Chapter 58: Multithreading

In C11 there is a standard thread library, <threads.h>, but no known compiler that yet implements it. Thus, to use multithreading in C you must use platform specific implementations such as the POSIX threads library (often referred to as pthreads) using the pthread.h header.

Section 58.1: C11 Threads simple example

```
#include <threads.h>
#include <stdio.h>

int run(void *arg)
{
    printf("Hello world of C11 threads.");
    return 0;
}

int main(int argc, const char *argv[])
{
    thrd_t thread;
    int result;
    thrd_create(&thread, run, NULL);
    thrd_join(&thread, &result);
    printf("Thread return %d at the end\n", result);
}
```

Chapter 59: Interprocess Communication (IPC)

Inter-process communication (IPC) mechanisms allow different independent processes to communicate with each other. Standard C does not provide any IPC mechanisms. Therefore, all such mechanisms are defined by the host operating system. POSIX defines an extensive set of IPC mechanisms; Windows defines another set; and other systems define their own variants.

Section 59.1: Semaphores

Semaphores are used to synchronize operations between two or more processes. POSIX defines two different sets of semaphore functions:

- 1. 'System V IPC' semctl(), semop(), semget().
- 'POSIX Semaphores' <u>sem_close()</u>, <u>sem_destroy()</u>, <u>sem_getvalue()</u>, <u>sem_init()</u>, <u>sem_open()</u>, <u>sem_post()</u>, <u>sem_trywait()</u>, <u>sem_unlink()</u>.

This section describes the System V IPC semaphores, so called because they originated with Unix System V.

First, you'll need to include the required headers. Old versions of POSIX required #include <sys/types.h>; modern POSIX and most systems do not require it.

```
#include <sys/sem.h>
```

Then, you'll need to define a key in both the parent as well as the child.

```
#define KEY 0x1111
```

This key needs to be the same in both programs or they will not refer to the same IPC structure. There are ways to generate an agreed key without hard-coding its value.

Next, depending on your compiler, you may or may not need to do this step: declare a union for the purpose of semaphore operations.

```
union semun {
   int val;
   struct semid_ds *buf;
   unsigned short *array;
};
```

Next, define your try (semwait) and raise (semsignal) structures. The names P and V originate from Dutch

```
struct sembuf p = { 0, -1, SEM_UNDO}; # semwait
struct sembuf v = { 0, +1, SEM_UNDO}; # semsignal
```

Now, start by getting the id for your IPC semaphore.

```
int id;
// 2nd argument is number of semaphores
// 3rd argument is the mode (IPC_CREAT creates the semaphore set if needed)
if ((id = semget(KEY, 1, 0666 | IPC_CREAT) < 0) {
    /* error handling code */
}</pre>
```

In the parent, initialise the semaphore to have a counter of 1.

```
union semun u;
u.val = 1;
if (semctl(id, 0, SETVAL, u) < 0) { // SETVAL is a macro to specify that you're setting the value of
the semaphore to that specified by the union u
    /* error handling code */
}
```

Now, you can decrement or increment the semaphore as you need. At the start of your critical section, you decrement the counter using the semop() function:

```
if (semop(id, &p, 1) < 0) {
    /* error handling code */
}</pre>
```

To increment the semaphore, you use &v instead of &p:

```
if (semop(id, &v, 1) < 0) {
    /* error handling code */
}</pre>
```

Note that every function returns 0 on success and -1 on failure. Not checking these return statuses can cause devastating problems.

Example 1.1: Racing with Threads

The below program will have a process fork a child and both parent and child attempt to print characters onto the terminal without any synchronization.

```
#include <stdio.h>
#include <stdlib.h>
#include <unistd.h>
#include <string.h>
int main()
{
    int pid;
    pid = fork();
    srand(pid);
    if(pid < 0)
        perror("fork"); exit(1);
    }
    else if(pid)
        char *s = "abcdefgh";
        int l = strlen(s);
        for(int i = 0; i < 1; ++i)
        {
            putchar(s[i]);
            fflush(stdout);
            sleep(rand() % 2);
            putchar(s[i]);
            fflush(stdout);
            sleep(rand() % 2);
```

```
else
{
    char *s = "ABCDEFGH";
    int l = strlen(s);
    for(int i = 0; i < 1; ++i)
    {
        putchar(s[i]);
        fflush(stdout);
        sleep(rand() % 2);
        putchar(s[i]);
        fflush(stdout);
        sleep(rand() % 2);
    }
}</pre>
```

Output (1st run):

```
aAABaBCbCbDDcEEcddeFFGGHHeffgghh
```

(2nd run):

```
aabbccAABddBCeeCffgDDghEEhFFGGHH
```

Compiling and running this program should give you a different output each time .

Example 1.2: Avoid Racing with Semaphores

Modifying *Example 1.1* to use semaphores, we have:

```
#include <stdio.h>
#include <stdlib.h>
#include <unistd.h>
#include <string.h>
#include <sys/types.h>
#include <sys/ipc.h>
#include <sys/sem.h>
#define KEY 0x1111
union semun {
    int val;
    struct semid_ds *buf;
    unsigned short *array;
};
struct sembuf p = { 0, -1, SEM_UNDO};
struct sembuf v = { 0, +1, SEM_UNDO};
int main()
{
    int id = semget(KEY, 1, 0666 | IPC_CREAT);
    if(id < 0)
    {
        perror("semget"); exit(11);
    }
    union semun u;
    u.val = 1;
    if(semctl(id, 0, SETVAL, u) < 0)
    {
```

```
perror("semctl"); exit(12);
    int pid;
    pid = fork();
    srand(pid);
    if(pid < 0)
    {
        perror("fork"); exit(1);
    }
    else if(pid)
        char *s = "abcdefgh";
        int 1 = strlen(s);
        for(int i = 0; i < 1; ++i)
            if(semop(id, \&p, 1) < 0)
            {
                perror("semop p"); exit(13);
            putchar(s[i]);
            fflush(stdout);
            sleep(rand() % 2);
            putchar(s[i]);
            fflush(stdout);
            if(semop(id, &v, 1) < 0)
            {
                perror("semop p"); exit(14);
            }
            sleep(rand() % 2);
    }
    else
        char *s = "ABCDEFGH";
        int l = strlen(s);
        for(int i = 0; i < 1; ++i)
            if(semop(id, \&p, 1) < 0)
                perror("semop p"); exit(15);
            putchar(s[i]);
            fflush(stdout);
            sleep(rand() % 2);
            putchar(s[i]);
            fflush(stdout);
            if(semop(id, &v, 1) < 0)
            {
                perror("semop p"); exit(16);
            sleep(rand() % 2);
        }
    }
}
```

Output:

 $a abb {\tt AABBCCccddeeDDffEEFFGGHHgghh}$

Compiling and running this program will give you the same output each time.					

