered		0
			Not Triggered		2
Qwen	Passed	1,210	Triggered	1 time	309
				2 times	172
				3 times	237
				4 times	214
				5 times	239
	Failed	211	Not Triggered		39
			Triggered		209
			Not Triggered		2

Conclusion for RQ1

RisConFix achieved an average repair success rate of **90%** across both models, with the best repair success rate reaching **97%**, demonstrating the effectiveness of RisConFix.

3.4.2 Efficiency (RQ2)

As shown in Table 1, for the 1,380 successfully repaired cases on DeepSeek, there are a total of 1,613 ($1,148 + 231 \times 2 + 1 \times 3$) repair attempts, resulting in an average number of repairs of **1.17** (Eq. 2). It means that with DeepSeek, RisConFix can fix risk-prone configurations with nearly one repair attempt on average, showing its capability to efficiently identify and repair improper configurations induced anomalies. In contrast, for Qwen, across its 1,171 repair-triggered cases within passed missions, the total number of repair attempts accumulates to 3,415 ($309 + 172 \times 2 + 237 \times 3 + 214 \times 4 + 239 \times 5$) repair attempts. The corresponding average number of repairs is **2.91** ($3,415/1,171$), which implies that Qwen requires approximately three repair iterations per triggered case to fix risk-prone configurations. Such differences in *ANR* reflect the models' robustness in handling risk-prone configurations of flight control software. DeepSeek's low *ANR* indicates its reliability in maintaining flight stability with minimal intervention, while Qwen's relatively higher *ANR* implies a greater cost in achieving the same level of repair effect. Therefore, choosing a suitable LLM model is crucial for improving repair efficiency. Nevertheless, our method still achieved an average of **2.04** repairs across both models, demonstrating RisConFix's practicality.

Conclusion for RQ2

RisConFix achieved an average number of repairs of **2.04** across both models, with a best average of **1.17** repairs observed on DeepSeek, evincing RisConFix's efficiency in repairing risk-prone configurations.

4 Related Work

Configurations play a crucial role in Cyber-Physical Systems (CPS). Prior studies in software engineering show that misconfigurations are a major cause of system failures [7], and numerous approaches have been proposed to detect or repair misconfigurations through static analysis [8–10], search-based methods [11, 12], or data-driven anomaly detection [13, 14].

In the context of unmanned aerial vehicles, existing work primarily aims at detecting misconfigurations rather than repairing them. For example, Ma et al. [15] proposed a fuzz testing approach based on evolutionary algorithms to generate configuration combinations that can lead to UAV unstable states. Chang et al. [16] proposed APFuzzer, a state-guided fuzzing system that uses a Quality-Diversity Enhanced Genetic Algorithm (QDGA) to detect incorrect configuration parameters causing abnormal drone flight states. Later, Chang et al. [17] proposed LDFuzzer, a low-cost, state-guided fuzzing system designed to search incorrect configuration parameter values in drone control systems.

Purandare et al. [18] explored failures in small Uncrewed Aerial Systems (sUAS) controller software by leveraging software product line engineering to systematically analyze the configuration parameter space, uncovering failures caused by single parameter value changes and all pairs of changes. Cui et al. [19] proposed a machine learning-based approach to detect incorrect control parameter configurations in Robotic Aerial Vehicles (RAVs) that may cause operational issues.

Besides detecting improper configurations, there is still some work that focuses on anomaly detection. For instance, AI Islam [20] proposed methods for detecting and diagnosing flight anomalies. Tan et al. [21] proposed RADD (Runtime Anomaly Detection for Drones), an integrated approach combining rule mining and unsupervised learning to detect runtime anomalies in drones. Shar et al. [22] proposed DronLomaly, a deep learning-based log analysis approach for real-time detection of anomalous drone behaviors that may lead to physical instability or safety risks. Minn et al. [23] developed an automated tool (named DronLomaly) for runtime anomalous behavior detection of DJI drones’ flight missions based on flight logs. In addition, many other works use fuzzing methods [15, 24, 25] to detect bugs and vulnerabilities in Drones.

In summary, existing research predominantly focuses on identifying misconfigurations or anomalous behaviors. Current approaches either expose risk-prone configurations [3, 4, 15–19], or detect anomalous behaviors [20–23, 26–28], but they lack providing automated mechanisms to restore system stability once a problematic configuration is detected. Moreover, prior studies have not explored the use of LLMs as a reasoning engine to analyze configuration–state relationships and further produce actionable misconfiguration fixes. To bridge this gap, we propose RisConFix, enabling LLM-driven diagnosis and repair of configuration-induced drone anomalies.

