## Part I C)

**The Algorithm**

The algorithm that was added for part c) is relatively straightforward. Our original implementation without interprocedural analysis was very fast so we had lots of space and timing to work with. After parsing the initial call graph from the provided file the function interProcedural() is run. Depending on your desired depth you can run the function several times to continually “flatten” linked functions.

The function operates by first taking a scope and looking at all the functions called in that scope. It takes all of these functions children (i.e. the functions they call, if there are any) and adds them as direct children to the original scope. It then removes the parent function from the scope which effectively “flattens” the function into all of its children. As it is rebuilding the new call graph it counts individual occurrences and pairs of functions.

**Results**

The first point of discussion is a small report on the original results from test2 vs the new results. Running the default (and correct) function results in the following 4 prospective bugs:

bug: A in scope2, pair: (A, B), support: 3, confidence: 75.00%

bug: A in scope3, pair: (A, D), support: 3, confidence: 75.00%

bug: B in scope3, pair: (B, D), support: 4, confidence: 80.00%

bug: D in scope2, pair: (B, D), support: 4, confidence: 80.00%

Running it again with inter-procedural analysis activated and with the same parameters (3 and 65) we get a prospective bug report of:

bug: B in scope3, pair: (B, D), support: 3, confidence: 75.00%

We see that there are 3 likely false positives when running the default algorithm on test 2. By using interprocedural analysis and just going 1 function layer deep we eliminate 75% of the bug reports and are left with just 1 of the 4. This is concrete evidence of the more advanced algorithm being more effective for test 2 specifically and likely many others.

**Additional Info**

It is interesting to note that with this implementation it is actually possible to remove some false positives and generate several more in return. Running on test3 (httpd), the default algorithm provides 205 likely bugs. Running with interprocedural analysis activated with a depth of 1 results in a whopping 719 likely bugs. This is a serious increase and strongly indicates that single depth interprocedural analysis does not always help. That being said, running it again with a depth of 2 results in 534, and 3 results in just 64 likely bugs. This indicates to me a strong correlation between complexity of the provided program and needed depth for interprocedural analysis to be of benefit.