

Scaling Symbolic Execution to Large Software Systems

Gábor Horváth¹[0000-0002-0834-0996],
Réka Kovács¹[0000-0001-6275-8552], and
Zoltán Porkoláb¹[0000-0001-6819-0224]

Department of Programming Languages and Compilers
Eötvös Loránd University, Faculty of Informatics
Budapest, Hungary
{xazax,rekanikolett,gsd}@caesar.elte.hu

Keywords: static analysis · symbolic execution · Clang.

Abstract. Static analysis is the analysis of a program without executing it, usually carried out by an automated tool. Symbolic execution is a popular static analysis technique used both in program verification and in bug detection software. It works by interpreting the code, introducing a symbol for each value unknown at compile time (e.g. user-given inputs), and carrying out calculations symbolically. The analysis engine strives to explore multiple execution paths simultaneously, although checking all paths is an intractable problem, due to the vast number of possibilities.

We focus on an error finding framework called the Clang Static Analyzer, and an infrastructure built around it named CodeChecker. The emphasis is on achieving end-to-end scalability. This includes the run time and memory consumption of the analysis, bug presentation to the users, automatic false positive suppression, incremental analysis, pattern discovery in the results, and usage in continuous integration loops. We also outline future directions and open problems concerning these tools.

While a rich literature exists on program verification software, error finding tools normally need to settle for survey papers on individual techniques. In this paper, we not only discuss individual methods, but also how these decisions interact and reinforce each other, creating a system that is greater than the sum of its parts. Although the Clang Static Analyzer can only handle C-family languages, the techniques introduced in this paper are mostly language-independent and applicable to other similar static analysis tools.

1 Introduction

Maintenance costs of a software increase with the size of the codebase. Static analysis has a great impact on reducing expenses of complex software [38]. For example, compiler warnings rely on various static analysis methods. Moreover, compilers can detect more and more optimization possibilities statically and

these optimizations make it possible to develop software using high-level language features. Static analysis, however, is also a great approach for finding bugs and code smells [10]. The earlier a bug is detected, the lower the cost of the fix [12]. This makes static analysis a useful and cheap supplement to testing, especially as some properties of the code such as compliance with coding conventions cannot be tested.

Testing is a useful method for catching programming errors but is rarely exhaustive. Critical corner cases can be easily left uncovered by tests. As famously stated by Dijkstra: “Program testing can be used to show the presence of bugs, but never to show their absence.” *Dynamic analysis* is a great supplement to testing: we run the program with additional runtime checks for errors. But it has the same shortcomings when it comes to coverage and corner cases. One way to cover additional cases is to use *random inputs* [21]. However, let’s consider the following code snippet (Listing 1):

```

1 void f(int x) {
2     if (x == 472349) {
3         abort();
4     }
5     // ...
6 }
```

Listing 1. An unfavorable test case for random testing.

While this code is somewhat artificial, it is possible to see that we have a very low probability to hit the `abort()` call during random testing.

One of the biggest advantages of static analysis is that the analysis can cover cases developers did not consider. It can provide an elegant solution to systematically explore interesting execution paths without concrete inputs, using information inferred from the source code. Moreover, testing (unless exhaustive) cannot prove the lack of a certain error, while static analysis may be able to prove the freedom of a class of errors.

Unfortunately, paraphrasing Rice’s theorem [45] from ’53: all non-trivial properties of a program are undecidable at compile time. Thus, static analysis tools often over-approximate or under-approximate the behavior of a program. Consequently, such tools may report false errors (called *false positives*) or they might miss some real problems (called *false negatives*). While verification tools aim to catch all errors at the cost of having a large number of false positives, industrial bug-finding tools aim to have a low false positive rate at the cost of missing some true errors. Bug reports need to be reviewed by developers one-by-one in order to be corrected. If the tool presents an overwhelming amount of false warnings to the developer, it becomes cumbersome to use, and developers eventually lose their trust and interest in the tool.

This paper is structured as follows. Section 2 gives an overview of the most popular static analysis methods, Section 3 explores symbolic execution - as the technique we personally focus on - in depth. Section 4 details the infrastruc-

ture built around the static analysis tools we use. Section 5 describes some of the challenges we faced while testing our analyzers and the solutions we found. Finally, Section 7 summarizes and concludes the paper.

2 Overview of methods

This section will summarize methods that are widely used in static analysis software. Due to space constraints, we do not intend to give an in-depth overview of these methods nor cover all available techniques. More specifically, we do not cover formal methods that are used for proving program correctness. All of the mentioned approaches are fully automated, unlike model checking and deductive methods. The user does not need to supply any invariants nor any description of the semantics of the program, everything is derived from the source text.

2.1 Matching tokens

Early versions of CppCheck [37] are a good example of using regular expressions to match specific token combinations in the source code. First, the tool preprocesses the source file and tokenizes its text, as tokens are easier to process in later phases than raw text. The user can write simple rules using regular expressions that are matched against the token stream. A sample rule can be seen on Listing 2.

In most of the general-purpose programming languages there are many ways to write code with the same semantics. CppCheck does many transformations on the token stream to simplify the rules written by the user. This process is called *canonicalization*. One example is to always use $<$ or \leq operators by eliminating $>$ and \geq operators by swapping their operands.

```

1 <?xml version="1.0"?>
2 <rule version="1">
3   <pattern>if \( p \) { free \( p \) ; }</pattern>
4   <message>
5     <id>redundantCondition</id>
6     <severity>style</severity>
7     <summary>It is valid to free a NULL pointer.</summary>
8   </message>
9 </rule>

```

Listing 2. An example rule to find redundant null checks in CppCheck.

There are several disadvantages of relying on a token stream for writing checks. First of all, it is hard to reverse-engineer the structure of the code, such as the precedence of operations, without actual parsing. Second, no type information is available, making certain checks hard to write. Finally, this representation also misses basic information such as which function is being called. In C++,

there are complex rules on how to do overload resolution, but this representation makes it impossible to determine the exact callee.

The main advantage of matching tokens is its simplicity. Such checks are easy to implement and very fast to run.

2.2 Matching the abstract syntax tree

The *abstract syntax tree* (AST) is a representation of the source code that also encodes structural information. We not only access tokens but we also know their roles and relationships. For example, the comma token in C++ can either be a separator for function arguments or the sequence operator. If we only have a token stream, we have to deal with such ambiguities, but once we have access to the AST, we know exactly what the role of a token is.

Often the AST is decorated with type information. This is important for desugaring type aliases and resolving calls to overloaded functions. In C++, it is also beneficial to have the code instantiated from templates in the AST.

This representation is suitable for catching many common errors, such as space allocation on the heap using the wrong size, and it proved to be strong enough to detect some misuses of the STL API [28]. Such syntactic checks are usually very efficient and it is viable to run them in the editor. Some rules can even be implemented using a single traversal of the AST. Clang Tidy [3] uses AST matching for most of its checks.

The disadvantage of AST matching is that we cannot reason about possible values of variables or about dependencies of expressions.

2.3 Abstract interpretation

Programs are rather complex structures, thus reasoning about them is hard. We may use abstractions to simplify the analyzed program and check for certain properties separately. For example, instead of trying to reason about the exact values a variable can hold, we can reason about the signedness of those values. Similarly, instead of trying to enumerate feasible execution paths of a program (which is undecidable), we can assume that all of the paths are feasible.

Using such methods we over-approximate the behavior of the program and simulate each possible execution without using too many resources during the analysis. Typically, for such analyses we use the *control flow graph* (CFG) of the program. The nodes of this graph are *basic blocks*, which are sequences of instructions always executed sequentially, while edges are the possible jumps between basic blocks. An example CFG can be seen in Figure 1.

During *abstract interpretation* [16] we reason about the possible values of variables at a certain program point. We can think of a program as a sequence of program states and transitions. Representing all the possible program states is an intractable problem, thus we use an abstract program state that captures some aspects of the variables. The way we represent this abstract program state is determined by the *abstract domain*. Some examples of abstract domains in




Fig. 1. A C function and its simplified control flow graph.

increasing expressiveness are signs, intervals, octagons [40], and polyhedra [47]. For example, if we choose our abstract domain to be intervals, a program state will consist of a program point and a mapping from each variable to an interval that over-approximates the possible values of the variable at the program point described by the state.

For an abstract interpretation algorithm we also need to define how each basic block transforms abstract values. For example, if we do sign analysis, we need to know which variables' signs are changed by a basic block. The functions describing this transformation are called *transfer functions*.

Flow-sensitive analysis Most of the times we are able to produce the values in the domain of the analysis for each basic block. We have a set of initial conditions for each basic block and propagate values between basic blocks using fixed-point iteration. The reason why such analysis will converge is that we chose the abstract domain to be a lattice¹ [11], and each operation during the analysis can only decrease the abstract value of a variable. Thus, in the worst case, we will reach a fixed point where each variable is mapped to the smallest element of the lattice (often called bottom).

