

- Secrets
- ABAP
- Apex
- C
- C++
- CloudFormation
- COBOL
- C#
- CSS
- Flex
- Go
- HTML
- Java
- JavaScript
- Kotlin
- Kubernetes
- Objective C
- PHP
- PL/I
- PL/SQL
- Python
- RPG
- Ruby
- Scala
- Swift
- Terraform
- Text
- TypeScript
- T-SQL
- VB.NET
- VB6
- XML



C++ static code analysis

Unique rules to find Bugs, Vulnerabilities, Security Hotspots, and Code Smells in your C++ code

All rules 578

Vulnerability 13

Bug 111

Security Hotspot 18

Code Smell 436

Quick Fix 68

Tags

Search by name...

"memset" should not be used to delete sensitive data

Vulnerability

POSIX functions should not be called with arguments that trigger buffer overflows

Vulnerability

XML parsers should not be vulnerable to XXE attacks

Vulnerability

Function-like macros should not be invoked without all of their arguments

Bug

The address of an automatic object should not be assigned to another object that may persist after the first object has ceased to exist

Bug

Assigning to an optional should directly target the optional

Bug

Result of the standard remove algorithms should not be ignored

Bug

"std::scoped_lock" should be created with constructor arguments

Bug

Objects should not be sliced

Bug

Immediately dangling references should not be created

Bug

"pthread_mutex_t" should be unlocked in the reverse order they were locked

Bug

"pthread_mutex_t" should be properly initialized and destroyed

Bug

"pthread_mutex_t" should not be consecutively locked or unlocked twice

Function-like macros should not be used

Analyze your code

Code Smell

Critical ?

cppcoreguidelines based-on-misra preprocessor bad-practice cert

It is tempting to treat function-like macros as functions, but the two things work differently. For instance, the use of functions offers parameter type-checking, while the use of macros does not. Additionally, with macros, there is the potential for a macro to be evaluated multiple times. In general, functions offer a safer, more robust mechanism than function-like macros, and that safety usually outweighs the speed advantages offered by macros. Therefore functions should be used instead when possible.

Noncompliant Code Example

```
#define CUBE (X) ((X) * (X) * (X)) // Noncompliant

void func(void) {
    int i = 2;
    int a = CUBE(++i); // Noncompliant. Expands to: int a = ((+
    // ...
}
```

Compliant Solution

```
inline int cube(int i) {
    return i * i * i;
}

void func(void) {
    int i = 2;
    int a = cube(++i); // yields 27
    // ...
}
```

See

- MISRA C:2004, 19.7 - A function should be used in preference to a function-like macro.
- MISRA C++:2008, 16-0-4 - Function-like macros shall not be defined.
- MISRA C:2012, Dir. 4.9 - A function should be used in preference to a function-like macro where they are interchangeable
- [CERT, PRE00-C](#). - Prefer inline or static functions to function-like macros
- [C++ Core Guidelines ES.31](#) - Don't use macros for constants or "functions"

Available In:

sonarlint

sonarcloud

sonarqube

Developer Edition

 Bug
"std::move" and "std::forward" should not be confused  Bug
A call to "wait()" on a "std::condition_variable" should have a condition  Bug
A pointer to a virtual base class shall only be cast to a pointer to a derived class by means of dynamic_cast  Bug
Functions with "noreturn" attribute should not return  Bug
RAII objects should not be temporary  Bug
"memcmp" should only be called with pointers to trivially copyable types with no padding  Bug
"memcpy", "memmove", and "memset" should only be called with pointers to trivially copyable types  Bug
"std::auto_ptr" should not be used  Bug
Destructors should be "noexcept"  Bug