

# A Bounded Verification Tool for Java

Stefan Koppier

February 11, 2019



# Introduction



# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>On the semantical differences between Java and C</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1	Types . . . . .	7
1.1.1	Primitive data types . . . . .	7
1.1.2	Arrays . . . . .	8
1.1.3	Strings . . . . .	8
1.1.4	Classes . . . . .	8
1.1.5	Interfaces . . . . .	8
1.1.6	Enum . . . . .	8
1.2	Expressions . . . . .	8
1.2.1	Literals . . . . .	8
1.2.2	Operators . . . . .	8
1.2.3	Assignment . . . . .	8
1.3	Namespaces . . . . .	8
<b>2</b>	<b>Phases of the Tool</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1	Lexing and Parsing . . . . .	9
2.2	Analysis . . . . .	9
2.2.1	Syntax Transformation . . . . .	9
2.2.2	Control Flow Analysis . . . . .	9
2.2.3	Reachability Analysis . . . . .	10
<b>3</b>	<b>CProver</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1	Properties . . . . .	11



# Chapter 1

## On the semantical differences between Java and C

### 1.1 Types

#### 1.1.1 Primitive data types

Java defines eight primitive data types: **boolean**, **char**, **byte**, **short**, **int**, **long**, **float**, **double**. All integral values are signed.

C defines one boolean type: `_Bool`, five standard signed integer types: **signed char**, **short int**, **int**, **long int**, **long long int**, and three standard floating point types: **float**, **double**, and **long double** [1, p. 40]. The downside of the integral primitives is that their size is not exactly specified, and is thus implementation specific. For example, the **int** primitive can be 32- or 64-bit, depending on the implementation. Luckily, CBMC defines four exact size integral values: `_int8`, `_int16`, `_int32`, and `_int64` [2, p. 39].

We can define an exact mapping of the primitive data types of Java, to those of C and CBMC. This mapping can be found in 1.1.

Table 1.1: Mapping of the primitive data types.

Type	Description	C equivalent
<b>boolean</b>	true or false	<code>_Bool</code>
<b>char</b>	16-bit Unicode value	
<b>byte</b>	8-bit signed integral value	<code>_int8</code>
<b>short</b>	16-bit signed integral value	<code>_int16</code>
<b>int</b>	32-bit signed integral value	<code>_int32</code>
<b>long</b>	64-bit signed integral value	<code>_int64</code>
<b>float</b>	IEEE 754 32-bit floating point value	<b>float</b>
<b>double</b>	IEEE 754 64-bit floating point value	<b>double</b>

**1.1.2 Arrays****1.1.3 Strings****1.1.4 Classes****1.1.5 Interfaces****1.1.6 Enum****1.2 Expressions****1.2.1 Literals****1.2.2 Operators****1.2.3 Assignment****1.3 Namespaces**



# Chapter 2

## Phases of the Tool

### 2.1 Lexing and Parsing

### 2.2 Analysis

#### 2.2.1 Syntax Transformation

#### 2.2.2 Control Flow Analysis

##### Definition 1

Define a basic block.

**Definition 2** The Control Flow Graph (CFG) of a method  $M$  is a directed graph  $G_M = (V, E, s)$  where

- $V$  is the set of nodes. Each vertex  $v$  in  $V$  is a pair consisting of an integral label, and a basic block. There exists a vertex  $v$  for every basic block in the method  $M$ .
- $E$  is the set of edges. There exists an edge  $(u, v)$  if and only if the basic block of  $v$  follows the basic block of  $u$  in the method  $M$ .
- $s$  is the vertex in  $V$  that is the initial basic block in the method  $M$ .

**Definition 3** The Extended Control Flow Graph (ECFG) of a program  $P$  is a directed graph  $G_P = (V, E, s)$  where

- $V$  is the set of nodes. Each vertex  $v$  in  $V$  is a pair consisting of an integral label, and a CFG. There exists a vertex  $v$  for every method  $M$  in  $P$ .
- $E$  is the set of edges. There exists an edge  $(u, v)$  if and only if the method of  $u$  invokes the method of  $v$ .
- $s$  is the initial method of the program  $P$ .