5 Experiences and Lessons Learned

Model quality and token resources matter. During our preliminary experiments, we observed a performance gap between LLM responses made using paid token resources and those relying on free token quotas. When using the free quota, the model occasionally produced less accurate configuration correction, resulting in more repair iterations before achieving a stable flight state. This suggests that the responsiveness and reasoning accuracy of our LLM-based repair mechanism are closely dependent on both model capacity and computational resources. Therefore, we recommend using advanced LLMs and sufficient token resources when applying RisConFix to ensure timely responses and better repair effects.

Necessity of embedding configuration constraints in prompt. In the pilot experiments, we initially designed prompts that only included anomaly type and the corresponding configuration, without providing the official recommendations from the developers. Under such incomplete guidance, the LLM often generated less effective repairs. When we added constraints from the official documentation, the LLM produced more effective fixes. This suggests that configuration constraints are essential when applying LLMs to configuration repair, and providing explicit configuration boundaries makes LLMs more capable of producing effective repairs, thereby reducing repair iterations.

Strengthening configuration management is essential for flight safety. Our experimental results indicate that the vast majority of misconfigurations we experimented with triggered anomalous flight states, and a substantial portion even resulted in crashes. This finding highlights that pre-flight configuration validation plays a critical role in preventing catastrophic failures. Effective configuration checks, which are the first line of safeguard for flight safety, should be strictly performed before flight missions.

6 Conclusion and Future Work

In response to the robustness degradation caused by risk-prone configurations in drone flight control systems, we proposed RisConFix, an LLM-based method, which detects anomalies caused by risk-prone configurations and repairs them in real time through an iterative monitoring-repair mechanism. To evaluate RisConFix, we conducted experiments on ArduPilot flight control software using a dataset comprising 1,421 misconfiguration cases and two representative large language models. The experimental results indicate that RisConFix attained an average repair success rate of 90% and an average number of repairs of 2.04 across two models, demonstrating both the effectiveness and efficiency of the proposed method.

Future research will focus on the generalizability of RisConFix. In particular, we plan to extend our method beyond drone flight control and explore automatic, real-time mitigation of improper configuration induced instabilities in other CPS, such as smart manufacturing systems and underwater robotic platforms. By adapting RisConFix to different control architectures and operational environments, we aim to develop a unified and scalable solution for ensuring configuration reliability across diverse CPS domains.

References

- [1] DroneCode. Px4—an open source flight control software for drones and other unmanned vehicles. Accessed: 2025.
- [2] ArduPilot Development Team. Ardupilot—versatile, trusted, open autopilot software for drones and other autonomous systems. Accessed: 2025.
- [3] Ruidong Han, Chao Yang, Siqi Ma, JiangFeng Ma, Cong Sun, Juanru Li, and Elisa Bertino. Control parameters considered harmful: Detecting range specification bugs in drone configuration modules via learning-guided search. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 462–473, 2022.
- [4] Ruidong Han, Siqi Ma, Juanru Li, Surya Nepal, David Lo, Zhuo Ma, and JianFeng Ma. Range specification bug detection in flight control system through fuzzing. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 50(3):461–473, 2024.
- [5] Nouridine Aliane. A survey of open-source uav autopilots. *Electronics*, 13(23):4785, 2024.
- [6] Ruidong Han, Shangzhi Xu, Juanru Li, Elisa Bertino, David Lo, JianFeng Ma, and Siqi Ma. Real-time rectifying flight control misconfiguration using intelligent agent. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, 34(4):1–29, 2025.
- [7] Xinyu Lian, Yinfang Chen, Runxiang Cheng, Jie Huang, Parth Thakkar, Minjia Zhang, and Tianyin Xu. Large language models as configuration validators. In *ICSE*, pages 1704–1716, 2025.
- [8] Akond Rahman, Shazibul Islam Shamim, Dibyendu Brinto Bose, and Rahul Pandita. Security misconfigurations in open source kubernetes manifests: An empirical study. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, 32(4):1–36, 2023.
- [9] Teng Wang, Haochen He, Xiaodong Liu, Shanshan Li, Zhouyang Jia, Yu Jiang, Qing Liao, and Wang Li. Confainter: Static taint analysis for configuration options. In *2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*, pages 1640–1651. IEEE, 2023.
- [10] Christopher S Timperley, Tobias Dürschmid, Bradley Schmerl, David Garlan, and Claire Le Goues. Rosdiscover: Statically detecting run-time architecture misconfigurations in robotics systems. In *2022 IEEE 19th International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA)*, pages 112–123. IEEE, 2022.
- [11] Pablo Valle, Aitor Arrieta, and Maite Arratibel. Automated misconfiguration repair of configurable cyber-physical systems with search: an industrial case study on elevator dispatching algorithms. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Practice (ICSE-SEIP)*, pages 396–408. IEEE, 2023.
- [12] Pablo Valle, Vincenzo Riccio, Aitor Arrieta, Paolo Tonella, and Maite Arratibel. An industrial experience report on applying search-based boundary input generation to cyber-physical systems. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 30(4):112, 2025.
- [13] David Fellner, Mark Stefan, Thomas I Strasser, Oliver Skrbinek, and Horst Paar. A pilot study on data-driven misconfiguration detection in existent power distribution systems. In *2024 International Conference on Materials and Energy: Energy in Electrical Engineering (ICOME-EE)*, pages 1–4. IEEE, 2024.
- [14] David Fellner. *Data Driven Detection of Misconfigurations in Power Distribution Systems*. PhD thesis, Technische Universität Wien, 2024.
- [15] Yuexuan Ma, Xiao Yu, Yuanzhang Li, Li Zhang, Yifei Yan, and Yu-an Tan. Fuzz testing of uav configurations based on evolutionary algorithm. In *International Conference on Blockchain Technology and Emerging Applications*, pages 41–56. Springer, 2023.
- [16] Zhiwei Chang, Hanfeng Zhang, Yue Yang, Yan Jia, Sihan Xu, Tong Li, and Zheli Liu. Fuzzing drone control system configurations based on quality-diversity enhanced genetic algorithm. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Security and Privacy*, pages 499–512. Springer, 2023.
- [17] Zhiwei Chang, Hanfeng Zhang, Yan Jia, Sihan Xu, Tong Li, and Zheli Liu. Low-cost fuzzing drone control system for configuration errors threatening flight safety in edge terminals. *Computer Communications*, 220:138–148, 2024.
- [18] Salil Purandare and Myra B Cohen. Exploration of failures in an suas controller software product line. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Systems and Software Product Line Conference*, pages 125–135, 2024.
- [19] Aoran Cui, Kaikai Pan, Qidi Zhong, and Wenyuan Xu. Learning-based detection of incorrect control parameter configurations for robotic aerial vehicle. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Unmanned Systems (ICUS)*, pages 1868–1873. IEEE, 2024.