Path-sensitive analysis The flow-sensitive analysis assumes that every possible walk over the CFG is a feasible path. That is almost never the case, since some of the paths can never be taken during execution. Let us consider the following example (Listing 3):

¹ A *lattice* is a partially ordered set, in which each pair of elements has a unique supremum and a unique infimum.

```

1  int f(int x) {
2      int c = 0;
3      if (x > 2) {
4          c = 3;
5      }
6      // ... (c is unchanged)
7      if (x > 5) {
8          return 9/c; // Division by zero?
9      }
10 }

```

Listing 3. A function that demonstrates the difference in precision between flow-sensitive and path-sensitive analyses.

A flow-sensitive analysis would report a division by zero error in the code above, even though such an error could never occur during runtime, since each time the value of x is greater than five, the value of c will not be zero. One possible improvement is to record *path constraints* for each checked execution path. A path-sensitive analysis will use the path constraint and SMT solvers to prune (some of) the infeasible paths. In the code above such analysis could derive that we never take the $x > 5$ branch when the value of c is zero. This method can help reduce the number of false positives significantly, but it can also result in a combinatorial explosion of states.

2.4 Symbolic Execution

Symbolic execution [25,32,8] is a path-sensitive static analysis method. In abstract interpretation, we over-approximate the behavior of the analyzed program and reason about every possible execution. On the other hand, during symbolic execution, we only reason about a set of paths, but more precisely. Thus, symbolic execution is both an over-approximation (there is a loss of information when we represent symbolic states) and under-approximation (we do not cover all of the possible execution paths).

3 Symbolic Execution

This chapter introduces symbolic execution in depth, concentrating on methods used by the Clang Static Analyzer [1] (henceforth referred to as *the analyzer*). There are other tools available that use similar techniques, e.g. Infer [14], which is open-source and free to use. KLEE [13] is also open source but it works on a lower level representation of the code and one of its purpose is to generate test cases automatically. A list of proprietary tools include CodeSonar [5], Klocwork [7], and Coverity [6].

Symbolic execution interprets the source code, assigning a symbol to represent each unknown value. Calculations are carried out symbolically. During the interpretation process, the analyzer attempts to enumerate all possible execution

paths. To represent the internal state of the analysis, the analyzer uses a data structure called the *exploded graph* [44]. Each vertex of this graph is a (*symbolic state, program point*) pair. A *symbolic state* corresponds to a set of real program states, while the *program point* determines the current location in the program, similarly to an instruction pointer. The edges of the graph are transitions between vertices. Memory is represented using a hierarchy of memory regions [49]. The analyzer builds the graph on demand during the analysis using a *worklist algorithm* that implements a path-sensitive walk over the CFG. The symbolic state consists of 3 components:

- **Environment:** A mapping from source code expressions to symbolic expressions.
- **Store:** A mapping from memory locations to symbolic expressions.
- **Generic data map:** A data structure where the analysis engine and checks store domain-specific information.

During the execution of a path, the analyzer collects constraints on symbolic expressions called *path constraints*. There is a built-in constraint solver that represents these constraints using a disjunction of ranges. This solver can reason about integers and pointers in linear expressions. It is also possible to use the *Z3 Theorem Prover* [41] as an external solver. The groundwork of adding support for more solvers is already being laid down, with the planned ability to use multiple ones at once for the same analysis. As mentioned earlier, these constraints are used to skip the analysis of infeasible paths. The constraint solver, however, can also be utilized by the checks to query certain information about the program states. This functionality can be used, for instance, to detect array out-of-bounds accesses or division by zero errors.




Fig. 2. A simplified version of the exploded graph built during the symbolic execution of a simple function. The right-hand side of the graph represents the *true* branch of the *if* statement, while the left-hand side describes the *false* branch.

An example analysis can be seen along with its simplified exploded graph on Figure 2. Each box in the exploded graph represents a symbolic program state. The first line of the box is the *store*, which holds mappings between memory regions and symbolic expressions. The other lines represent path constraints over symbols collected during exploration. We omitted any remaining components for brevity.

In function `g`, the values of `b` and `x` are initially unknown. These values are represented in the analysis by symbols $\$b$ and $\$x$, which can take any arbitrary value that their type permits. Since `b` acts as the condition of the `if` statement, its range of values can be divided into two interesting subsets: $\$b \in [0, 0]$, which leads to the `then` branch, and $\$b \in [\text{IMIN}, -1] \cup [1, \text{IMAX}]$, which leads to the `if` branch. `IMIN` and `IMAX` represent the minimal and maximal integer value available on a given platform, respectively. As the analysis continues, on the execution path where the value of `b` is assumed to be zero, we later discover that the value of `x` is the constant `42`. The symbol $\$x$ is no longer needed on this path. On the other path, the value of `b` can be anything but zero. Later we discover that the value of `x` is one larger than the original value of `b`. The symbol $\$x$ is no longer needed on any of the paths, it can be garbage collected.

The real exploded graph generated by Clang for this code snippet consists of 19 nodes and each node contains more information than our simplified nodes. A fraction of the real graph can be examined in Figure 15 in Appendix A.

Notice that each node in the exploded graph is very similar to its predecessor. Each transition will only modify a small part of the symbolic program state. Storing all states in memory separately would cost a lot of memory. The analyzer uses an *immutable/persistent AVL tree* [19] to mitigate this problem. Using immutable data structures, each time we create a new state, it will refer back to its predecessor instead of copying the old one. Thus each element of the state will be stored only once regardless of how many states are referring to that element.

Symbolic execution might find the same error on multiple paths. For example, we might allocate a chunk of memory that we never release, and the function might have multiple return paths. The analyzer will find the memory leak on every path. Instead of flooding the user with all of the paths, the analyzer will only present the shortest one, as seen on Listing 4.

```

1 int f(int x) {
2     int *p = new int;
3     if (x > 0)
4         return 1; // Warning: memory leak.
5     // ...
6     return 0;
7 }
```

Listing 4. The memory leak stemming for never deallocating memory pointed to by `p` can be realized on both a shorter and a longer path through `f`. The analyzer will only warn on the shortest path to avoid spurious error reports.

3.1 Memory model

How should the analyzer represent memory? Let us explore this problem through the following example (Listing 5):

```

1 struct X { int a, b; };
2 void unknown(int *);
3 void unknown2(X *);
4 void g() {
5     X x{0, 2};           // A
6     unknown(&x.a);      // B
7     int val = 5 / x.a;  // Should we warn?
8     unknown2(&x);      // C
9     int val2 = 5 / x.b; // Should we warn?
10 }

```

Listing 5. Motivating example for the hierarchical memory model.

In function `g`, at program point `A`, we know the value of each local variable including the fields of `x`. What can we say about program point `B`? We do not know the body of function `unknown` and it is free to modify the value of `x.a`, since we have passed its address. Thus, a division by zero warning is likely to be a false positive. In order to avoid such spurious warnings we sometimes need to erase some information from the program state. We call this process *invalidation*. After the call to `unknown` the value of `x.a` is no longer known, the analyzer will not warn at the division. What happens at program point `C`? Since the `unknown2` function is free to modify any of the fields of `x` we need to invalidate both of them to avoid the false positive. Thus, we need to model the relation between the memory of the object `x` and its fields `x.a` and `x.b`.




Fig. 3. *Left:* An expression representing field `f` of an object that is stored as the second element of array `a` on the stack. *Right:* The region hierarchy describing the memory layout of the expression on the left.

The analyzer is using a hierarchical representation for memory regions. Figure 3 contains a small snippet of code and its representation in the analyzer. We call the top region the *memory space region*. It is often useful to know whether a certain variable is allocated on the stack, on the heap, or is a global variable. We call the immediate children of the memory space regions *base regions*. As an optimization some internal algorithms in the analyzer are working on base

regions. This way these algorithms will not need to process the whole sub-tree but only one region for each of the corresponding sub-trees.

Note that this representation could be extremely memory-heavy. Imagine an array of one million elements where each element is a `struct` of one hundred fields. Creating a tree for one hundred million memory regions would not only consume a lot of memory but also take a lot of time. Because of this, the analyzer will not create the memory regions upfront. It will only create one region for the array and construct child regions lazily each time an element is written to. Until then all of the reads to any of the elements will return a default value represented by a default binding. For an uninitialized array, this default binding would represent an undefined value.

3.2 Context sensitivity

Some errors span across multiple functions. For example, we might mistakenly delete a chunk of allocated memory once in one function and again in another one. Thus, it is useful to be able to analyze across function call boundaries. If we analyze a function only once for all the call sites, we call the analysis *context-insensitive*.

In *context-sensitive analysis* we differentiate between call sites and analyze the function body for each calling context individually. In the Clang Static Analyzer we use *inline substitution / function cloning* to achieve context-sensitive analysis, meaning that the analyzer will act as if the function body was copied to the call site.

Note that we cannot inline all the functions due to cycles in the function call graph. In case the analyzer cannot inline a call, it will handle the function as *unknown* and do the necessary invalidations to avoid spurious warnings. We call this *conservative evaluation* of a function call. Also, we do not always know the calling context of a function. There might be functions without call sites that are entry points to our program, or the call sites are not known due to separate compilation. Those functions are analyzed without calling contexts and we call them *top-level functions*.

