

How to run the code ?

1. `javac ./testcases/java/*.java`
2. `export CLASSPATH=./sootclasses-trunk-jar-with-dependencies.jar:$CLASSPATH`
3. `javac PA1.java`
4. `java PA1 <arg1> <arg2>`
 - **arg1** : analysis_option [jap.dmt, jap.npc, jap.abc, ...]
 - **arg2** : testcase_name [Testcase1, Testcase2 , ...]

Observation

Testcase 1

- Analysis : **jap.abc** (Array bound checker)
- The java code contains an array of int `Numbers` .
- In the `for` loop, all the access are within the correct index range and hence, the jimple file reports all these access as [safe lower bound] [safe upper bound]
- In line 14, however we accessed the value at a negative index `-2` . Since this is an out of bound access, jimple IR reports it as [potentially unsafe lower bound] [safe upper bound] at *line 14* .
- The array bound checker does a forward analysis. Its because before we conclude whether an access is out of bound or not, its important to know the size of the array first.

Testcase 2

- Analysis : **jap.abc** (Array bound checker)
- The java code contains an array of string `names` .
- For the `names` array, we make two different access, one at *line 10* (for index 2), other at *line 11* (for index 5) , jimple IR reports the first access as [safe lower bound] [safe upper bound], while the second access as [safe lower bound] [unsafe upper bound] because the names array has only 3 elements.
- The array bound checker does a forward analysis. Its because before we conclude whether an access is out of bound or not, its important to know the size of the array first.

Testcase 3

- Analysis : **jap.lvtagger** (Live variable analysis)
- Live variable analysis is a program analysis technique used to determine the set of variables that are live or still in use at various points in a program. A variable is considered "live" if its value may be used later in the program, meaning that there is a subsequent computation that depends on its current value. Identifying live variables is crucial for optimizing compilers and various program analyses.
- This test case has following snippet:

```

1. int x = 5;
2. int y = x + 3;
3. int z = y * 2;
4. int result = z;
5. System.out.println(result);

```

1. Initialize Sets:

- Create a set for each program point (line of code).
- Initialize the set of live variables at each program point to be empty.

2. Iterative Analysis:

- Start from the end of the program and work backward.
- For each line of code, update the live variable set based on the definition and use of variables.

2. Data Flow Equations:

$$IN[n] = USE[n] \cup (OUT[n] - DEF[n])$$

$$OUT[n] = \bigcup (IN[s]) \text{ for all successors } s \text{ of } n$$

Here, `USE` is the set of variables used, `DEF` is the set of variables defined, and `∪` represents the union of sets.

• Analysis Steps:

- **Line 5** (`System.out.println(result);`):
 - $OUT[5] = \{\}$
 - $IN[5] = OUT[5] \cup USE[5] = \{\} \cup \{result\} = \{result\}$
- **Line 4** (`int result = z;`):
 - $OUT[4] = IN[5]$
 - $IN[4] = OUT[4] \cup USE[4] - DEF[4] = \{result\} \cup \{z\} - \{result\} = \{z\}$
- **Line 3** (`int z = y * 2;`):
 - $OUT[3] = IN[4]$
 - $IN[3] = OUT[3] \cup USE[3] - DEF[3] = \{z\} \cup \{y\} - \{z\} = \{y, z\}$
- **Line 2** (`int y = x + 3;`):
 - $OUT[2] = IN[3]$
 - $IN[2] = OUT[2] \cup USE[2] - DEF[2] = \{y, z\} \cup \{x\} - \{y\} = \{x, y, z\}$
- **Line 1** (`int x = 5;`):
 - $OUT[1] = IN[2]$
 - $IN[1] = OUT[1] \cup USE[1] - DEF[1] = \{x, y, z\} \cup \{\} - \{\} = \{x, y, z\}$

After the iterative analysis, the live variable sets stabilize:

- $IN[1] = \{x, y, z\}$

- $IN[2] = \{x, y, z\}$
- $IN[3] = \{y, z\}$
- $IN[4] = \{z\}$
- $IN[5] = \{result\}$

The jimple file also reports similar observation with some optimisation.

This analysis is a backward analysis because to know the variables that are going to be used in future, we need to analyse backwards.

Testcase 4

- Analysis: **jap.npc** (Null pointer checker)
- In this test case, we have defined two string variables viz str1 and str2.
- While str1 has been initialised with a non null string value - "NonNullString", str2 can be non Null as well as Null depending on the output of the Math.random() function.
- As a result of this uncertainty for the value of str2. Jimple IR outputs str1 as [Non Null] at *line 7* while str2 as [Unknown] at *line 10*.
- This analysis is also a forward analysis, because to determine if a variable is null or not requires to know the statements that are before it. Hence analysis needs to be done in forward direction.

Testcase 5

- Analysis: **jap.dmt** (Tags dominator of statements)
- A node d of a control-flow graph **dominates** a node n if every path from the *entry node* to n must go through d . Notationally, this is written as $d \text{ dom } n$ (or sometimes $d \gg n$). By definition, every node dominates itself.
- To perform this analysis, the testcase contains a simple if else block. The jimple IR is observed to notice which statements dominate a given statement in the code.
- According to the Jimple IR:
 - Line 6 is dominated by Line: 6
 - Line 7 is dominated by Line : 6, 7
 - Line 9 (checking isCat() == 0) is dominated by Line: 6, 7, 9
 - Line 10 is dominated by: 6,7,9,10
 - Line 12 is dominated by: 6,7,9,12
 - Line 15 is dominated by: 6,7,9,15
 - Return is dominated by: 6,7,9,15, return
- This analysis is a forward analysis because we are only considered about the statements that comes before a given statement for determining whether it dominates or not.