Chapter 60: Testing frameworks

Many developers use unit tests to check that their software works as expected. Unit tests check small units of larger pieces of software, and ensure that the outputs match expectations. Testing frameworks make unit testing easier by providing set-up/tear-down services and coordinating the tests.

There are many unit testing frameworks available for C. For example, Unity is a pure C framework. People quite often use C++ testing frameworks to test C code; there are many C++ test frameworks too.

Section 60.1: Unity Test Framework

<u>Unity</u> is an <u>xUnit</u>-style test framework for unit testing C. It is written completely in C and is portable, quick, simple, expressive and extensible. It is designed to especially be also useful for unit testing for embedded systems.

A simple test case that checks the return value of a function, might look as follows

```
void test_FunctionUnderTest_should_ReturnFive(void)
{
    TEST_ASSERT_EQUAL_INT( 5, FunctionUnderTest() );
}
```

A full test file might look like:

```
#include "unity.h"
#include "UnitUnderTest.h" /* The unit to be tested. */

void setUp (void) {} /* Is run before every test, put unit init calls here. */
void tearDown (void) {} /* Is run after every test, put unit clean-up calls here. */

void test_TheFirst(void)
{
    TEST_IGNORE_MESSAGE("Hello world!"); /* Ignore this test but print a message. */
}

int main (void)
{
    UNITY_BEGIN();
    RUN_TEST(test_TheFirst); /* Run the test. */
    return UNITY_END();
}
```

Unity comes with some example projects, makefiles and some Ruby rake scripts that help make creating longer test files a bit easier.

Section 60.2: CMocka

<u>CMocka</u> is an elegant unit testing framework for C with support for mock objects. It only requires the standard C library, works on a range of computing platforms (including embedded) and with different compilers. It has a <u>tutorial</u> on testing with mocks, <u>API documentation</u>, and a variety of <u>examples</u>.

```
#include <stdarg.h>
#include <stddef.h>
#include <setjmp.h>
#include <cmocka.h>

void null_test_success (void ** state) {}
```

```
void null_test_fail (void ** state)
    assert_true (0);
}
/* These functions will be used to initialize
   and clean resources up after each test run */
int setup (void ** state)
    return 0;
}
int teardown (void ** state)
    return 0;
int main (void)
    const struct CMUnitTest tests [] =
        cmocka_unit_test (null_test_success),
        cmocka_unit_test (null_test_fail),
    };
    /* If setup and teardown functions are not
      needed, then NULL may be passed instead */
    int count_fail_tests =
        cmocka_run_group_tests (tests, setup, teardown);
    return count_fail_tests;
}
```

Section 60.3: CppUTest

<u>CppUTest</u> is an <u>xUnit</u>-style framework for unit testing C and C++. It is written in C++ and aims for portability and simplicity in design. It has support for memory leak detection, building mocks, and running its tests along with the Google Test. Comes with helper scripts and sample projects for Visual Studio and Eclipse CDT.

```
#include <CppUTest/CommandLineTestRunner.h>
#include <CppUTest/TestHarness.h>

TEST_GROUP(Foo_Group) {}

TEST(Foo_Group, Foo_TestOne) {}

/* Test runner may be provided options, such as to enable colored output, to run only a specific test or a group of tests, etc. This will return the number of failed tests. */

int main(int argc, char ** argv) {
    RUN_ALL_TESTS(argc, argv);
}
```

A test group may have a setup() and a teardown() method. The setup method is called prior to each test and the

teardown() method is called after. Both are optional and either may be omitted independently. Other methods and variables may also be declared inside a group and will be available to all tests of that group.

```
TEST_GROUP(Foo_Group)
{
    size_t data_bytes = 128;
    void * data;

    void setup()
    {
        data = malloc(data_bytes);
    }

    void teardown()
    {
            free(data);
    }

    void clear()
    {
            memset(data, 0, data_bytes);
    }
}
```

Chapter 61: Valgrind

Section 61.1: Bytes lost -- Forgetting to free

Here is a program that calls malloc but not free:

```
#include <stdio.h>
#include <stdlib.h>

int main(int argc, char **argv)
{
    char *s;
    s = malloc(26); // the culprint
    return 0;
}
```

With no extra arguments, valgrind will not look for this error.

But if we turn on --leak-check=yes or --tool=memcheck, it will complain and display the lines responsible for those memory leaks if the program was compiled in debug mode:

```
$ valgrind -q --leak-check=yes ./missing_free
==4776== 26 bytes in 1 blocks are definitely lost in loss record 1 of 1
==4776== at 0x4024F20: malloc (vg_replace_malloc.c:236)
==4776== by 0x80483F8: main (missing_free.c:9)
==4776==
```

If the program is not compiled in debug mode (for example with the -g flag in GCC) it will still show us where the leak happened in terms of the relevant function, but not the lines.

This lets us go back and look at what block was allocated in that line and try to trace forward to see why it wasn't freed.

Section 61.2: Most common errors encountered while using Valgrind

Valgrind provides you with the *lines at which the error occurred* at the end of each line in the format (file.c:line_no). Errors in valgrind are summarised in the following way:

```
ERROR SUMMARY: 1 errors from 1 contexts (suppressed: 0 from 0)
```

The most common errors include:

1. Illegal read/write errors

```
==8451== Invalid read of size 2
==8451== at 0x4E7381D: getenv (getenv.c:84)
==8451== by 0x4EB1559: __libc_message (libc_fatal.c:80)
==8451== by 0x4F5256B: __fortify_fail (fortify_fail.c:37)
==8451== by 0x4F5250F: __stack_chk_fail (stack_chk_fail.c:28)
==8451== by 0x40059C: main (valg.c:10)
==8451== Address 0x700000007 is not stack'd, malloc'd or (recently) free'd
```

This happens when the code starts to access memory which does not belong to the program. The size of the memory accessed also gives you an indication of what variable was used.