In order to improve the false positive ratio, the analyzer will not re-analyze a function as top-level if it was already analyzed via inlining. The reason is that we always have more information after inlining from the calling context. We also might end up losing coverage due to some of the paths not being exercised by the call sites observed by the analyzer. For example, for the code in Figure 4, the analyzer will only check `f` in the calling context of `g`, thus it will not find the division by zero error.

<pre> 1 int f(int x) { 2 if (x > 0) 3 return x; 4 return x/0; 5 } </pre>	<pre> 1 int g() { 2 return f(3); 3 } </pre>
---	---

Fig. 4. In the Clang Static Analyzer, an inlined function will not be re-analyzed as a top-level function. The analyzer only checks function `f` in the calling context of function `g`, thus it does not find the division by zero error in `f`.

While not re-analyzing certain functions as top-level will introduce false negatives, it is also an optimization and reduces the number of false positives.

What functions should be picked for top-level analysis? We can use topological sorting to pick good candidates. While we cannot do a topological sort on cyclic graphs, we can use heuristics to have an order with a close-to-minimal number of back edges in the determined order of vertices. In the future we also plan to experiment with annotations, so the user can specify which functions should be treated as entry points.

3.3 Exploration strategy

The biggest weakness of symbolic execution is its time complexity. The number of explored paths can be exponential in the branching factor. Moreover, if the analyzed software has loops, the number of paths might be infinite. Thus, it is not possible to do an exhaustive search over all paths. Symbolic analysis engines usually have some budgets that decide when to stop exploring a certain path and when to stop analyzing a top-level function. Once we have a budget, we can keep the run time of the analysis within reasonable limits.

It is not trivial, however, to decide which paths to examine during this limited time. Since we use worklist algorithm, we are free to choose which basic block to process next. This choice will determine the exploration strategy. The analyzer implements multiple ones: *breadth-first search* (BFS), *depth-first search* (DFS), and *unexplored first search*.

The default strategy will prioritize basic blocks that have been visited the least times so far during the analysis. This helps us maximize analysis coverage. As we will see later, we also prefer to find bugs on short execution paths as they are more likely to be true positive, and easier to interpret by developers [24]. Thus, we usually favor heuristics that prefer to explore multiple short paths rather than a few long ones.

Figure 5 shows how a depth-first search (DFS) might look like. While this exploration strategy results in very long paths, it also has some advantages. We need less memory to use DFS, since we can drop the states corresponding to already explored paths. Also, in breadth-first search (BFS, in Figure 6) the worklist size tends to be larger, which adds more extra memory. Moreover, using DFS, we are more likely to look up the same parts of the symbolic state during symbolic execution, which is also a great performance benefit.




Fig. 5. An illustration of the depth-first search (DFS) exploration strategy.




Fig. 6. An illustration of the breadth-first search (BFS) exploration strategy.

In order to combine the advantages of BFS and DFS, we can define *analysis budgets*. These budgets can have a big impact on the shape of the built explored graph, on run time performance, coverage, and the false positive ratio. The analyzer has limits such as the number of nodes to build for a top-level function, the maximal stack size during inlining, maximum number of times the same basic block on a path can be visited, and maximum size for a function to inline. Using these budget limits, we can enjoy the benefits of DFS while mitigating some of the drawbacks. For example, the analyzer will not end up spending all its time exploring one really long path, never visiting the rest of the code. These limits also prove to be useful while using other exploration strategies, like the default unexplored-first method.

Exploration strategy has a profound impact on false negatives, as it might cause the engine to miss faulty code paths, but it is also important for the false positive ratio, as the number of explored infeasible paths depends on it. One

way to reduce the probability of visiting infeasible paths is to use *trace-guided exploration*. During trace-guided exploration we record a set of paths from a real execution of the program (called *traces*) and derive further paths from feasible traces by either following a trace symbolically, or by generating a new trace from an old one, negating one of the path conditions. This method is mostly used in *concolic execution* [46], which stands for the combination of concrete and symbolic execution. There are also other advanced exploration strategies to do directed symbolic execution [36] where the tool prioritizes paths that can reach a certain program point. In case we are interested in one particular kind of check it is possible to create heuristics that guide the analysis towards paths that are more likely to contain such errors [31].

3.4 Cross translation unit analysis (CTU)

The scope of the analysis has a big impact on its precision. If we cannot reason about functions in separate translation units, we will not find the errors that span across translation unit boundaries. in Figure 7 we see a division by zero error that the analysis will not find unless it can reason about both A.cpp and B.cpp together at the same time.

Listing 6. A.cpp

```

1 int f(int x);
2
3 void g() {
4     // Division by zero.
5     // No warning below.
6     int x = f(42);
7 }

```

Listing 7. B.cpp

```

1 int f(int x) {
2     // Potential
3     // division by zero.
4     return 5 / (x - 42);
5 }

```

Fig. 7. Example of a false negative error spanning across translation unit boundaries.

Listing 8. A.cpp

```

1 bool f(int x);
2
3 void g() {
4     int x = 0;
5     if (f(x)) ++x;
6     // Warning below:
7     // division by zero.
8     int c = 5 / x;
9 }

```

Listing 9. B.cpp

```

1 bool f(int x) {
2     return x % 2 == 0;
3 }

```

Fig. 8. Example of a false positive error spanning across translation unit boundaries.

Extending the scope of the analysis has other benefits in addition to finding issues that span across translation units. We can also eliminate false positive findings. In some cases, the analyzer cannot deduce that a path is infeasible due to a lack of information that is only available in a separate translation unit. Consider Figure 8. If the analyzer knows the body of function `f`, it can deduce that the `if` branch is always taken and there is no division by zero. If the body of the function is unknown, the analyzer assumes that the branch might not be taken and reports a division by zero error.

We can approach this problem in a multiple ways. Some projects pursue *unity builds* [39], which is a way to create one big translation unit that is fed into the compiler. This way it is easier to achieve whole program analysis and also reduces compilation time. Unfortunately, it does not support incremental compilation and parallelization of the build process. Moreover, right now there is no way to automatically create a unity build from a project. The main advantage of unity build is that we can use existing tools that only support analyzing a single translation unit and use them for whole program analysis without modification.

In the upcoming C++ standard *modules* will be introduced. They will mitigate some problems with the compilation model, but will not eliminate them completely. The introduced solution is backward compatible, but a significant amount of development will be required to translate existing systems to use the new features.

An alternative way of extending the scope of the analysis is to use summaries, which are described in Subsection 3.5 in depth.




Fig. 9. Two-pass cross translation unit analysis in the Clang Static Analyzer.

Architecture Originally, the Clang Static Analyzer analyzed each translation unit in complete separation, in one pass. To implement cross-translation unit analysis, we have extended the analysis process with a *second pass* [30]. The architecture is shown in Figure 9. For C family languages, we need the compilation command to be able to parse the source code properly. Both passes require a database that contains the compilation command for each translation unit. The first pass parses the translation units and builds up an abstract syntax tree. We serialize ASTs to the disk in a binary format, and create an *index file* that records function definition locations.

It is worth to mention that function names cannot be keys in the index file. Function names are not unique in C++ due to several features such as templates, overloading, and namespaces. We use a type of identifier called USR, which stands for *Unified Symbol Resolution*. This is a unique string that can be generated for each declaration by the Clang compiler. The main purpose of its introduction into the compiler was to support the *go-to-definition* and similar functionalities of integrated development environments (IDEs).

In the second pass, the analyzer will analyze each translation unit. When it encounters a call to a function that does not have an implementation in the current translation unit, the analyzer will look the function definition up in the index. If the definition is in the index, the analyzer can locate the corresponding AST dump and load its contents into memory. The result of the analysis will be a `plist` file for each translation unit, which is a form of XML that encodes dictionaries and arrays holding information about all the errors in that unit.

AST merging Even after loading the AST of the other translation unit holding the desired function definition into memory, we are still not done. We have two separate ASTs, one representing the original translation unit that is being analyzed, and one representing the other translation unit that was loaded from the dump. These ASTs have separate symbol tables, separate representations of the same types, and their source locations are in separate file managers. We need to merge the two ASTs to be able to do the same inline analysis for calls *across* translation units that we do *within* a unit. In Clang there exists a module to merge ASTs called `ASTImporter`. Unfortunately, before our work on cross translation unit analysis began, this module had been fairly incomplete. A large portion of our initial effort went into adding C++ support to the AST merging process. Merging ASTs can also discover one definition rule violations, when the same type has semantically different representation in multiple translation units. We were able to find such cases in open source projects.

Caching Both merging the AST and loading it from the disk can be expensive. So we use two levels of *caching*. If an external AST is requested for the second time during analysis, we do not load it again, but keep it in memory. Once we have already merged a subtree of the AST, we do not attempt to merge it again.

Consistency In the original analysis, an inlined function will not be re-analyzed as a top-level function. Should we implement similar behavior across translation units? For example, if a function has already been analyzed during a call chain originating from a separate translation unit, should we consider it as a top level function, when we analyze the unit where its definition can be found? The answer is yes. Usually, translation units are analyzed in parallel using separate invocations of the analyzer. If the decision whether we analyze a function as top-level depends on the analysis of other translation units, we introduce a race condition. We can construct cases where the result of the analysis depends on

the order in which the units were processed. It is important to have consistent results across runs, otherwise the users of the analyzer cannot be sure whether they properly fixed the reported issue, or the fluctuation of reports is due to the non-determinism in the analysis.

