

# nodiscard(“should have a reason”)

JeanHeyd Meneide <[phdofthehouse@gmail.com](mailto:phdofthehouse@gmail.com)>

September 23rd, 2019

**Document:** n2430

**Audience:** WG14

**Proposal Category:** New Features

**Target Audience:** General Developers, Compiler/Tooling Developers

## *Abstract:*

Many functions return a value, however, not all function return values are of equal importance to the caller. The recent `[[nodiscard]]` attribute allows compilers to issue a diagnostics, but only hands the user a generic error message. This proposal enhances the `[[nodiscard]]` attribute in the same manner as the `[[deprecated]]` attribute, giving developers the same power to guide their users to better APIs with the aid of the compiler by providing a `string-literal` attribute argument clause.

## Introduction

[Document N2267](#) introduced a new attribute `[[nodiscard]]` in the C2x working paper. This has provided significant improvements in reminding programmers of the safety issues of discarding the return value of a function. The `[[nodiscard]]` attribute has helped prevent a serious class of software bugs, but sometimes it is hard to communicate exactly **why** a function is marked as `[[nodiscard]]` and perhaps what actions should be taken to rectify the issue.

This paper supplies an addendum to allow a developer to add a string attribute token to let someone provide a small reasoning or reminder for why a function has been marked `[[nodiscard("potential memory leak")]]`.

## Design Considerations

This paper is an enhancement of a preexisting feature to help programmers provide clarity with their code. Anything that makes the implementation warn or error should also provide some reasoning or perhaps point users to a knowledge base or similar to have any questions they have about the reason for the `nodiscard` attribute answered.

Consider the following code example, before and after the change:

```
#define FOO_BASE 0xBA51CF00

#define FOO_LINK_TYPE 1

struct foo { /* ... */ };
[[nodiscard]] int foo_get_value(struct foo*);
```

## Status Quo:

```

[[nodiscard]]
foo* foo_create(int, struct foo*);
[[nodiscard]]
int foo_compare(struct foo*, struct foo*);

// Always > 0
const int kHandles = ...;

int main (int, char*[]) {


    foo* foo_handles[kHandles + 1] = { };
    foo_handles[0] = create(BASE_FOO, NULL);
    for (int i = 1; i < kHandles; ++i) {
        foo_handles[i] = create(FOO_LINK_TYPE, foo_handles[0])
    }

    /* sometime later */

    for (int i = 0; i < kHandles,
        foo_compare(foo_handles[0], foo_handles[i]), foo_get_value(foo_handles[i]) > 0;
        // ^ warning: function return value marked nodiscard was discarded
        ++i) {
        /* process... */
    }

    return 0;
}

```

 - warning, but it is a generic warning; what exactly went wrong here?

## With Proposal:

```

[[nodiscard("memory leaked")]]
struct foo* foo_create(int, struct foo*);
[[nodiscard("value of foo comparison unused")]]
int foo_compare(struct foo*, struct foo*);

// Always > 0
const int kHandles = ...;

int main (int, char*[]) {

    struct foo* foo_handles[kHandles + 1] = { };
    foo_handles[0] = create(BASE_FOO, NULL);
    for (int i = 1; i < kHandles; ++i) {
        foo_handles[i] = create(FOO_LINK_TYPE, foo_handles[0])
    }

    /* sometime later */

    for (int i = 0; i < kHandles,
        foo_compare(foo_handles[0], foo_handles[i]), foo_get_value(foo_handles[i]) > 0;
        // ^ warning: function return marked nodiscard was discarded - value of foo comparison
        unused
        ++i) {
        /* process... */
    }
}

```

```
    return 0;
}
```

✔ - warning much more clearly makes it obvious that a comma was used with the return value of `foo_compare`, and not `&&`.

The design is very simple and follows the lead of the deprecated attribute. We propose allowing a string literal to be passed as an attribute argument clause, allowing for `[[nodiscard("use the returned token with lib_foobar")]]`. The key here is that there are some `nodiscard` attributes that have different kinds of “severity” versus others.

Adding a reason to `nodiscard` allows implementers of the standard library, library developers, and application writers to benefit from a more clear and concise error beyond `error:<line>: value marked [[nodiscard]] was discarded`. This makes it easier for developers to understand the intent for return values for the used libraries (and understand from which individual expression errors originate in complex expressions).

## Implementation Experience

This is in the official C++ Standard, and has been [merged into Clang already](#). A patch is out for [GCC](#). It would be good to maintain parity with C++ to allow headers that work in both languages to continue to use the same syntax, since this is going to be an increasingly useful existing practice.

## Proposed Wording

This proposed wording is currently relative to Working Paper N2385. The intent of this wording is to allow for the `[[nodiscard]]` attribute to be able to take a string literal.

## Changes

Rewrite §6.7.11.2 “The `nodiscard` attribute”’s **Constraint** subsection as follows:

The `nodiscard` attribute shall be applied to the identifier in a function declarator or to the definition of a structure, union, or enumeration type. It shall appear at most once in each attribute list. If an attribute argument clause is present, it shall have the form:

( *string-literal* )

Add additional clauses in the **Semantics** subsection as follows:

A name or entity declared without the `nodiscard` attribute can later be redeclared with the attribute and vice-versa. Redeclarations using different forms of the attribute (with or without the attribute-argument-clause or with different attribute-argument-clauses) are allowed.

[ Note: Thus, an entity initially declared without the attribute can be marked as `nodiscard` by a subsequent redeclaration. However, after an entity is marked as `nodiscard`, later redeclarations do not remove the `nodiscard` from the entity. — end note ]

Add a third example after the first two in the **Recommended Practice** subsection as follows:

```
[[nodiscard("must check armed state")]]  
bool arm_detonator(int);  
  
void call(void) {  
    arm_detonator(3);  
    detonate();  
}
```

A diagnostic for the call to `arm_detonator` using the *string-literal* in the *attribute-argument-clause* is encouraged.