2. Use of Uninitialized Variables

```
==8795== 1 errors in context 5 of 8:
==8795== Conditional jump or move depends on uninitialised value(s)
==8795== at 0x4E881AF: vfprintf (vfprintf.c:1631)
==8795== by 0x4E8F898: printf (printf.c:33)
==8795== by 0x400548: main (valg.c:7)
```

According to the error, at line 7 of the main of valg.c, the call to printf() passed an uninitialized variable to printf.

3. Illegal freeing of Memory

```
==8954== Invalid free() / delete / delete[] / realloc()
==8954== at 0x4C2EDEB: free (in /usr/lib/valgrind/vgpreload_memcheck-amd64-linux.so)
==8954== by 0x4005A8: main (valg.c:10)
==8954== Address 0x5203040 is 0 bytes inside a block of size 240 free'd
==8954== at 0x4C2EDEB: free (in /usr/lib/valgrind/vgpreload_memcheck-amd64-linux.so)
by 0x40059C: main (valg.c:9)
==8954== block was alloc'd at
==8954== at 0x4C2DB8F: malloc (in /usr/lib/valgrind/vgpreload_memcheck-amd64-linux.so)
by 0x40058C: main (valg.c:7)
```

According to valgrind, the code freed the memory illegally (a second time) at *line 10* of valg.c, whereas it was already freed at *line 9*, and the block itself was allocated memory at *line 7*.

Section 61.3: Running Valgrind

```
valgrind ./my-program arg1 arg2 < test-input
```

This will run your program and produce a report of any allocations and de-allocations it did. It will also warn you about common errors like using uninitialized memory, dereferencing pointers to strange places, writing off the end of blocks allocated using malloc, or failing to free blocks.

Section 61.4: Adding flags

You can also turn on more tests, such as:

```
valgrind -q --tool=memcheck --leak-check=yes ./my-program arg1 arg2 < test-input
```

See valgrind --help for more information about the (many) options, or look at the documentation at http://valgrind.org/ for detailed information about what the output means.

Chapter 62: Common C programming idioms and developer practices

Section 62.1: Comparing literal and variable

Suppose you are comparing value with some variable

```
if ( i == 2) //Bad-way
{
    doSomething;
}
```

Now suppose you have mistaken == with =. Then it will take your sweet time to figure it out.

```
if( 2 == i) //Good-way
{
    doSomething;
}
```

Then, if an equal sign is accidentally left out, the compiler will complain about an "attempted assignment to literal." This won't protect you when comparing two variables, but every little bit helps.

See here for more info.

Section 62.2: Do not leave the parameter list of a function blank — use void

Suppose you are creating a function that requires no arguments when it is called and you are faced with the dilemma of how you should define the parameter list in the function prototype and the function definition.

- You have the choice of keeping the parameter list empty for both prototype and definition. Thereby, they look just like the function call statement you will need.
- You read somewhere that one of the uses of keyword **void** (there are only a few of them), is to define the parameter list of functions that do not accept any arguments in their call. So, this is also a choice.

So, which is the correct choice?

ANSWER: using the keyword *void*

GENERAL ADVICE: If a language provides certain feature to use for a special purpose, you are better off using that in your code. For example, using **enums** instead of #define macros (that's for another example).

C11 section 6.7.6.3 "Function declarators", paragraph 10, states:

The special case of an unnamed parameter of type void as the only item in the list specifies that the function has no parameters.

Paragraph 14 of that same section shows the only difference:

... An empty list in a function declarator that is part of a definition of that function specifies that the

function has no parameters. The empty list in a function declarator that is not part of a definition of that function specifies that no information about the number or types of the parameters is supplied.

A simplified explanation provided by K&R (pgs-72-73) for the above stuff:

Furthermore, if a function declaration does not include arguments, as in double atof();, that too is taken to mean that nothing is to be assumed about the arguments of atof; all parameter checking is turned off. This special meaning of the empty argument list is intended to permit older C programs to compile with new compilers. But it's a bad idea to use it with new programs. If the function takes arguments, declare them; if it takes no arguments, use void.

So this is how your function prototype should look:

```
int foo(void);
```

And this is how the function definition should be:

```
int foo(void)
{
    ...
    <statements>
    ...
    return 1;
}
```

One advantage of using the above, over int foo() type of declaration (ie. without using the keyword **void**), is that the compiler can detect the error if you call your function using an erroneous statement like foo(42). This kind of a function call statement would not cause any errors if you leave the parameter list blank. The error would pass silently, undetected and the code would still execute.

This also means that you should define the main() function like this:

```
int main(void)
{
    ...
    <statements>
    ...
    return 0;
}
```

Note that even though a function defined with an empty parameter list takes no arguments, it does not provide a prototype for the function, so the compiler will not complain if the function is subsequently called with arguments. For example:

```
#include <stdio.h>

static void parameterless()
{
    printf("%s called\n", __func__);
}

int main(void)
{
    parameterless(3, "arguments", "provided");
```

```
return 0;
}
```

If that code is saved in the file proto79.c, it can be compiled on Unix with GCC (version 7.1.0 on macOS Sierra 10.12.5 used for demonstration) like this:

```
$ gcc -03 -g -std=c11 -Wall -Wextra -Werror -Wmissing-prototypes -pedantic proto79.c -o proto79
$
```

If you compile with more stringent options, you get errors:

If you give the function the formal prototype static void parameterless (void), then the compilation gives errors:

Moral — always make sure you have prototypes, and make sure your compiler tells you when you are not obeying the rules.

Chapter 63: Common pitfalls

This section discusses some of the common mistakes that a C programmer should be aware of and should avoid making. For more on some unexpected problems and their causes, please see Undefined behavior

Section 63.1: Mixing signed and unsigned integers in arithmetic operations

It is usually not a good idea to mix **signed** and **unsigned** integers in arithmetic operations. For example, what will be output of following example?

```
#include <stdio.h>
int main(void)
{
    unsigned int a = 1000;
    signed int b = -1;

    if (a > b) puts("a is more than b");
    else puts("a is less or equal than b");

    return 0;
}
```

Since 1000 is more than -1 you would expect the output to be a is more than b, however that will not be the case.