Evaluation Surprisingly, mostly due to the well-defined budgets, it was feasible to run cross translation unit analysis on large projects using a personal computer. Run time and memory consumption numbers can be inspected in Figure 16 in Appendix B. While the analysis did take longer and consumed more memory, the increase was proportional to the number of reports found. We also observed a slight improvement in the false positive ratio as seen in Figure 17 in Appendix B. Also note that the shape of the exploded graph can change due to the increase in the scope of the analysis, resulting in a change of coverage patterns. Thus, while we do see new findings, we can also lose some of them (see Figure 18 in Appendix B). Some of the findings might be lost due to being refuted by the additional information available to the analyzer while others are due to coverage changes.

Future work The main setback of cross translation unit analysis is the lack of support for consistent results when we use incremental analysis. The reason is that we not only need to recheck the changed files, but all the files that contain paths that enter the changed files. If we re-run the analysis for all those files, it will no longer feel incremental. Solving this issue is going to take a significant amount of research and engineering effort.

3.5 Summary-based analysis

Inlining is not the only way to implement inter-procedural analysis. An alternative is called *summary-based analysis*, and it works by summarizing the semantics of a function and using the summary to evaluate the effects of the function at the call site. As the name suggests, these summaries will only estimate the behavior of the function. These kind of analyses are never as precise as inlining but they tend to be more scalable.

Often, summaries are specific to a kind of analysis. For example, we could think of the type signature of a function as a summary for type checking, which is also static analysis. For symbolic execution we encountered two approaches. The first one uses *logical formulae* as its abstraction and encodes information about the pre- and post-states of a function call. Such summaries have the form $\phi_1 \Rightarrow (\phi_2 \vee \phi_3) \wedge \phi_4 \Rightarrow \phi_5 \dots$, where each ϕ is a predicate over the program state. The left side of the implication corresponds to the state before the call, and the right side corresponds to the state after the call. The other approach uses *state machines* as its abstraction. An example is [48].

There are certain classes of summaries. *May summaries* are over-approximations. The may summary $\phi_1 \Rightarrow \phi_2$ means that no states satisfying $\neg\phi_2$ are reachable from states satisfying ϕ_1 . *Must summaries* are under-approximations.

The must summary $\phi_1 \Rightarrow \phi_2$ means any state satisfying ϕ_2 is reachable from any state satisfying ϕ_1 . There are methods to use both may and must summaries to improve the analysis [23].

Inferring preconditions for a function is a great way to generate summaries. One well established approach is using *backward symbolic execution* [15].

Unfortunately, the analyzer does not implement general function summaries at the point of writing this paper. It does have, however, a set of *modeling checks* that act as summaries for certain widely used functions like those in the C standard library. These checks are written manually. While it is great to support hand written summaries, the goal is to automatically generate them from implementations. Another mitigation for the lack of summaries is the support for *annotations*. There are certain annotations that greatly improve the precision of the analysis, but we rely on the user to add them. One such annotation is to mark functions that will never return, such as assertions. This is essential to avoid false positives from infeasible paths.

```

1 <function name="strcpy">
2   <leak-ignore/>
3   <noreturn>>false</noreturn>
4   <arg nr="1">
5     <not-null/>
6   </arg>
7   <arg nr="2">
8     <not-null/>
9     <not-uninit/>
10  <strz/>
11 </arg>
12 </function>

```

Fig. 10. An example summary written for CppCheck.

CppCheck also supports user-written summaries that capture information about pre- and postconditions of a function. Figure 10 shows an example. Further efforts exist to use textual representation for summaries [29]. The basic idea is to write code that under- or over-approximates the original function using the same language.

Modeling loops Functions are not the only entities that can be summarized. Some analyses are attempting to summarize the effects of *loops* [22].

Right now the analyzer uses a very primitive method to model loops. We *unroll* loops up to three times to avoid too many iterations. Each iteration might split paths multiple times, thus we might end up having an explosion in the number of paths to explore. This under-approximation helps us keep the run time reasonable and the number of false positives low. A recent addition to

the analyzer detects loops of a specific form that will not split paths too often. Those loops are unrolled completely.

One problem is that we might use up all our budgets during unrolling a loop, resulting in a coverage loss. In order to regain that coverage, we implemented *loop widening*, which over-approximates the effects of the loop and continues the execution after the loop. While it improves coverage, we need to do a significant amount of invalidation for the over-approximation, which can lead to additional false positives. For this reason, this feature is off by default. One reason it needs to do an excessive amount of invalidation is the lack of pointer analysis. Since we do not execute the loop body symbolically, we need some other oracle to get the possible pointees of each pointer and reference to know which values to invalidate. An abstract interpretation method is a viable candidate and we do plan to implement it in the future.

3.6 Checkers

This paper is not intended to be a guide on how to write a *check* (or *checker*) for the Clang Static Analyzer, but we do wish to give a brief idea about how they interact with the engine. In case you want to develop new checks we recommend the following guides: [50,18,2].

Checks in the analyzer can be classified into two main categories. One comprises *modeling checks* that will not report any warning, but instead help the engine simulate the program. Modeling checks represent domain-specific knowledge about a codebase, e.g. simulate the behavior of standard library functions like `toupper`. Checks belonging to the other class *find errors*.

Each check can subscribe to a set of events like function calls or division operations, and maintain their own state for each path. Checks can also query the state, but instead of dealing with specific symbolic expressions, authors are advised to ask questions like *Can the second argument of this function be zero on this path?* This query will be forwarded to an SMT solver.

Statistical checks The classical approach of writing checks is to encapsulate some *domain-specific knowledge* about the expected behavior of the program. For example, we expect each memory allocation function call to be paired with a memory deallocation function call on each path. The problem of this approach is that we need to know which functions allocate or deallocate, but lots of system programs are using non-standard APIs for these purposes. An alternative approach is to assume that most of the code is bug free and try to infer the rules from the source code using statistical methods. A prominent method is described in [35].

The upstream version of the Clang Static Analyzer does not support statistical analysis, as it does not support arbitrary passes. Usually, we do not want to restrict statistical inference to a single translation unit a time, but rather run it as a separate pass over the whole source code before analysis. We have, however, a fork of Clang which supports some basic statistical checks that infer

annotations such as which function’s return values are required to be checked. If a function’s return value is checked 99% of the time, it is very likely that the rest of the calls with unchecked return values are not correct. We do plan to upstream this infrastructure in the near future.

Bug reports While the analyzer will show us the path leading to each reported bug, it can still be challenging to understand the reasons behind a certain report. Thus, checks can add additional notes or events to execution paths that are rendered for the user. For instance, for a memory leak error, the check can add a note indicating the point where the leaked memory was allocated. This is a great help in deciding whether a warning is a false positive or a real error.

A closely connected concept is that of the **Bug Reporter Visitor**, which traverses the execution path leading to the bug, adding notes before they are displayed to the user. Built-in visitors exist that track the source of certain values. This can help display information like where the zero came from in case of a division by zero error.

False positive suppression A visitor can also mark a bug report false positive. Those marked errors will not be presented to the user. One of the visitors filtering false positives is based on so-called *inline defensive checks*. Let us consider the code on Listing 10:

```

1  int f(int *p) {
2      if (p == 0)
3          return 0;
4      // ...
5      return x;
6  }
7
8  void g(int *q) {
9      int a = f(q);
10     int b = *q; // Should we warn?
11     // ...
12 }

```

Listing 10. A warning filtered out by the *inline defensive check* heuristic.

Should we warn about a possible `null` dereference of `q` in function `g`? The analyzer *would* warn if we disabled the visitor mentioned before, because there exists a path where function `f` returns 0 and the value of `q` is also 0. On this path we will dereference `q`. The check in `f`, however, might be redundant for `g`, if `g`’s author knows that in `g`’s context `q` may never be `null`. In other words, we do not know for which set of callers this check is relevant, so it is safer not to warn. The inline defensive check visitor will prevent issuing such warnings.

```

1 void g(int *q) {
2     int a = f(q);
3     if (q == 0)
4         a = 0;
5     int b = *q; // Should we warn?
6     // ...
7 }

```

Listing 11. A warning that is **not** filtered out by the *inline defensive check* heuristic.

For the code on Listing 11, the analyzer will warn regardless of the warning suppressing heuristics, since the developer definitely considered the case of `q` being null. Thus we can assume that `null` is a valid input for `g`. So it is safe to warn for the possible `null` dereference.

As we can see, infeasible paths are one of the biggest challenges of symbolic execution. Since the analyzer is using a fast but simple solver, it will not attempt to warn when it reaches an assertion failure. Instead, it will conclude that the execution path was infeasible.

There exist tools that are able to generate test cases based on the results of symbolic execution. The Clang Static Analyzer did not pursue this direction because of the simplicity of the default constraint solver. If the analyzer ends up emitting a test case that does not trigger the behavior, the user might have a false sense of security, even though it might still be possible to trigger it with a different test case.