We perform the Control Flow Analysis (CFA) in a way similar to that described by Nielson et al. [3].

We define the CFA as:

$$\begin{aligned}
init([x = e]^l) &= l \\
init([S_1]; [S_2]) &= init(S_1) \\
init([\mathbf{assert} \ e \ g]^l) &= l \\
init([\mathbf{assume} \ e \ g]^l) &= l \\
init([\mathbf{break} \ x]^l) &= l \\
init([\mathbf{continue} \ x]^l) &= l \\
init(\mathbf{if} ([e]^l) \{S\}) &= l \\
init(\mathbf{if} ([e]^l) \{S_1\} \mathbf{else} \{S_2\}) &= l \\
init(\mathbf{while} ([e]^l) \{S\}) &= l \\
init(\mathbf{for} (; [e]^l; \dots) \{S\}) &= l \\
init(\mathbf{for} ([i]^{l'}; [e]^l; \dots) \{S\}) &= l'
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
final([x = e]^l) &= \{l\} \\
final([S_1]; [S_2]) &= final(S_2) \\
final([\mathbf{assert} \ e \ g]^l) &= \{l\} \\
final([\mathbf{assume} \ e \ g]^l) &= \{l\} \\
final([\mathbf{break} \ x]^l) &= \{l\} \\
final([\mathbf{continue} \ x]^l) &= \{l\} \\
final(\mathbf{if} ([e]^l) \{S\}) &= final(S) \\
final(\mathbf{if} ([e]^l) \{S_1\} \mathbf{else} \{S_2\}) &= final(S_1) \cup final(S_2) \\
final(\mathbf{while} ([e]^l) \{S\}) &= \{l\} \cup breaks_0(S) \\
final(\mathbf{for} (\dots; [e]^l; \dots) \{S\}) &= \{l\} \cup breaks_0(S) \\
final(x : \mathbf{while} ([e]^l) \{S\}) &= \{l\} \cup breaks_x(S) \\
final(x : \mathbf{for} (\dots; [e]^l; \dots) \{S\}) &= \{l\} \cup breaks_x(S)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
flow([x = e]^l) &= \emptyset \\
flow([S]; [\mathbf{break} \ x]^l) &= flow(S) \\
flow([S]; [\mathbf{continue} \ x]^l) &= flow(S) \\
flow([S_1]; [S_2]) &= flow(S_1) \cup flow(S_2) \cup \{(l, init(S_2)) \mid \in final(S_1)\} \\
flow([\mathbf{assert} \ e \ g]^l) &= \emptyset \\
flow([\mathbf{assume} \ e \ g]^l) &= \emptyset \\
flow([\mathbf{break} \ x]^l) &= \emptyset \\
flow([\mathbf{continue} \ x]^l) &= \emptyset \\
flow(\mathbf{if} ([e]^l) \{S\}) &= flow(S) \cup (l, init(S)) \\
flow(\mathbf{if} ([e]^l) \{S_1\} \mathbf{else} \{S_2\}) &= flow(S_1) \cup flow(S_2) \cup (l, init(S_1)) \cup (l, init(S_2)) \\
flow(\mathbf{while} ([e]^l) \{S\}) &= todo \\
flow(\mathbf{for} (; [e]^l; \dots) \{S\}) &= todo \\
flow(\mathbf{for} ([i]^{l'}; [e]^l; \dots) \{S\}) &= todo
\end{aligned}$$

### 2.2.3 Reachability Analysis

# Chapter 3

## CProver

### 3.1 Properties

array bounds	test
pointer	test
division by zero	test
arithmetic over- and underflow	test
shift greater than bit-width	test
floating-point for +/-Inf	test
floating-point for NaN	test
user assertions	test



# Bibliography

- [1] International standard iso/iec iso/iec 9899:201x programming languages c. Standard, International Organization for Standardization, Geneva, CH, 2011.
- [2] Daniel Kroening. *The CProver User Manual*.
- [3] Flemming Nielson, Hanne R Nielson, and Chris Hankin. *Principles of program analysis*. Springer, 2015.