Arithmetic operations between different integral types are performed within a common type defined by the so called usual arithmetic conversions (see the language specification, 6.3.1.8).

In this case the "common type" is unsigned int, Because, as stated in <u>Usual arithmetic conversions</u>,

714 Otherwise, if the operand that has unsigned integer type has rank greater or equal to the rank of the type of the other operand, then the operand with signed integer type is converted to the type of the operand with unsigned integer type.

This means that int operand b will get converted to unsigned int before the comparison.

When -1 is converted to an <u>unsigned int</u> the result is the maximal possible <u>unsigned int</u> value, which is greater than 1000, meaning that a > b is false.

Section 63.2: Macros are simple string replacements

Macros are simple string replacements. (Strictly speaking, they work with preprocessing tokens, not arbitrary strings.)

```
#include <stdio.h>

#define SQUARE(x) x*x

int main(void) {
    printf("%d\n", SQUARE(1+2));
    return 0;
}
```

You may expect this code to print 9 (3*3), but actually 5 will be printed because the macro will be expanded to 1+2*1+2.

You should wrap the arguments and the whole macro expression in parentheses to avoid this problem.

```
#include <stdio.h>

#define SQUARE(x) ((x)*(x))

int main(void) {
    printf("%d\n", SQUARE(1+2));
    return 0;
}
```

Another problem is that the arguments of a macro are not guaranteed to be evaluated once; they may not be evaluated at all, or may be evaluated multiple times.

```
#include <stdio.h>

#define MIN(x, y) ((x) <= (y) ? (x) : (y))

int main(void) {
   int a = 0;
   printf("%d\n", MIN(a++, 10));
   printf("a = %d\n", a);
   return 0;
}</pre>
```

In this code, the macro will be expanded to ((a++) <= (10) ? (a++) : (10)). Since a++ (0) is smaller than 10, a++ will be evaluated twice and it will make the value of a and what is returned from MIN differ from you may expect.

This can be avoided by using functions, but note that the types will be fixed by the function definition, whereas macros can be (too) flexible with types.

```
#include <stdio.h>
int min(int x, int y) {
    return x <= y ? x : y;
}
int main(void) {
    int a = 0;
    printf("%d\n", min(a++, 10));
    printf("a = %d\n", a);
    return 0;
}</pre>
```

Now the problem of double-evaluation is fixed, but this min function cannot deal with double data without truncating, for example.

Macro directives can be of two types:

```
#define OBJECT_LIKE_MACRO followed by a "replacement list" of preprocessor tokens
#define FUNCTION_LIKE_MACRO(with, arguments) followed by a replacement list
```

What distinguishes these two types of macros is the character that follows the identifier after #define: if it's an *lparen*, it is a function-like macro; otherwise, it's an object-like macro. If the intention is to write a function-like

macro, there must not be any white space between the end of the name of the macro and (. Check <u>this</u> for a detailed explanation.

```
Version \geq C99
In C99 or later, you could use static inline int min(int x, int y) { ...}.
Version \geq C11
```

In C11, you could write a 'type-generic' expression for min.

```
#include <stdio.h>
#define min(x, y) \_Generic((x), \
                        long double: min_ld, \
                        unsigned long long: min_ull, \
                        default: min_i \
                        )(x, y)
#define gen_min(suffix, type) \
    static inline type min_{\#}suffix(type x, type y) \{ return (x < y) ? x : y; \}
gen_min(ld, long double)
gen_min(ull, unsigned long long)
gen_min(i, int)
int main(void)
    unsigned long long ull1 = 50ULL;
    unsigned long long ull2 = 37ULL;
    printf("min(%llu, %llu) = %llu \ n", ull1, ull2, min(ull1, ull2));
    long double ld1 = 3.141592653L;
    long double 1d2 = 3.141592652L;
    printf("min(%.10Lf, %.10Lf) = %.10Lf \ ", ld1, ld2, min(ld1, ld2));
    int i1 = 3141653;
    int i2 = 3141652;
    printf(''min(%d, %d) = %d\n'', i1, i2, min(i1, i2));
    return 0;
}
```

The generic expression could be extended with more types such as double, float, long long, unsigned long, long, unsigned — and appropriate gen_min macro invocations written.

Section 63.3: Forgetting to copy the return value of realloc into a temporary

If realloc fails, it returns NULL. If you assign the value of the original buffer to realloc's return value, and if it returns NULL, then the original buffer (the old pointer) is lost, resulting in a <u>memory leak</u>. The solution is to copy into a temporary pointer, and if that temporary is not NULL, **then** copy into the real buffer.

```
char *buf, *tmp;
buf = malloc(...);
...

/* WRONG */
if ((buf = realloc(buf, 16)) == NULL)
    perror("realloc");
```

```
/* RIGHT */
if ((tmp = realloc(buf, 16)) != NULL)
    buf = tmp;
else
    perror("realloc");
```

Section 63.4: Forgetting to allocate one extra byte for \0

When you are copying a string into a malloced buffer, always remember to add 1 to strlen.

```
char *dest = malloc(strlen(src)); /* WRONG */
char *dest = malloc(strlen(src) + 1); /* RIGHT */
strcpy(dest, src);
```

This is because strlen does not include the trailing \0 in the length. If you take the WRONG (as shown above) approach, upon calling strcpy, your program would invoke undefined behaviour.

It also applies to situations when you are reading a string of known maximum length from stdin or some other source. For example

```
#define MAX_INPUT_LEN 42

char buffer[MAX_INPUT_LEN]; /* WRONG */
char buffer[MAX_INPUT_LEN + 1]; /* RIGHT */

scanf("%42s", buffer); /* Ensure that the buffer is not overflowed */
```

Section 63.5: Misunderstanding array decay

A common problem in code that uses multidimensional arrays, arrays of pointers, etc. is the fact that Type** and Type[M][N] are fundamentally different types:

```
#include <stdio.h>

void print_strings(char **strings, size_t n)
{
    size_t i;
    for (i = 0; i < n; i++)
        puts(strings[i]);
}

int main(void)
{
    char s[4][20] = {"Example 1", "Example 2", "Example 3", "Example 4"};
    print_strings(s, 4);
    return 0;
}</pre>
```

Sample compiler output:

```
void print_strings(char **strings, size_t n)
```

The error states that the s array in the main function is passed to the function print_strings, which expects a different pointer type than it received. It also includes a note expressing the type that is expected by print_strings and the type that was passed to it from main.

