() coverity®

Static Analysis

More than finding bugs

Bob Archer



What do we do?



Look for defects in code

(in C/C++, Java and C#)



A simple example – find the bug

void foo0(int* p, int i, int j)
{

*p = j;

}



Slightly more subtle – find the bug

```
void foo( int* );
```

}

```
void foo5( int* p, int i, int j )
{
    if( p )
        foo( p );
    *p = j;
```



Checker examples

- FORWARD_NULL
- DEADCODE
- COPY_PASTE_ERROR
- LOCK_INVERSION
- RESOURCE_LEAK
- NESTING_INDENT_MISMATCH



DEADCODE

}

```
void deadcode( int i )
{
    if( i != 10 || i != 12 ) {
        return;
    }
    ++i;
```



DEADCODE

```
void deadcode( int i )
{
    if( i != 10 || i != 12 ) {
        return;
    }
        The condition is always true
```

++i;

}



COPY_PASTE_ERROR

```
struct S {
    int x, y;
};
```

}

void copyPasteError(bool b, int z) {

```
S s1;
s1.x = 0;
s1.y = 0;
if( b )
    s1.x = s1.x + z;
if( b )
    s1.y = s1.x + z;
```



COPY_PASTE_ERROR

```
struct S {
    int x, y;
};
```

}

void copyPasteError(bool b, int z) {

```
S s1;
s1.x = 0;
s1.y = 0;
if( b )
      s1.x = s1.x + z;
if( b )
      s1.y = s1.x + z;
```



LOCK_INVERSION

```
int a, b;
```

```
void test1_ok() {
    _spin_lock(&a);
    _spin_lock(&b);
}
void test1_good() {
    _spin_lock(&a);
    _spin_lock(&b);
}
void test1_bad() {
    _spin_lock(&b);
    _spin_lock(&a);
}
```



LOCK_INVERSION

```
int a, b;
```

```
void test1_ok() {
    _spin_lock(&a);
    _spin_lock(&b);
}
void test1_good() {
    _spin_lock(&a);
    _spin_lock(&b);
}
void test1_bad() {
    _spin_lock(&b);
    _spin_lock(&a);
}
```



RESOURCE_LEAK

```
void test2(bool b)
{
    int* p;
    p = malloc(10);
    if (b)
         free(p);
}
```



NESTING_INDENT_MISMATCH

void nesting_indent_mismatch(int x)
{

```
if (x == 0)
    x = foo();
    bar(x);
```

}



NESTING_INDENT_MISMATCH

void nesting_indent_mismatch(int x)
{

```
if (x == 0)
    x = foo();
    bar(x);
```

}



Checkers

ARRAY_VS_SINGLETON	COM.BSTR.CONV	MISSING_RETURN	SIZEOF_MISMATCH
ASSERT_SIDE_EFFECT	COPY_PASTE_ERROR	NEGATIVE_RETURNS	SLEEP
ATOMICITY	COPY_WITHOUT_ASSIGN	NO_EFFECT	STACK_USE
BAD_ALLOC_ARITHMETIC	CTOR_DTOR_LEAK	NULL_RETURNS	STRAY_SEMICOLO
BAD_ALLOC_STRLEN	DEADCODE	OPEN_ARGS	STREAM_FORMAT_
BAD_COMPARE	DELETE_ARRAY	ORDER_REVERSAL	STRING_NULL
BAD_EQ	DELETE_VOID	OVERRUN	STRING_OVERFLO
BAD_EQ_TYPES	ENUM_AS_BOOLEAN	PARSE_ERROR	STRING_SIZE
BAD_FREE	EVALUATION_ORDER	PASS_BY_VALUE	SWAPPED_ARGUM
BAD_OVERRIDE	FORWARD_NULL	READLINK	TAINTED_SCALAR
BAD_SHIFT	GUARDED_BY_VIOLATION	RESOURCE_LEAK	TAINTED_STRING
BAD_SIZEOF	INFINITE_LOOP	RETURN_LOCAL	TOCTOU
BUFFER_SIZE	INVALIDATE_ITERATOR	REVERSE_INULL	UNCAUGHT_EXCE
CALL_SUPER	LOCK	REVERSE_NEGATIVE	UNINIT
CHAR_IO	LOCK_INVERSION	SECURE_CODING	UNINIT_CTOR
CHECKED_RETURN	MISRA_CAST	SECURE_TEMP	UNREACHABLE
CHROOT	MISSING_BREAK	SELF_ASSIGN	UNUSED_VALUE
COM.BAD_FREE	MISSING_LOCK	SIGN_EXTENSION	USE_AFTER_FREE

