

- 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 311
- Vulnerability 13
- Bug 74
- Security Hotspot 18
- Code Smell 206
- Quick Fix 14

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
"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	Bug
Functions with "noreturn" attribute should not return	Bug
"memcpy" should only be called with pointers to trivially copyable types with no padding	Bug

Two branches in a conditional structure should not have exactly the same implementation

Analyze your code

Code Smell

Major

design suspicious

Having two cases in a switch statement or two branches in an if chain with the same implementation is at best duplicate code, and at worst a coding error. If the same logic is truly needed for both instances, then in an if chain they should be combined, or for a switch, one should fall through to the other.

Noncompliant Code Example

```
switch (i) {
  case 1:
    doFirstThing();
    doSomething();
    break;
  case 2:
    doSomethingDifferent();
    break;
  case 3: // Noncompliant; duplicates case 1's implementation
    doFirstThing();
    doSomething();
    break;
  default:
    doTheRest();
}

if (a >= 0 && a < 10) {
  doFirstThing();
  doTheThing();
}
else if (a >= 10 && a < 20) {
  doTheOtherThing();
}
else if (a >= 20 && a < 50) {
  doFirstThing();
  doTheThing(); // Noncompliant; duplicates first condition
}
else {
  doTheRest();
}
```

Exceptions

Blocks in an if chain that contain a single line of code are ignored, as are blocks in a switch statement that contain a single line of code with or without a following break.

```
if (a == 1) {
  doSomething(); //no issue, usually this is done on purpose
} else if (a == 2) {
  doSomethingElse();
} else {
  doSomething();
}
```

Stack allocated memory and non-owned memory should not be freed

 Bug

Closed resources should not be accessed

 Bug

Dynamically allocated memory should be released

 Bug

Freed memory should not be used

}

But this exception does not apply to `if` chains without `else`-s, or to `switch`-es without default clauses when all branches have the same single line of code. In case of `if` chains with `else`-s, or of `switch`-es with default clauses, rule `{rule:cpp:S3923}` raises a bug.

```
if (a == 1) {
    doSomething(); //Noncompliant, this might have been done o
} else if (a == 2) {
    doSomething();
}
```

Available In:

 |  |  Developer Edition