The problem is due to something called *array decay*. What happens when s with its type char[4][20] (array of 4 arrays of 20 chars) is passed to the function is it turns into a pointer to its first element as if you had written &s[0], which has the type char (*)[20] (pointer to 1 array of 20 chars). This occurs for any array, including an array of pointers, an array of arrays of arrays (3-D arrays), and an array of pointers to an array. Below is a table illustrating what happens when an array decays. Changes in the type description are highlighted to illustrate what happens:

Before Decay		After Decay	
char [20]	array of (20 chars)	char *	pointer to (1 char)
char [4][20]	array of (4 arrays of 20 chars)	char (*)[20]	pointer to (1 array of 20 chars)
char *[4]	array of (4 pointers to 1 char)	char **	pointer to (1 pointer to 1 char)
	array of (3 arrays of 4 arrays of 20 chars)	char (*)[4][20]	pointer to (1 array of 4 arrays of 20 chars)
char (*[4])[20]	array of (4 pointers to 1 array of 20 chars)	char (**)[20]	pointer to (1 pointer to 1 array of 20 chars)

If an array can decay to a pointer, then it can be said that a pointer may be considered an array of at least 1 element. An exception to this is a null pointer, which points to nothing and is consequently not an array.

Array decay only happens once. If an array has decayed to a pointer, it is now a pointer, not an array. Even if you have a pointer to an array, remember that the pointer might be considered an array of at least one element, so array decay has already occurred.

In other words, a pointer to an array (char (*)[20]) will never become a pointer to a pointer (char **). To fix the print_strings function, simply make it receive the correct type:

```
void print_strings(char (*strings)[20], size_t n)
/* OR */
void print_strings(char strings[][20], size_t n)
```

A problem arises when you want the print_strings function to be generic for any array of chars: what if there are 30 chars instead of 20? Or 50? The answer is to add another parameter before the array parameter:

```
puts(strings[i]);
}
int main(void)
{
    char s[4][20] = {"Example 1", "Example 2", "Example 3", "Example 4"};
    print_strings(4, 20, s);
    return 0;
}
```

Compiling it produces no errors and results in the expected output:

```
Example 1
Example 2
Example 3
Example 4
```

Section 63.6: Forgetting to free memory (memory leaks)

A programming best practice is to free any memory that has been allocated directly by your own code, or implicitly by calling an internal or external function, such as a library API like strdup(). Failing to free memory can introduce a memory leak, which could accumulate into a substantial amount of wasted memory that is unavailable to your program (or the system), possibly leading to crashes or undefined behavior. Problems are more likely to occur if the leak is incurred repeatedly in a loop or recursive function. The risk of program failure increases the longer a leaking program runs. Sometimes problems appear instantly; other times problems won't be seen for hours or even years of constant operation. Memory exhaustion failures can be catastrophic, depending on the circumstances.

The following infinite loop is an example of a leak that will eventually exhaust available memory leak by calling getline(), a function that implicitly allocates new memory, without freeing that memory.

```
#include <stdlib.h>
#include <stdlib.h>
#include <stdlib.h>

int main(void)
{
    char *line = NULL;
    size_t size = 0;

    /* The loop below leaks memory as fast as it can */

    for(;;) {
        getline(&line, &size, stdin); /* New memory implicitly allocated */
        /* <do whatever> */
        line = NULL;
    }
    return 0;
}
```

In contrast, the code below also uses the getline() function, but this time, the allocated memory is correctly freed, avoiding a leak.

```
#include <stdlib.h>
#include <stdio.h>
```

```
int main(void)
{
    char *line = NULL;
    size_t size = 0;

for(;;) {
        if (getline(&line, &size, stdin) < 0) {
            free(line);
            line = NULL;

            /* Handle failure such as setting flag, breaking out of loop and/or exiting */
        }

        /* <do whatever> */
        free(line);
        line = NULL;

    }

    return 0;
}
```

Leaking memory doesn't always have tangible consequences and isn't necessarily a functional problem. While "best practice" dictates rigorously freeing memory at strategic points and conditions, to reduce memory footprint and lower risk of memory exhaustion, there can be exceptions. For example, if a program is bounded in duration and scope, the risk of allocation failure might be considered too small to worry about. In that case, bypassing explicit deallocation might be considered acceptable. For example, most modern operating systems automatically free all memory consumed by a program when it terminates, whether it is due to program failure, a system call to exit(), process termination, or reaching end of main(). Explicitly freeing memory at the point of imminent program termination could actually be redundant or introduce a performance penalty.

Allocation can fail if insufficient memory is available, and handling failures should be accounted for at appropriate levels of the call stack. <code>getline()</code>, shown above is an interesting use-case because it is a library function that not only allocates memory it leaves to the caller to free, but can fail for a number of reasons, all of which must be taken into account. Therefore, it is essential when using a C API, to read the <code>documentation (man page)</code> and pay particular attention to error conditions and memory usage, and be aware which software layer bears the burden of freeing returned memory.

Another common memory handling practice is to consistently set memory pointers to NULL immediately after the memory referenced by those pointers is freed, so those pointers can be tested for validity at any time (e.g. checked for NULL / non-NULL), because accessing freed memory can lead to severe problems such as getting garbage data (read operation), or data corruption (write operation) and/or a program crash. In most modern operating systems, freeing memory location 0 (NULL) is a NOP (e.g. it is harmless), as required by the C standard — so by setting a pointer to NULL, there is no risk of double-freeing memory if the pointer is passed to free(). Keep in mind that double-freeing memory can lead to very time consuming, confusing, and difficult to diagnose failures.

Section 63.7: Copying too much

```
char buf[8]; /* tiny buffer, easy to overflow */
printf("What is your name?\n");
scanf("%s", buf); /* WRONG */
scanf("%7s", buf); /* RIGHT */
```

If the user enters a string longer than 7 characters (- 1 for the null terminator), memory behind the buffer buf will

be overwritten. This results in undefined behavior. Malicious hackers often exploit this in order to overwrite the return address, and change it to the address of the hacker's malicious code.

Section 63.8: Mistakenly writing = instead of == when comparing

The = operator is used for assignment.

The == operator is used for comparison.