3.7 Refutation

Despite heavy developer effort, the analyzer suffers from the problem of false positive reports much like other similar tools. One possible way to improve report quality is to improve the constraint management of symbolic expressions, which plays an important role in proving the infeasibility of impossible execution paths. An important intermediary step in this direction is the refutation of false positive reports by re-evaluating constraints by a more powerful constraint solver than the one currently built into the engine [43].

The range-based constraint solver The analyzer collects constraints on symbolic variables encountered in the program to be able to detect if they become unsatisfiable. Solving these constraints is only one side of the coin: generating and managing them is another. Support for constraint management is therefore scattered throughout the analyzer engine. The current solution centers around a solver operating on range-based constraints, which is only capable of handling some common binary operations between symbolic values and concrete integers (called `SymIntExprs`), and some relational operations between two symbols (`SymSymExprs`). Although it is very fast, it lacks support for many other commonly used arithmetic operations even on `SymIntExprs`, such as bitwise operations, multiplication, division, etc.

A more powerful solver In 2017, support for an alternative constraint solver backend, the Z3 Theorem Prover, has been added to the engine. Z3 is a state-of-the-art general-purpose SMT solver developed by Microsoft Research. It is capable of handling most arithmetic operations not supported by the current solver, such as those on floating-point values, and it also represents integers more realistically, modeling them with fixed-width bitvectors.

Unfortunately, the analyzer will not be able to harness the full power of Z3 until symbolic expression support is improved in the engine. The analyzer currently does not build up symbolic expressions consisting of floating-point type values, and subsequently does not generate constraints on them, meaning that information about such expressions never arrives at the constraint manager. Still, without any further effort, Z3 should already be able to improve analysis precision for expressions involving pointers and integers.

Nevertheless, the analyzer still does not employ Z3 as the default constraint solver backend. The reason behind this is its negative impact on the duration of the analysis, with execution times soaring up to and above a factor of 20 times the usual. This slow-down stems from the nature of SMT solvers, which follow complex inner heuristics, and often use up all of the allowed time as limited by the timeout parameter for a single operation. For practical use, an intermediary solution is needed.

Experimental comparison of the two solvers In an effort to explore how each of the currently available constraint solving backends affect analysis performance and quality, we made the following experiment. For 3 real-world open-source projects, we ran two analyses, each with default settings but differing in the use of the constraint manager backend. We were concerned about the number of reports and execution times in each case. In Table 1, the RB keyword denotes the default range-based solver built into the engine, while reports added and removed are meant for the Z3 cases compared to the runs using the range-based solver. Analysis duration is showed in `hh:mm:ss` format.

Project name	Reports (RB)	Reports (Z3)	Reports removed	Reports added	Duration (RB)	Duration (Z3)
tmux	19	19	0	0	00:01:07	03:03:10
redis	243	64	185	6	00:03:04	05:42:53
xerces-c	88	2	86	0	00:04:59	01:41:32

Table 1. Report counts and run time durations of default-configured analyses run using either the range-based (RB) or the Z3 constraint manager back-ends on 3 open-source projects. The *Reports added* and *Reports removed* columns compare Z3 against the range-based solver.

We can observe that using Z3 as the constraint management system throughout the whole analysis process elongates run time from a matter of minutes to a matter of hours. As the engine builds the exploded graph data structure for each analyzed top-level function in a project, it keeps requesting operations from the

Z3 back-end that are more expensive than those of the range-based back-end. For a million source files, this adds up to a run time that is no more feasible for industrial use.

Refutation in action One possible compromise is to use the Z3 back-end for *false positive refutation*. This means to perform the analysis as usual, then post-process the collected bug reports and remove those that lie on paths that are found to be infeasible by Z3. Thus, instead of participating in the analysis of a million source files, Z3 is only presented with at most a few hundred bug reports that need to be cross-checked. This method can eliminate a large portion of false positive reports while only introducing a tolerable burden on the run time of the analysis.

In order to see how the use of Z3 for refutation can help us remove false positives, consider the example on Listing 12.

```

1 void g(int d);
2 void f(int *a, int *b) {
3     int c = 5;
4     if ((a - b) == 0)
5         c = 0;
6     if (a != b)
7         g(3 / c); // Warning: division by zero.
8 }

```

Listing 12. A sample function causing the analyzer to emit a false positive warning on line 8, due to insufficient constraint handling.

Arriving at the second `if`, both conditions are understood and translated to ranged constraints, but the solver is not able to prove that they contradict each other. This can be seen from the exploded graph as the current path splits to two, meaning that the constraint manager found both new states to be feasible. On the path assuming that both conditions are true, the exploded node holds the constraints that can be seen on Listing 13:

```

1 Ranges of symbol values:
2 (reg_0<int * a> - (reg_1<int * b>): { [0, 0] }
3 (reg_1<int * b> - (reg_0<int * a>): { [PTR_MIN, -1],
4                                     [1, PTR_MAX] }

```

Listing 13. Range constraints collected for pointers `a` and `b` during the analysis of function `f` on Listing 12, up until line 8.

Here, the `a != b` condition has been rearranged by the engine to `(b - a) != 0`, and the constraint was generated by subtracting zero from the full range of possible pointer values, representing the result with a union of the two intervals below and above zero. These constraints can be modeled by the small `z3` program on Listing 14:

```

1 (declare-const a (_ BitVec 32))
2 (declare-const b (_ BitVec 32))
3 (assert (= (bvsb a b) #x00000000))
4 (assert (bvslt (bvsb b a) #x00000000))
5 (assert (bvsgt (bvsb b a) #x00000000))
6 (check-sat)
7 (get-model)

```

Listing 14. A small program written in Z3’s native SMT-LIB format, encoding the range constraints seen on Listing 13, and checking their satisfiability. The `unsat` result it gives means that the path on which these constraints have been collected is infeasible.

After execution, the program on Listing 14 gives an `unsat` result, i.e. the problem is proved to be unsatisfiable. This is the simplest case refutation should be able to handle: ranged constraints are readily available in the program state, they only need to be fed to a Z3 solver instance in the proper format. For this, constraints on symbolic values need to be converted to the internal expression type used by Z3, which involves the translation of integer relations into their corresponding correct bitvector operations. If the translation succeeds and Z3 can prove the state to be infeasible, the report is marked invalid, and never shown to the user.

Evaluation The false positive refutation option was designed to provide a compromise between the speed of the default analysis and the precision of an analysis using the Z3 constraint manager backend.

We cannot expect the same results for several reasons. First, analyzing projects using the Z3 back-end, the whole process uses the Z3 constraint manager, and the resulting exploded graph may differ from the one built in default mode. This means that constraints stored in the graph may be slightly more realistic or precise than those generated in the default mode. However, its working mechanism also differs from the case in which the default analysis is merely enhanced by the refutation visitor. Because of its independent nature, refutation may eliminate false reports that an analysis with the Z3 back-end cannot, e.g. those caused by weaknesses in the engine’s general operation. Results are shown in Table 2.

Project name	Reports (RB)	Reports (REF)	Reports (Z3)	Duration (RB)	Duration (REF)	Duration (Z3)
tmux	20	16	19	00:01:01	00:01:18	03:03:10
redis	243	161	64	00:02:15	00:04:01	05:42:53
xerces-c	88	40	2	00:03:22	01:01:22	01:41:32

Table 2. Comparison of analyses run with the default configuration (RB), with refutation enabled (REF) and using the Z3 constraint manager back-end (Z3).

Next, we compared the performance of a default analysis to one with refutation enabled, but on more projects, and weighing whether the number of reports removed justifies any run time penalties, as essentially this was our most important concern. Table 3 contains the number of bug reports for two analysis runs

Project name	Reports (RB)	Reports (REF)	Reports removed	Duration (RB)	Duration (REF)
tmux	20	16	4	00:01:01	00:01:18
redis	243	161	82	00:02:15	00:04:01
xerces-c	88	40	48	00:03:22	01:01:22
libWebM	32	28	4	00:01:21	00:02:50
curl	42	36	6	00:01:01	00:01:00
bitcoin	871	865	6	00:29:30	00:40:17

Table 3. Report numbers for analyses with a default configuration (RB) and with false positive refutation (REF) enabled for some open-source projects.

for 6 open-source projects, one with a default configuration, and one with the naive prototype of false positive refutation enabled.

Both the number of invalidated reports and the difference in analysis duration depends heavily on the analyzed project. For example, `xerces` seems to have needed a lot of post-processing work, with more than a half (55%) of its reports removed and experiencing an excessive increase in execution time (by a factor of 20). On the other hand, no temporal overhead of false positive refutation can be observed in the case of `curl`. After performing a manual inspection of some of the removed reports, either the falseness of the reports was difficult to determine (because of long bug paths), or we found that the report was truly a mistake on the analyzer’s behalf and its removal increased the overall quality of the analysis.

One disadvantage of using refutation is the existence of the timeout parameter. It is no longer deterministic whether `Z3` can refute a bug or not so the displayed results can oscillate between runs. While this could certainly happen we never observed it.

Related work There were attempts to use other solvers for refutation besides `Z3` [20]. Also, there are experiments to use machine learning to fine tune solvers [9] for a certain use-case. While it is an interesting idea we never experimented with this direction. An alternative approach to reducing the run time of analysis with `Z3` would be to only use `Z3` for certain some decision but not all. It is possible to come up with some heuristics based on the number of constraints on the symbols when should we query to more sophisticated solver. This is something that we might experiment with in the future.

