Assembly Code Analysis: Problem 10 - Running Maximum Array

1. C Code to Ground Truth (gd) ARM Assembly Mapping

C Code Function:

```
С
int *func0(int *numbers, int size) {
    if (size <= 0) {
        return NULL;
    }
    int *out = malloc(size * sizeof(int));
    if (!out) {
        return NULL;
    }
    int max = numbers[0];
    for (int i = 0; i < size; i++) {
        if (numbers[i] > max) max = numbers[i];
        out[i] = max;
    }
    return out;
}
```

Register Mapping in Ground Truth (gd):

```
• x0: int *numbers (input) → int *out (return value)
```

- w1/x1: (int size) (array size)
- x19: saved (int *numbers) pointer
- x20: saved (int size)
- **w21**: saved (int size) (32-bit)
- w8: max variable (running maximum)
- x9: loop counter (decremented)
- x10: out array pointer (incremented)
- x11: numbers array pointer (incremented)
- w12: temporary for numbers[i]

Line-by-Line C to Assembly Mapping:

Size Check:

```
if (size <= 0) return NULL;</pre>
```

Ground Truth:

Memory Allocation:

```
int *out = malloc(size * sizeof(int));
if (!out) return NULL;
```

Ground Truth:

Initialize Max:

```
int max = numbers[0];
```

Ground Truth:

Main Loop:

```
c
for (int i = 0; i < size; i++) {
   if (numbers[i] > max) max = numbers[i];
   out[i] = max;
}
```

Ground Truth:

```
LBB0_4: ; Loop start

ldr w12, [x11], #4 ; w12 = numbers[i], increment pointer

cmp w12, w8 ; compare numbers[i] with max

csel w8, w12, w8, gt ; max = (numbers[i] > max) ? numbers[i] : max

str w8, [x10], #4 ; out[i] = max, increment pointer

subs x9, x9, #1 ; decrement loop counter

b.ne LBB0_4 ; continue if not done
```

Return:

```
c return out;
```

Ground Truth:

```
assembly ; x0 already contains the allocated array pointer ret
```

2. Vertical Comparison: Ground Truth vs Predicted

Key Differences Found:

Location	Ground Truth (gd)	Predicted (pred)	Issue
Label Numbers	(LBB0_5) (NULL return) (exit)	(LBB0_6) (NULL return) (exit)	Label numbering differs
Loop Setup	sub x9, x21, #1 x10, x0, #4 x19, #4	(add x9, x0, #4) (add x10, x19, #4) (x11, x21, #1)	Different variable assignment
Loop Counter	Uses x9 as loop counter (decremented)	Uses (x11) as loop counter (decremented)	Different counter register
Pointer Management	(x10) = out pointer onter numbers pointer	x9 = out pointer x10 = numbers pointer	Swapped pointer roles
Critical Addition	Missing	(mov x0, x8) (b LBB0_7)	MAJOR ERROR: Returns max value instead of array pointer!

3. Error Analysis and Root Causes

Primary Error: Incorrect Return Value

The most critical difference is in the predicted code's block 5:

```
; CORRECT (gd):
; (no extra code - x0 already contains malloc'd array pointer)
b LBB0_6 ; jump to exit, returning array pointer
; INCORRECT (pred):
mov x0, x8 ; ERROR: x0 = max value (w8)
b LBB0 7 ; jump to exit, returning max value!
```

Critical Issues in Predicted Code:

Issue 1: Fundamental Return Value Error

```
c
// C code expects: return out; (pointer to array)
// Ground truth: returns malloc'd array pointer in x0
// Predicted: returns the maximum value instead of array pointer
```

Impact: The function returns an integer (max value) cast as a pointer, which will likely cause:

Segmentation faults when caller tries to access the "array"

- Memory leaks (allocated array is never freed)
- · Completely wrong behavior

Issue 2: Register Role Confusion

The predicted code swaps pointer roles but maintains correct logic within the loop:

This register reassignment is actually **functionally correct** - it's just a different register allocation choice.

Issue 3: Loop Counter Variable

```
assembly
; CORRECT (gd):
sub x9, x21, #1  ; x9 = loop counter
subs x9, x9, #1  ; decrement x9 in loop
; DIFFERENT BUT FUNCTIONAL (pred):
sub x11, x21, #1  ; x11 = loop counter
subs x11, x11, #1  ; decrement x11 in loop
```

Again, this is just a different register choice but functionally equivalent.

Connection to Compiler Optimization:

The predicted code shows signs of **incorrect optimization understanding**:

- 1. **Register Allocation**: The compiler can freely choose different registers for the same logical operations, which explains the pointer role swaps.
- 2. **Control Flow Optimization**: The compiler might reorganize basic blocks and labels, explaining the different label numbers.
- 3. **Critical Misunderstanding**: The predicted code seems to confuse the **return value semantics**. It appears to think the function should return the maximum value rather than the array pointer.

Root Cause Analysis:

The core issue is a **fundamental misunderstanding of function semantics**:

- What it should do: Allocate array, fill with running maximum, return array pointer
- What pred does: Allocate array, fill with running maximum, return the maximum value

This suggests the prediction model confused this function with a different pattern - perhaps a function that finds and returns the maximum value rather than building a running maximum array.

Logical Consequences:

- 1. Caller Crash: Any code using the returned "pointer" will likely segfault
- 2. **Memory Leak**: The allocated array becomes unreachable
- 3. **Type Confusion**: Integer value interpreted as pointer address
- 4. Complete Functional Failure: The function fails its primary purpose

Severity: This is a **critical functional error** that makes the entire function unusable, despite the internal loop logic being mostly correct.