One should be careful not to mix the two. Sometimes one mistakenly writes

```
/* assign y to x */
if (x = y) {
    /* logic */
}
```

when what was really wanted is:

```
/* compare if x is equal to y */
if (x == y) {
    /* logic */
}
```

The former assigns value of y to x and checks if that value is non zero, instead of doing comparison, which is equivalent to:

```
if ((x = y) != 0) {
   /* logic */
}
```

There are times when testing the result of an assignment is intended and is commonly used, because it avoids having to duplicate code and having to treat the first time specially. Compare

versus

Modern compilers will recognise this pattern and do not warn when the assignment is inside parenthesis like above, but may warn for other usages. For example:

```
if ((x = y) != 0) /* no warning; explicit */
```

Some programmers use the strategy of putting the constant to the left of the operator (commonly called <u>Yoda conditions</u>). Because constants are rvalues, this style of condition will cause the compiler to throw an error if the wrong operator was used.

```
if (5 = y) /* Error */
if (5 == y) /* No error */
```

However, this severely reduces the readability of the code and is not considered necessary if the programmer follows good C coding practices, and doesn't help when comparing two variables so it isn't a universal solution. Furthermore, many modern compilers may give warnings when code is written with Yoda conditions.

Section 63.9: Newline character is not consumed in typical scanf() call

When this program

```
#include <stdio.h>
#include <string.h>

int main(void) {
    int num = 0;
    char str[128], *lf;

    scanf("%d", &num);
    fgets(str, sizeof(str), stdin);

if ((lf = strchr(str, '\n')) != NULL) *lf = '\0';
    printf("%d \"%s\"\n", num, str);
    return 0;
}
```

is executed with this input

```
42
life
```

the output will be 42 "" instead of expected 42 "life".

This is because a newline character after 42 is not consumed in the call of scanf() and it is consumed by fgets() before it reads life. Then, fgets() stop reading before reading life.

To avoid this problem, one way that is useful when the maximum length of a line is known -- when solving problems in online judge syste, for example -- is avoiding using scanf() directly and reading all lines via fgets(). You can use sscanf() to parse the lines read.

```
#include <stdio.h>
#include <string.h>

int main(void) {
   int num = 0;
   char line_buffer[128] = "", str[128], *lf;

   fgets(line_buffer, sizeof(line_buffer), stdin);
   sscanf(line_buffer, "%d", &num);
```

```
fgets(str, sizeof(str), stdin);

if ((lf = strchr(str, '\n')) != NULL) *lf = '\0';
printf("%d \"%s\"\n", num, str);
return 0;
}
```

Another way is to read until you hit a newline character after using scanf() and before using fgets().

```
#include <stdio.h>
#include <string.h>

int main(void) {
    int num = 0;
    char str[128], *lf;
    int c;

    scanf("%d", &num);
    while ((c = getchar()) != '\n' && c != EOF);
    fgets(str, sizeof(str), stdin);

    if ((lf = strchr(str, '\n')) != NULL) *lf = '\0';
    printf("%d \"%s\"\n", num, str);
    return 0;
}
```

Section 63.10: Adding a semicolon to a #define

It is easy to get confused in the C preprocessor, and treat it as part of C itself, but that is a mistake because the preprocessor is just a text substitution mechanism. For example, if you write

```
/* WRONG */
#define MAX 100;
int arr[MAX];
```

the code expands to

```
int arr[100;];
```

which is a syntax error. The remedy is to remove the semicolon from the #define line. It is almost invariably a mistake to end a #define with a semicolon.

Section 63.11: Incautious use of semicolons

Be careful with semicolons. Following example

```
if (x > a);
a = x;
```

actually means:

```
if (x > a) {}
a = x;
```

which means x will be assigned to a in any case, which might not be what you wanted originally.

Sometimes, missing a semicolon will also cause an unnoticeable problem:

```
if (i < 0)
    return
day = date[0];
hour = date[1];
minute = date[2];</pre>
```

The semicolon behind return is missed, so day=date[0] will be returned.

One technique to avoid this and similar problems is to always use braces on multi-line conditionals and loops. For example:

```
if (x > a) {
    a = x;
}
```

Section 63.12: Undefined reference errors when linking

One of the most common errors in compilation happens during the linking stage. The error looks similar to this:

```
$ gcc undefined_reference.c
/tmp/ccoXhwF0.o: In function `main':
undefined_reference.c:(.text+0x15): undefined reference to `foo'
collect2: error: ld returned 1 exit status
$
```

So let's look at the code that generated this error:

```
int foo(void);
int main(int argc, char **argv)
{
    int foo_val;
    foo_val = foo();
    return foo_val;
}
```

We see here a *declaration* of foo (int foo();) but no *definition* of it (actual function). So we provided the compiler with the function header, but there was no such function defined anywhere, so the compilation stage passes but the linker exits with an Undefined reference error.

To fix this error in our small program we would only have to add a definition for foo:

```
/* Declaration of foo */
int foo(void);

/* Definition of foo */
int foo(void)
{
    return 5;
}

int main(int argc, char **argv)
{
    int foo_val;
    foo_val = foo();
    return foo_val;
}
```

Now this code will compile. An alternative situation arises where the source for foo() is in a separate source file foo.c (and there's a header foo.h to declare foo() that is included in both foo.c and undefined_reference.c). Then the fix is to link both the object file from foo.c and undefined_reference.c, or to compile both the source files:

```
$ gcc -c undefined_reference.c
$ gcc -c foo.c
$ gcc -o working_program undefined_reference.o foo.o
$
```

Or:

```
$ gcc -o working_program undefined_reference.c foo.c
$
```

A more complex case is where libraries are involved, like in the code:

```
#include <stdio.h>
#include <stdlib.h>
#include <math.h>
int main(int argc, char **argv)
    double first;
    double second;
    double power;
    if (argc != 3)
        fprintf(stderr, "Usage: %s <denom> <nom>\n", argv[0]);
        return EXIT_FAILURE;
    }
    /* Translate user input to numbers, extra error checking
    * should be done here. */
    first = strtod(argv[1], NULL);
    second = strtod(argv[2], NULL);
    /* Use function pow() from libm - this will cause a linkage
     * error unless this code is compiled against libm! */
    power = pow(first, second);
    printf("%f to the power of %f = %f\n", first, second, power);
    return EXIT_SUCCESS;
}
```

The code is syntactically correct, declaration for pow() exists from #include <math.h>, so we try to compile and link but get an error like this:

```
$ gcc no_library_in_link.c -o no_library_in_link
/tmp/ccduQQqA.o: In function `main':
no_library_in_link.c:(.text+0x8b): undefined reference to `pow'
collect2: error: ld returned 1 exit status
$
```

This happens because the *definition* for pow() wasn't found during the linking stage. To fix this we have to specify we want to link against the math library called libm by specifying the -lm flag. (Note that there are platforms such

as macOS where -lm is not needed, but when you get the undefined reference, the library is needed.)