4 Tooling

We define the scalability of static analysis not only in terms of efficient use of computing resources, but also in terms of efficient use of human resources like developer time². `CodeChecker` [4] is a tool designed to ease the integration

² Based on the Intellectual output O1 part/topic “Static Code Analysis with `CodeChecker`” of project No. 2017-1-SK01-KA203-035402 (for more details see Acknowledgement).

of the analyzer and other similar static analysis tools into build systems and continuous integration loops. It is also a full-fledged bug management system that keeps track of errors found by these tools.

4.1 Build systems

Different static analysis tools have different strengths and weaknesses. Thus it is often advised to use multiple tools. One problem of using multiple tools is that we need to integrate all of them into the build system and the continuous integration loop. Unfortunately, this is not a one time cost, since these build systems and CI loops tend to change over the course of a project, having these tools integrated can add a maintenance cost later on. One purpose of CodeChecker is to reduce the burden on the developers and make the experience more streamlined. CodeChecker supports multiple static analysis engines and we plan to add more in the future. If a project is using CodeChecker, they only need to integrate one tool into their workflow, which was designed with integrators in mind from the start, and they get multiple analyzers for a constant cost (in the number of analyzers).

The method we found most robust for integration is to capture compiler invocations issued by the build system by hijacking the `exec` system call family. Each time the build system invokes an external binary, CodeChecker will be notified and it can log the build command. We also support incremental analysis, because we rely on the original build systems to decide which files are compiled (thus need to be re-analyzed). Another advantage of being plugged into the original build system is supporting code generators. If a build step generates code before compilation, CodeChecker will see the generated code.

The architecture of CodeChecker can be seen in Figure 11. As you can see our job is not finished after having logged the compilation commands. Different compilers use different flags. We added a layer to translate some of the flags from the most common compilers like GCC to Clang. CodeChecker also supports multi-pass analysis. Results are stored into a database and a web server will serve clients through a remote procedure call interface.

4.2 Presenting the warnings

Given a finite budget of developer time and thousands of reports on large software, it is important to evaluate reports with the best return on investment first. CodeChecker helps prioritize easy-to-evaluate and high-severity bugs for developers, aided by advanced filtering capabilities that find reports that are likely to be relevant to solving a certain problem.

The bug list view showcasing some of the filtering capabilities can be seen in Figure 12. The current version is using built-in heuristics for *ranking*, but in the future we plan to introduce machine learning based methods. The idea is not new, other researchers already reported a significant increase in static analysis tool usability by introducing such rankings [34,33]. One of the challenges is to




Fig. 11. CodeChecker architecture.

extract all useful features from the analysis engine, as it was originally designed to emit only the information necessary to understand the bug reports.

For example, the Clang Static Analyzer does not support computing a *confidence value* for each bug report. It would be a great help for ranking systems. While at first seems to be an easy task to use a probabilistic approach reducing the confidence each time we cannot decide which branch should we take on a certain path, the main challenge is how to increase the confidence when the same bug is found on multiple paths. We cannot just add the probabilities for each path since these paths might not be completely independent.

CodeChecker also supports *differential analysis* that prevents developers from introducing new bugs without requiring them to fix all legacy reports beforehand. This is a useful feature, because developers in the industry are often reluctant to change old but well-tested code. And this is very reasonable since new code is more likely to have true positive results than well tested code.

One of the main advantages of CodeChecker is that it is able to display the path emitted by the analysis tools (see Figure 13). This way the developer will have a clue about how to reproduce a problem. We can also display important events along the path such as where the object we forgot to release had been allocated. It is also important to display the assumptions made by the analyzer, as it can aid both the understanding of the problem and the classification of true and false positives.

Diff	Run ID	Name	Date	Number of bugs	Duration	Check command	Detection status
	1	Xerces_3.1.1	2017-09-14 02:28:40	63	00:00:04	Show	(83)
	4	Xerces_3.1.1_CTV	2017-09-14 04:06:41	225	00:01:32	Show	(225)
	3	Xerces_3.1.1_update_3.1.2	2017-09-14 02:29:48	71	00:00:08	Show	(19), (17)
	6	Xerces_3.1.1_update_3.1.2_CTV	2017-09-14 04:23:27	232	00:02:38	Show	(7), (13), (207)
	2	Xerces_3.1.2	2017-09-14 02:30:31	55	00:00:04	Show	(55)
	5	Xerces_3.1.2_CTV	2017-09-14 04:19:02	214	00:01:43	Show	(214)

Run name	File	Message	Checker name	Severity	Review status	Review comment	Detection status
Xerces_3.1.1_update_3.1.2	...SDOMFormatter.cpp @ Line 152	Value stored to 'trailer' is never read	...SDOMFormatter	Dead Stores			
	...iOSScannerBase64.cpp @ Line 481	The right operand of '+' is a garbage value	...iOSScannerBase64	Uninitialized Memory Operations			
	...iOSScannerBase64.cpp @ Line 480	1st function call argument is an uninitialized value	...iOSScannerBase64	CallAndWriteScope			
	...iOSScannerBase64.cpp @ Line 480	Memory allocated by operator new should be deallocated by 'delete' not 'delete[]'	...iOSScannerBase64	UnmatchedDeallocator			
	...iOSScannerBase64.cpp @ Line 168	Array access results in a null pointer dereference	...iOSScannerBase64	NullDereference			
	...iOSScannerBase64.cpp @ Line 431	Array access results in a null pointer dereference	...iOSScannerBase64	NullDereference			
	...iOSScannerBase64.cpp @ Line 197	Null pointer passed as an argument to a 'normal' parameter	...iOSScannerBase64	NullPointerParameter			
	...iOSScannerBase64.cpp @ Line 1833	Value stored to 'key' is never read	...iOSScannerBase64	Dead Stores			
	...iOSScannerBase64.cpp @ Line 149	Array access (via field 'Range') results in a null pointer dereference	...iOSScannerBase64	NullDereference			
	...iOSScannerBase64.cpp @ Line 885	Value stored to 'iOSScannerBase64' is never read	...iOSScannerBase64	Dead Stores			
	...iOSScannerBase64.cpp @ Line 112	Undefined or garbage value returned to caller	...iOSScannerBase64	UninitializedReturn			
	...iOSScannerBase64.cpp @ Line 1079	Value stored to 'startIdx' during its initialization is never read	...iOSScannerBase64	Dead Stores			
	...iOSScannerBase64.cpp @ Line 238	Value stored to 'buffer' is never read	...iOSScannerBase64	Dead Stores			
	...iOSScannerBase64.cpp @ Line 698	1st function call argument is an uninitialized value	...iOSScannerBase64	CallAndWriteScope			
	...iOSScannerBase64.cpp @ Line 416	Value stored to 'ucPR' is never read	...iOSScannerBase64	Dead Stores			
	...iOSScannerBase64.cpp @ Line 327	Called C++ object pointer is null	...iOSScannerBase64	CallAndWriteScope			
	...iOSScannerBase64.cpp @ Line 2754	Forming reference to null pointer	...iOSScannerBase64	NullPointer			

Fig. 12. CodeChecker’s bug list view allows the user to browse and filter warnings.

An unsolved challenge comes from the diversity of static analysis tools. The same error might be found by different tools and all of them might represent it in a different way. For example, they might find the same error on a different path, they might have separate warning messages, they might even report the same error to different locations. It would be nice to present each error only once to the user regardless of how many tools reported it. We do plan to add some heuristics to match these warnings.

In modern software development, communication is an important factor. The chances are good that a developer might want to ask the opinion of a colleague when evaluating a report. We added several features to support communication. We provide permanent links for each report so that users can include those links in chat messages, emails or bug tracking tools. We also let users comment to issues, so that they can express their reasons for classifying a report as a true or false positive.

During the analysis of a C++ program, the analyzer might see a large amount of code that is irrelevant to the user, for example third party headers. CodeChecker supports configuration options to automatically exclude those results. By excluding those headers, CodeChecker will not even store those reports, saving disk space for the user.

In an ever-changing software project it is always challenging to keep bug classification up to date. In case of a false positive division by zero error, how do we match the classification made for an older version of the software, to a newer one? Developers might have moved the function containing the error into a new file, and added or removed multiple lines of code around the warning. We support two methods for suppressing false positives permanently that are resilient to changes. The first one is using comments near the warning, the second one is using hashes of the context of the warning. We advise users to rely on

digested by the reviewers. Ideally, reproduction should be painless, and it should be possible to present results in an easily shareable and digestible format.

In this section, we present a toolchain [27,26] for the Clang Static Analyzer (CSA), that we call *CSA testbench*, which aims to improve the situation by supporting both reviewers and authors in the following ways:

- help authors select a set of relevant projects for testing, and run static analysis on them,
- aggregate statistics about the analysis (e.g.: how often a cut heuristic is triggered when building the symbolic execution graph),
- aggregate the results of the analysis,
- help authors and reviewers evaluate and share the results,
- help reviewers reproduce results and maintain tests.