SIZEOF_MISMATCH USER_POINTER SLEEP VARARGS STACK_USE VOLATILE_ATOMICITY STRAY_SEMICOLON WRAPPER_ESCAPE STREAM_FORMAT_STATE STRING_NULL STRING_OVERFLOW STRING_SIZE SWAPPED_ARGUMENTS TAINTED_SCALAR TAINTED_STRING TOCTOU UNCAUGHT_EXCEPT UNINIT UNINIT_CTOR UNREACHABLE UNUSED_VALUE



A talk in three parts

Technical (how do we find defects?)

Philosophical (what is a defect anyway?)

Psychological

(how do we persuade a programmer that there really is a defect?)



Technical

How do we find defects?



What is static analysis?



What is static analysis?

Looking for defects *without* running the code

(we analyze the code itself, not the execution of that code)



What is static analysis?

Analysis of *all* paths (in theory)

(not just those encountered during execution of a test suite)



Problems

Complete analysis \equiv Halting problem



Problems

Complete analysis \equiv Halting problem

Huge state space



Problems

Complete analysis \equiv Halting problem

Huge state space

Combinatorial explosion



Solution

Abstract Interpretation



Solution

Abstract Interpretation

(simplify, simplify, simplify)



New problems

What do we simplify?

How do we simplify it?

How much do we simplify it?



The bane of our existence





Overall picture





Build capture & emit





Build capture

- Wrap the user's build
 - Files
 - Order
 - Command line options
 - Compiler used

• Just building is a hard problem



Emit

- Our own compiler front end
- Produces an AST + other data we want



Other data?

- Indentation information
- Unnecessary casts that are (usually) thrown away by Mono front end
- The complete list of every file that was compiled along with all of the options used so that we don't have to run the build system again.











Look for known defect patterns in the AST

Report them


Intraprocedural / interprocedural

- Intraprocedural
 - No (or limited) knowledge of other functions
 - Poor for data sensitive checkers
 - Usually simple & fast
- Interprocedural
 - Knows a lot about other functions
 - Good for tracking data flow between functions
 - Abstract interpretation create simplified models of other functions
 - Complex, slow, necessary



Flow insensitive / flow sensitive

- Flow insensitive
 - Things that are always true
 - Mostly intraprocedural
 - High certainty makes few assumptions
- Flow sensitive
 - Things that are conditionally true
 - Tracks the evolution of (simplified) state
 - Intraprocedural or interprocedural
 - Less certainty relies on abstractions



Flow sensitive analysis

- Loops are a problem
- Continue until nothing more to be learned
- Trade off between speed and analysis fidelity



False path pruning

```
void f(int x) {
   int y;
   if (x)
       y = 1; /* A */
   else
       y = 2; /* B */
    ··· /* C */
   if (x)
       ++y; /* D */
   else
       --y; /* E */
```

}



False path pruning

}

void f(int x) { Feasible: int y; if (x) A - C - Dy = 1; /* A */ B - C - Eelse y = 2; /* B */ ···· /* C */ Infeasible if (x) ++y; /* D */ A - C - Eelse B - C - D--y; /* E */



Is there a defect here?

}

```
char foo( int fd )
{
    char buf;
    lseek( fd, 0, SEEK_SET );
    read( fd, &buf, /*nbyte*/ 1 );
    return buf;
```



Is there a defect here?

}

```
char foo( int fd )
{
    char buf;
    lseek( fd, 0, SEEK_SET );
    read( fd, &buf, /*nbyte*/ 1 );
    return buf;
```



Is there a defect here?

```
char foo( int fd )
{
    char buf;
    lseek( fd, 0, SEEK_SET );
    read( fd, &buf, /*nbyte*/ 1 );
    return buf;
}
```

lseek is called 10 times in the code. Its return value is checked in the other 9 places.