So we run the compilation stage again, this time specifying the library (after the source or object files):

```
$ gcc no_library_in_link.c -lm -o library_in_link_cmd
$ ./library_in_link_cmd 2 4
2.000000 to the power of 4.000000 = 16.000000
$
```

And it works!

Section 63.13: Checking logical expression against 'true'

The original C standard had no intrinsic Boolean type, so bool, **true** and **false** had no inherent meaning and were often defined by programmers. Typically **true** would be defined as 1 and **false** would be defined as 0.

```
Version ≥ C99
```

C99 adds the built-in type _Bool and the header <stdbool.h> which defines bool (expanding to _Bool), false and true. It also allows you to redefine bool, true and false, but notes that this is an obsolescent feature.

More importantly, logical expressions treat anything that evaluates to zero as false and any non-zero evaluation as true. For example:

```
/* Return 'true' if the most significant bit is set */
bool isUpperBitSet(uint8_t bitField)
{
    if ((bitField & 0x80) == true) /* Comparison only succeeds if true is 0x80 and bitField has
that bit set */
    {
        return true;
    }
    else
    {
        return false;
    }
}
```

In the above example, the function is trying to check if the upper bit is set and return **true** if it is. However, by explicitly checking against **true**, the if statement will only succeed if (bitfield & 0x80) evaluates to whatever **true** is defined as, which is typically 1 and very seldom 0x80. Either explicitly check against the case you expect:

```
/* Return 'true' if the most significant bit is set */
bool isUpperBitSet(uint8_t bitField)
{
    if ((bitField & 0x80) == 0x80) /* Explicitly test for the case we expect */
    {
        return true;
    }
    else
    {
        return false;
    }
}
```

Or evaluate any non-zero value as true.

```
/* Return 'true' if the most significant bit is set */
bool isUpperBitSet(uint8_t bitField)
{
    /* If upper bit is set, result is 0x80 which the if will evaluate as true */
    if (bitField & 0x80)
    {
        return true;
    }
    else
    {
        return false;
    }
}
```

Section 63.14: Doing extra scaling in pointer arithmetic

In pointer arithmetic, the integer to be added or subtracted to pointer is interpreted not as change of *address* but as number of *elements* to move.

```
#include <stdio.h>
int main(void) {
    int array[] = {1, 2, 3, 4, 5};
    int *ptr = &array[0];
    int *ptr2 = ptr + sizeof(int) * 2; /* wrong */
    printf("%d %d\n", *ptr, *ptr2);
    return 0;
}
```

This code does extra scaling in calculating pointer assigned to ptr2. If sizeof(int) is 4, which is typical in modern 32-bit environments, the expression stands for "8 elements after array[0]", which is out-of-range, and it invokes undefined behavior.

To have ptr2 point at what is 2 elements after array [0], you should simply add 2.

```
#include <stdio.h>
int main(void) {
   int array[] = {1, 2, 3, 4, 5};
   int *ptr = &array[0];
   int *ptr2 = ptr + 2;
   printf("%d %d\n", *ptr, *ptr2); /* "1 3" will be printed */
   return 0;
}
```

Explicit pointer arithmetic using additive operators may be confusing, so using array subscripting may be better.

```
#include <stdio.h>
int main(void) {
    int array[] = {1, 2, 3, 4, 5};
    int *ptr = &array[0];
    int *ptr2 = &ptr[2];
    printf("%d %d\n", *ptr, *ptr2); /* "1 3" will be printed */
    return 0;
}
```

E1[E2] is identical to (*((E1)+(E2))) (N1570 6.5.2.1, paragraph 2), and *(E1[E2]) is equivalent to ((E1)+(E2))

Alternatively, if pointer arithmetic is preferred, casting the pointer to address a different data type can allow byte addressing. Be careful though: endianness can become an issue, and casting to types other than 'pointer to character' leads to strict aliasing problems.

```
#include <stdio.h>
int main(void) {
   int array[3] = {1,2,3}; // 4 bytes * 3 allocated
   unsigned char *ptr = (unsigned char *) array; // unsigned chars only take 1 byte
   /*
     * Now any pointer arithmetic on ptr will match
     * bytes in memory. ptr can be treated like it
     * was declared as: unsigned char ptr[12];
     */
     return 0;
}
```

Section 63.15: Multi-line comments cannot be nested

In C, multi-line comments, /* and */, do not nest.

If you annotate a block of code or function using this style of comment:

```
/*
 * max(): Finds the largest integer in an array and returns it.
 * If the array length is less than 1, the result is undefined.
 * arr: The array of integers to search.
 * num: The number of integers in arr.
 */
int max(int arr[], int num)
{
   int max = arr[0];
   for (int i = 0; i < num; i++)
       if (arr[i] > max)
            max = arr[i];
   return max;
}
```

You will not be able to comment it out easily:

```
//Causes an error on the line below...
*/
```

One solution is to use C99 style comments:

```
// max(): Finds the largest integer in an array and returns it.
// If the array length is less than 1, the result is undefined.
// arr: The array of integers to search.
// num: The number of integers in arr.
int max(int arr[], int num)
{
    int max = arr[0];
    for (int i = 0; i < num; i++)
        if (arr[i] > max)
            max = arr[i];
    return max;
}
```

Now the entire block can be commented out easily:

Another solution is to avoid disabling code using comment syntax, using #ifdef or #ifndef preprocessor directives instead. These directives *do* nest, leaving you free to comment your code in the style you prefer.

```
#define DISABLE_MAX /* Remove or comment this line to enable max() code block */
#ifdef DISABLE_MAX
/*
 * max(): Finds the largest integer in an array and returns it.
 * If the array length is less than 1, the result is undefined.
 * arr: The array of integers to search.
 * num: The number of integers in arr.
 */
int max(int arr[], int num)
{
    int max = arr[0];
    for (int i = 0; i < num; i++)
        if (arr[i] > max)
            max = arr[i];
    return max;
}
```

Some guides go so far as to recommend that code sections must *never* be commented and that if code is to be temporarily disabled one could resort to using an #if 0 directive.