The input of the toolset is a single configuration file. The output is an HTML report with useful information and figures, which also contains the input configuration for easier reproducibility.

Semi-automatic test suite generation The conventional approach to testing the analysis engine is to run it on a number of projects. Finding a sufficient amount of relevant real-world projects can be challenging. Ideal projects should be open-source for reproducibility and should exercise the right parts of the analyzer. For example, if the change is related to the modeling of dynamic type information, only projects using dynamic type information should be included. One possible option is to check a random sample of open-source projects, hoping to find enough of them that displays all of the required traits. A slightly better approach is to use code searching and indexing services and search for projects with interesting code snippets. These services, however, are optimized to present the individual snippets and suboptimal to retrieve the most relevant projects according to some criteria.

To mitigate this problem, we created a script to harvest the results from an existing code search service (searchcode.com) and to recommend projects to be included in the test suite based on the results.

For example, in order to test a new static analysis check written to detect `pthread_mutex_t` abuse, we might be interested in C and C++ projects that use `pthread` extensively. Using the syntax seen on Listing 15, we can specify the keywords to search for, the languages we are interested in, the desired number of projects:

```
1 $ ./gen_project_list.py 'pthread' 'C C++' 5 -o pthread.json
```

Listing 15. A sample invocation of the project list generator tool.

The call on Listing 15 creates a configuration file with the suggested projects in the JSON format showed on Listing 16.

```

1 {
2   "projects": [
3     { "url": "github.com/itkovian/torque.git",
4       "name": "torque" }, ...
5   ]
6 }

```

Listing 16. A fraction of a configuration file generated by the project list generator tool invocation showed on Listing 15.

Easy reproduction and sharing The next problem is sharing results with reviewers. A regular pattern we see is that the patch author shares text files containing analysis results on certain projects. However, text dumps of static analysis results are hard to interpret and the measurements are hard to reproduce. How did the author compile the project? Which version of the analyzed project was used? How did the author invoke the analyzer? What configuration options were used? What revision (commit) of the analyzer was used?

Our scripts use a concise configuration format that contains all the relevant information about the analyzed projects: repository, tag/commit, configuration options for the analysis, etc. Obtaining this configuration file enables reviewers to reproduce the exact same measurements at their convenience. They can also easily suggest modifications to the conducted experiment. Moreover, the results are not mere text dumps anymore but are presented on a convenient web user interface that also displays the path associated with the report. Other information such as the number of code lines of the project, version of the analyzer, analysis time, analysis coverage, and statistics from the analysis engine is recorded and figures like charts are generated automatically. An example figure from an HTML report is in Figure 14.

The file with the project list is almost enough to run the analysis on its own. The only extra information needed to be specified is the CodeChecker server where analysis results are intended to be stored for later inspection, as seen on Listing 17.

```

1 {
2   "projects": ... ,
3   "CodeChecker": {
4     "url" : "localhost:15010/Default"
5   }
6 }

```

Listing 17. A segment of the configuration file specifying the address of the CodeChecker server.

After this we are ready to run the analysis on the previously selected set of projects, as shown on Listing 18.




Fig. 14. An interactive chart generated by the CSA Testbench scripts.

```
1 $ ./run_experiments.py --config pthread.json
```

Listing 18. Sample invocation of the main driver script of the experiment.

The script downloads each of the projects, attempts to infer their build system and build them, runs the analysis, and finally collects the results. At the time of writing this paper `autotools`, `CMake`, and `make` are supported as build systems.

In case a special build command is required or the build system is not yet supported, the user can specify the build command. Building a special version of the project characterized by a tag or a commit hash instead of top of tree is also possible and highly encouraged to get consistent results with subsequent experiments. Finally, differential analysis can currently be conducted by running the same projects multiple times with different options passed to the analyzer or using different versions of the analyzer. An example can be seen on Listing 19.

```

1 {
2   "projects": [ ... ],
3   "configurations": [
4     {
5       "name": "original",
6       "clang_sa_args": "",
7     },
8     {
9       "name": "variant A",
10      "clang_sa_args": "argument to enable feature A",
11      "clang_path": "path to clang variant"
12    }
13  ],
14  ...
15 }

```

Listing 19. Differential testing can be achieved by running many analyses on the same projects with different options passed to the analyzer.

More precise differential analysis Finally, the number of tools available to support differential analysis on a project is scarce. In case of the Clang Static Analyzer, we can only compare the number of bugs found, analyzer engine statistics, and coverage percentage measured in basic blocks. All of these are aggregated scalar values missing positional information, with the statistics and the coverage being displayed individually for each translation unit.

We implemented analysis coverage measurement right in the heart of the analyzer based on the `gcov` format. We do not calculate coverage as an overall percentage value but record it separately for each line. This makes it possible to precisely aggregate coverage information over translation units. This also makes it possible to do differential analysis on the coverage itself. Our toolset includes scripts to aid that kind of analysis.

In some cases, we are interested in the reason behind a specific bug report disappearing when running the analysis with different parameters. Performing differential analysis on the coverage, we are able to determine whether the analyzer actually examined the code in question during both runs.

The analyzer can output different kinds of statistics such as the number of paths examined, the number of times a specific cut heuristic was used etc. Instead of having a fixed set of statistics to collect we used some heuristics to process the output of the analyzer, in which we are able to automatically detect statistics and aggregate them over translation units.

We create an HTML summary of the statistics collected during the analysis. This report includes charts and histograms. We mine the log emitted by the analyzer to automatically collect all the statistics. After adding a new statistic to the analyzer engine the author only needs to add a single entry in the configuration file to make the toolset generate a figure based on that statistic. We do

not generate figures from all the statistics by default to not flood the user with useless information.

Recommended workflow Using our toolset, the recommended workflow is the following. The author of the patch provides reviewers with a link to the test results. Reviewers can choose to either merely look at the results or repeat the whole experiment based on the configuration, depending on the verification effort required for the change. They can also suggest changes to the configuration to gain more insight into the changes.

Alternative use cases Monitoring changes in the static analysis engine is not the only use case of the CSA testbench scripts. We can use these scripts to tune certain parameters / heuristics of the analyzer to improve the results on a set of projects.

C-Reduce C-Reduce [42] is a tool that takes a large C, C++, or OpenCL file that has a property of interest (such as triggering a compiler bug) and automatically produces a much smaller C/C++ file that has the same property. We also use C-Reduce to get minimal examples that showcase differences between two versions of the static analysis engine. First, we need a file on which analysis engine versions produce different results. This can be a different set of warnings or other statistics emitted by the engine. These minimal examples can greatly aid our understanding of the effects of a change. The main shortcoming of C-Reduce is the lack of support for reducing multiple translation units at once. We do plan to add this feature in the future.

6 Our contributions

Symbolic execution is a static program analysis technique that can be considered an extension of compiler warnings. It produces diagnostics without user intervention, based on the build system, but the underlying analysis is substantially more powerful than the data flow analysis present in compilers, and the reports provide the programmer with the execution trace that leads to the bug. In turn, the time complexity of the algorithm is exponential, thus it needs clever heuristics to be a realistic solution for industrial projects.

- What we did: - Implemented CTU - Summary-based analysis (concept) - Implemented refutation - Implemented checkers

7 Summary

In this paper we summarized our experiences collected while contributing to the state-of-the-art Clang Static Analyzer and CodeChecker products. Along with the introduction of these tools, we also described a variety of related methods and alternative approaches. While we often enumerated specific examples of design decisions, we do believe this paper will prove to be a useful resource for anyone

deciding to work on static analysis tools, as it is easy to find analogies when analyzing other languages.

We described our tools using a holistic view on static analysis pipelines including build process integration, analysis framework testing, and presentation of reports to the users. Hopefully, we demonstrated that each stage of the pipeline is important in order to scale the analysis to large software systems. It is important to not only think about resources like CPU time or memory, but also developer time, which is often the most scarce resource. We outlined some possible future work for our toolset that we consider worth pursuing.

Acknowledgement

The project has been supported by the European Union, co-financed by the European Social Fund (EFOP-3.6.3-VEKOP-16-2017-00002).