Statistical checkers

- Look for consistency
- Return value of lseek checked 9 times out of 10 probable error







• Adds defects to the database



- Adds defects to the database
- Remember that we're not just doing this once.
 - The code might undergo many revisions and have analysis re-run each time
 - Once a bug has been committed we don't want it reported as a separate entry. (Lose categorization information)



- Adds defects to the database
- Remember that we're not just doing this once.
 - The code might undergo many revisions and have analysis re-run each time
 - Once a bug has been committed we don't want it reported as a separate entry. (Lose categorization information)
- Cross reference information



- Adds defects to the database
- Remember that we're not just doing this once.
 - The code might undergo many revisions and have analysis re-run each time
 - Once a bug has been committed we don't want it reported as a separate entry. (Lose categorization information)
- Cross reference information
- This is where our customers view the defects



Managing defects

- Prioritize
- Categorize
- Annotate
- Assign
- Integrate with bug tracking systems, lifecycle management systems etc.
- Search by time, file, component, severity etc.
- Set a baseline (no new defects)



Philosophical

What is a defect anyway?



Quiz time – what is a defect?



Quiz time – what is a defect?

- A crash
- Fragile code unstable under modification
- Doesn't match the specification
- Doesn't match the programmer's intent
- Inconsistent
- Confusing
- Doesn't obey the house style
- Makes the customer say "What?"
- Something the customer wants to know about
- Inefficient (slow)
- Inefficient (wasteful of some finite resource)
- Security vulnerability
- Non-conformant with an external standard/constraint, such as MISRA



What is a defect?

```
void foo1(
    int* p,
    int i,
    int j )
{
    if( p )
         foo(p);
    *p = j;
}
```



What is a defect?

void foo1(void foola(int* p, int* p, int i, int i, int j) int j) { { if(p) foo(p); *p = j; *p = j; } }



What is the defect here?

void foo1(int* p, int i, int j) { if(p) foo(p); *p = j;

}

Is the defect:

- 1. That the pointer was dereferenced without a NULL check?
- 2. That foo1 checked for a NULL pointer even though it will never be passed a NULL pointer?
- 3. That the code is inconsistent?



Programmer's intent?

```
void nesting_indent_mismatch(int x)
{
    if (x == 0)
```

```
if (x == 0)
    x = foo();
    bar(x);
```

}



Programmer's intent?

```
std::string display = foo();
```

```
if( condition ) {
    display = bar();
}
else {
    display = baz();
}
```

```
write( display );
```



What does Coverity think of as a defect?

- A crash
- Fragile code unstable under modification
- Doesn't match the specification
- Doesn't match the programmer's intent
- Inconsistent
- Confusing (sort of)
- Doesn't obey the house style
- Makes the customer say "What?"
- Something the customer wants to know about
- Inefficient (slow)
- Inefficient (wasteful of some finite resource)
- Security vulnerability
- Non-conformant with an external standard/constraint, such as MISRA



Psychological

Persuasion



How many people like being told they're wrong?



How many people like being told they're wrong?

The egoless programmer

Jerry Weinberg - The Psychology of Computer Programming



Reporting the problem isn't enough

Show the evidence

(and even then they might not believe you)



Bane of our existence #1

	Coverity does not report bug	Coverity reports bug
Bug exists in code	False Negative	True Positive
Bug does not exist in code	True Negative	False Positive



Bane of our existence #1

	Coverity does not report bug	Coverity reports bug
Bug exists in code	False Negative	True Positive
Bug does not exist in code	True Negative	False Positive

Too many false negatives Too many false positives

- our product is ineffective
- loss of confidence





Changes in our results between versions



- Good churn
 - increase true positive / true negative
 - decrease false positive / false negative
- Bad churn
 - decrease true positive / true negative
 - increase false positive / false negative



- Good churn
 - increase true positive / true negative
 - decrease false positive / false negative
- Bad churn
 - decrease true positive / true negative
 - increase false positive / false negative

Even good churn can be a problem



What managers want to see



time



What managers actually see




Bane of our existence #2 - churn

- Managers hate seeing the graph go up
- Can result in customers not upgrading our product (if we can't see the defect it isn't there)



Summary

- Technical problems are formidable
- Philosophical defining the problem is tricky
- Psychological people are always the most complex part of any system



Thanks

- My Coverity colleagues including:
 - Roger Scott
 - Peter Henriksen
 - Peter Dillinger

A Few Billion Lines of Code Later: Using Static Analysis to Find Bugs in the Real World



Coverity®

Copyright 2013 Coverity, Inc.