- [20] Md Nafee Al Islam. *Real-Time Detection and Diagnosis of Flight Anomalies in Small Unmanned Aerial Systems*. University of Notre Dame, 2024.
- [21] Ivan Tan, Wei Minn, Christopher M Poskitt, Lwin Khin Shar, and Lingxiao Jiang. Runtime anomaly detection for drones: An integrated rule-mining and unsupervised-learning approach. In *International Conference on Engineering of Complex Computer Systems*, pages 3–23. Springer, 2025.
- [22] Lwin Khin Shar, Wei Minn, Nguyen Binh Duong Ta, Jiani Fan, Lingxiao Jiang, and Daniel Lim Wai Kiat. Dronomaly: Runtime detection of anomalous drone behaviors via log analysis and deep learning. In *2022 29th Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference (APSEC)*, pages 119–128. IEEE, 2022.
- [23] Wei Minn, Yan Naing Tun, Lwin Khin Shar, and Lingxiao Jiang. Dronomaly: Runtime log-based anomaly detector for dji drones. In *Proceedings of the 2024 IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering: Companion Proceedings*, pages 6–10, 2024.
- [24] Yuexuan Ma, Xiao Yu, Li Zhang, Zhao Li, Yuanzhang Li, and Yu-an Tan. Dynamic fuzz testing of uav configuration parameters based on dual guidance of fitness and coverage. *Connection Science*, 36(1):2312104, 2024.
- [25] Vikas K Malviya, Wei Minn, Lwin Khin Shar, and Lingxiao Jiang. Fuzzing drones for anomaly detection: A systematic literature review. *Computers & Security*, 148:104157, 2025.
- [26] Chafiq Titouna, Farid Naït-Abdesselam, and Hassine Mounsla. An online anomaly detection approach for unmanned aerial vehicles. In *2020 International Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing (IWCMC)*, pages 469–474. IEEE, 2020.
- [27] Chuanjiang Li, Kai Luo, Lei Yang, Shaobo Li, Haoyu Wang, Xiangjie Zhang, and Zihao Liao. A zero-shot fault detection method for uav sensors based on a novel cvae-gan model. *IEEE Sensors Journal*, 24(14):23239–23254, 2024.
- [28] Aakash Kumar, Shifeng Wang, Ali Muhammad Shaikh, Hazrat Bilal, Bo Lu, and Shigeng Song. Building on prior lightweight cnn model combined with lstm-am framework to guide fault detection in fixed-wing uavs. *International Journal of Machine Learning and Cybernetics*, 15(9):4175–4191, 2024.