This paper is part of dissemination of results of the Erasmus+ Key Action 2 (Strategic partnership for higher education) project No. 2017-1-SK01-KA203-035402: "Focusing Education on Composability, Comprehensibility and Correctness of Working Software". The information and views set out in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Neither the European Union institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

References

1. Clang Static Analyzer, <https://clang-analyzer.llvm.org/> (last accessed: 28-02-2019).
2. Clang Static Analyzer: Checker Developer Manual, https://clang-analyzer.llvm.org/checker_dev_manual.html (last accessed: 28-02-2019).
3. Clang-Tidy, <https://clang.llvm.org/extra/clang-tidy/> (last accessed: 28-02-2019).
4. CodeChecker, <https://github.com/Ericsson/codechecker> (last accessed: 28-02-2019).
5. CodeSonar, <https://www.grammatech.com/products/codesonar> (last accessed: 28-02-2019).
6. Coverity, <https://scan.coverity.com/> (last accessed: 28-02-2019).
7. Klocwork, <https://www.roguewave.com/products-services/klocwork> (last accessed: 28-02-2019).
8. Baldoni, R., Coppa, E., D’Elia, D.C., Demetrescu, C., Finocchi, I.: A survey of symbolic execution techniques. *CoRR* **abs/1610.00502** (2016), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1610.00502>
9. Balunovic, M., Bielik, P., Vechev, M.: Learning to solve SMT formulas. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. pp. 10338–10349 (2018)
10. Bessey, A., Block, K., Chelf, B., Chou, A., Fulton, B., Hallem, S., Henri-Gros, C., Kamsky, A., McPeak, S., Engler, D.: A few billion lines of code later: Using

- static analysis to find bugs in the real world. *Commun. ACM* **53**(2), 66–75 (Feb 2010). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1646353.1646374>, <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1646353.1646374>
11. Birkhoff, G.: *Lattice theory*, vol. 25. American Mathematical Soc. (1940)
 12. Boehm, B., Basili, V.R.: Software defect reduction top 10 list. *Computer* **34**(1), 135–137 (Jan 2001). <https://doi.org/10.1109/2.962984>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/2.962984>
 13. Cadar, C., Dunbar, D., Engler, D.R., et al.: KLEE: Unassisted and automatic generation of high-coverage tests for complex systems programs. In: *OSDI*. vol. 8, pp. 209–224 (2008)
 14. Calcagno, C., Distefano, D.: Infer: An automatic program verifier for memory safety of C programs. In: *NASA Formal Methods Symposium*. pp. 459–465. Springer (2011)
 15. Chandra, S., Fink, S.J., Sridharan, M.: Snugglebug: a powerful approach to weakest preconditions. In: *ACM Sigplan Notices*. vol. 44, pp. 363–374. ACM (2009)
 16. Cousot, P., Cousot, R.: Abstract interpretation: a unified lattice model for static analysis of programs by construction or approximation of fixpoints. In: *Proceedings of the 4th ACM SIGACT-SIGPLAN symposium on Principles of programming languages*. pp. 238–252. ACM (1977)
 17. De Lucia, A.: Program slicing: methods and applications. In: *Proceedings First IEEE International Workshop on Source Code Analysis and Manipulation*. pp. 142–149 (Nov 2001). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SCAM.2001.972675>
 18. Dergachev, A.: Clang Static Analyzer: A Checker Developer’s Guide, <https://github.com/haoNoQ/clang-analyzer-guide> (last accessed: 28-02-2019).
 19. Driscoll, J.R., Sarnak, N., Sleator, D.D., Tarjan, R.E.: Making data structures persistent. *Journal of computer and system sciences* **38**(1), 86–124 (1989)
 20. Gadelha, M.Y.R., Steffinlongo, E., Cordeiro, L.C., Fischer, B., Nicole, D.A.: Smt-based refutation of spurious bug reports in the clang static analyzer. *CoRR abs/1810.12041* (2018), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.12041>
 21. Godefroid, P., Levin, M.Y., Molnar, D.: SAGE: whitebox fuzzing for security testing. *Communications of the ACM* **55**(3), 40–44 (2012)
 22. Godefroid, P., Luchaup, D.: Automatic partial loop summarization in dynamic test generation. In: *Proceedings of the 2011 International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. pp. 23–33. ACM (2011)
 23. Godefroid, P., Nori, A.V., Rajamani, S.K., Tetali, S.D.: Compositional may-must program analysis: unleashing the power of alternation. *ACM Sigplan Notices* **45**(1), 43–56 (2010)
 24. Hallem, S., Chelf, B., Xie, Y., Engler, D.: A system and language for building system-specific, static analyses. In: *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 2002 Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. pp. 69–82. PLDI ’02, ACM, New York, NY, USA (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1145/512529.512539>, <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/512529.512539>
 25. Hampapuram, H., Yang, Y., Das, M.: Symbolic path simulation in path-sensitive dataflow analysis. *SIGSOFT Softw. Eng. Notes* **31**(1), 52–58 (Sep 2005). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1108768.1108808>, <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1108768.1108808>
 26. Horváth, G., Kovács, R., Szécsi, P.: Towards proper differential analysis of static analysis engine changes. In: *Proceedings of the 11th Conference of PhD Students in Computer Science*. pp. 75–78 (2018)
 27. Horvath, G., Kovacs, R., Szecsi, P.: Clang Static Analyzer Testbench (2018), <https://github.com/Xazax-hun/csa-testbench> (last accessed: 28-02-2019).

28. Horváth, G., Pataki, N.: Clang matchers for verified usage of the c++ standard template library. *Annales Mathematicae et Informaticae* **44**, 99–109 (2015)
29. Horváth, G., Pataki, N.: Source language representation of function summaries in static analysis. In: Proceedings of the 11th Workshop on Implementation, Compilation, Optimization of Object-Oriented Languages, Programs and Systems. pp. 6:1–6:9. ICPOOLPS '16, ACM, New York, NY, USA (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3012408.3012414>, <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/3012408.3012414>
30. Horváth, G., Szécsi, P., Gera, Z., Krupp, D., Pataki, N.: Challenges of implementing cross translation unit analysis in the Clang Static Analyzer. In: 2018 IEEE 18th International Working Conference on Source Code Analysis and Manipulation (SCAM). pp. 171–176. IEEE (2018)
31. Kádár, I.: The optimization of a symbolic execution engine for detecting runtime errors. *Acta Cybernetica* **23**(2), 573–597 (2017)
32. King, J.C.: Symbolic execution and program testing. *Commun. ACM* **19**(7), 385–394 (Jul 1976). <https://doi.org/10.1145/360248.360252>, <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/360248.360252>
33. Kremenek, T., Ashcraft, K., Yang, J., Engler, D.R.: Correlation exploitation in error ranking. In: SIGSOFT FSE (2004)
34. Kremenek, T., Engler, D.R.: Z-ranking: Using statistical analysis to counter the impact of static analysis approximations. In: SAS (2003)
35. Kremenek, T., Twohey, P., Back, G., Ng, A., Engler, D.: From uncertainty to belief: Inferring the specification within. In: Proceedings of the 7th symposium on Operating systems design and implementation. pp. 161–176. USENIX Association (2006)
36. Ma, K.K., Phang, K.Y., Foster, J.S., Hicks, M.: Directed symbolic execution. In: International Static Analysis Symposium. pp. 95–111. Springer (2011)
37. Marjamäki, D.: CppCheck: a tool for static C/C++ code analysis (2013), <http://cppcheck.sourceforge.net/>
38. Michael, Z., Robert, K.C.: The real cost of software errors. *IEEE Security & Privacy* **7**(2), 87–90 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2009.56>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2009.56>
39. Mihalicza, J.: How #includes affect build time in large systems. In: Proceedings of the 8th international conference on applied informatics (ICAI 2010). vol. 2, pp. 343–350 (2012)
40. Miné, A.: The octagon abstract domain. *Higher-order and symbolic computation* **19**(1), 31–100 (2006)
41. de Moura, L., Bjørner, N.: Z3: An Efficient SMT Solver, vol. 4963, pp. 337–340. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2008). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-78800-3_24, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-78800-3_24
42. Regehr, J., Chen, Y., Cuoq, P., Eide, E., Ellison, C., Yang, X.: Test-case reduction for C compiler bugs. In: ACM SIGPLAN Notices. vol. 47, pp. 335–346. ACM (2012)
43. Reka Kovacs, G.H.: An initial prototype of tiered constraint solving in the Clang Static Analyzer. *Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai: Series Informatica* **63**, 88–101 (2018)
44. Reps, T., Horwitz, S., Sagiv, M.: Precise interprocedural dataflow analysis via graph reachability. In: Proceedings of the 22Nd ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages. pp. 49–61. POPL '95, ACM, New York, NY, USA (1995). <https://doi.org/10.1145/199448.199462>, <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/199448.199462>

45. Rice, H.G.: Classes of recursively enumerable sets and their decision problems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **74**, 358–366 (1953)
46. Sen, K.: Concolic testing. In: *Proceedings of the twenty-second IEEE/ACM international conference on Automated software engineering*. pp. 571–572. ACM (2007)
47. Singh, G., Püschel, M., Vechev, M.: Fast polyhedra abstract domain. In: *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*. vol. 52, pp. 46–59. ACM (2017)
48. Xie, Y., Aiken, A.: Scalable error detection using boolean satisfiability. *Acm Sigplan Notices* **40**(1), 351–363 (2005)
49. Xu, Z., Kremenek, T., Zhang, J.: A memory model for static analysis of C programs. In: *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Leveraging Applications of Formal Methods, Verification, and Validation - Volume Part I*. pp. 535–548. *ISoLA'10*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg (2010), <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1939281.1939332>
50. Zaks, A., Rose, J.: Building a checker in 24 hours, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kdxlsP5QVPw> (last accessed: 28-02-2019).

A Appendix: Exploded graph




Fig. 15. A segment of the exploded graph generated for the sample function of Figure 2.

B Appendix: Cross translation unit analysis




Fig. 16. Execution time and memory consumption characteristics of the cross-translation unit analysis mode.




Fig. 17. False positive ratio using the cross-translation unit analysis mode as opposed to the default single translation unit mode.




Fig. 18. New and lost bugs using the cross-translation unit analysis mode as opposed to the default single translation unit mode.