See #if 0 to block out code sections.

Section 63.16: Ignoring return values of library functions

Almost every function in C standard library returns something on success, and something else on error. For example, malloc will return a pointer to the memory block allocated by the function on success, and, if the function failed to allocate the requested block of memory, a null pointer. So you should always check the return value for easier debugging.

This is bad:

```
char* x = malloc(10000000000UL * sizeof *x);
/* more code */
scanf("%s", x); /* This might invoke undefined behaviour and if lucky causes a segmentation
violation, unless your system has a lot of memory */
```

This is good:

```
#include <stdlib.h>
#include <stdio.h>
int main(void)
    char* x = malloc(10000000000UL * sizeof *x);
    if (x == NULL) {
        perror("malloc() failed");
        exit(EXIT_FAILURE);
    }
    if (scanf("%s", x) != 1) {
        fprintf(stderr, "could not read string\n");
        free(x);
        exit(EXIT_FAILURE);
    }
    /* Do stuff with x. */
    /* Clean up. */
    free(x);
    return EXIT_SUCCESS;
}
```

This way you know right away the cause of error, otherwise you might spend hours looking for a bug in a completely wrong place.

Section 63.17: Comparing floating point numbers

Floating point types (float, double and long double) cannot precisely represent some numbers because they have finite precision and represent the values in a binary format. Just like we have repeating decimals in base 10 for fractions such as 1/3, there are fractions that cannot be represented finitely in binary too (such as 1/3, but also, more importantly, 1/10). Do not directly compare floating point values; use a delta instead.

```
#include <float.h> // for DBL_EPSILON and FLT_EPSILON
#include <math.h> // for fabs()
int main(void)
{
   double a = 0.1; // imprecise: (binary) 0.000110...
   // may be false or true
   printf("10 * 0.1 is indeed 1.0. This is not quaranteed in the general case. <math>\n");
   }
   // Using a small delta value.
   if (fabs(a + a + a + a + a + a + a + a + a + a - 1.0) < 0.000001) {
       // C99 5.2.4.2.2p8 guarantees at least 10 decimal digits
       // of precision for the double type.
       printf("10 * 0.1 is almost 1.0.\n");
   }
   return 0;
}
```

Another example:

```
gcc -03 -g -I./inc
                         -std=c11 -Wall -Wextra -Werror -Wmissing-prototypes -Wstrict-prototypes
-Wold-style-definition rd11.c -o rd11 -L./lib -lsoq
#include <stdio.h>
#include <math.h>
static inline double rel_diff(double a, double b)
    return fabs(a - b) / fmax(fabs(a), fabs(b));
}
int main(void)
{
    double d1 = 3.14159265358979;
    double d2 = 355.0 / 113.0;
    double epsilon = 1.0;
    for (int i = 0; i < 10; i++)
        if (rel_diff(d1, d2) < epsilon)</pre>
            printf("%d:%.10f <=> %.10f within tolerance %.10f (rel diff %.4E)\n",
                   i, d1, d2, epsilon, rel_diff(d1, d2));
            printf("%d:%.10f <=> %.10f out of tolerance %.10f (rel diff %.4E)\n",
                   i, d1, d2, epsilon, rel_diff(d1, d2));
        epsilon \neq 10.0;
    }
    return 0;
}
```

Output:

```
0:3.1415926536 <=> 3.1415929204 within tolerance 1.00000000000 (rel diff 8.4914E-08) 1:3.1415926536 <=> 3.1415929204 within tolerance 0.1000000000 (rel diff 8.4914E-08) 2:3.1415926536 <=> 3.1415929204 within tolerance 0.0100000000 (rel diff 8.4914E-08) 3:3.1415926536 <=> 3.1415929204 within tolerance 0.0010000000 (rel diff 8.4914E-08) 4:3.1415926536 <=> 3.1415929204 within tolerance 0.0001000000 (rel diff 8.4914E-08)
```

```
5:3.1415926536 <=> 3.1415929204 within tolerance 0.0000100000 (rel diff 8.4914E-08) 6:3.1415926536 <=> 3.1415929204 within tolerance 0.0000010000 (rel diff 8.4914E-08) 7:3.1415926536 <=> 3.1415929204 within tolerance 0.0000001000 (rel diff 8.4914E-08) 8:3.1415926536 <=> 3.1415929204 out of tolerance 0.0000000100 (rel diff 8.4914E-08) 9:3.1415926536 <=> 3.1415929204 out of tolerance 0.0000000010 (rel diff 8.4914E-08)
```

Section 63.18: Floating point literals are of type double by default

Care must be taken when initializing variables of type float to literal values or comparing them with literal values, because regular floating point literals like 0.1 are of type double. This may lead to surprises:

```
#include <stdio.h>
int main() {
    float n;
    n = 0.1;
    if (n > 0.1) printf("Wierd\n");
    return 0;
}
// Prints "Wierd" when n is float
```

Here, n gets initialized and rounded to single precision, resulting in value 0.10000000149011612. Then, n is converted back to double precision to be compared with 0.1 literal (which equals to 0.100000000000001), resulting in a mismatch.

Besides rounding errors, mixing float variables with double literals will result in poor performance on platforms which don't have hardware support for double precision.

Section 63.19: Using character constants instead of string literals, and vice versa

In C, character constants and string literals are different things.

A character surrounded by single quotes like 'a' is a *character constant*. A character constant is an integer whose value is the character code that stands for the character. How to interpret character constants with multiple characters like 'abc' is implementation-defined.

Zero or more characters surrounded by double quotes like "abc" is a *string literal*. A string literal is an unmodifiable array whose elements are type char. The string in the double quotes plus terminating null-character are the contents, so "abc" has 4 elements ({'a', 'b', 'c', '\0'})

In this example, a character constant is used where a string literal should be used. This character constant will be converted to a pointer in an implementation-defined manner and there is little chance for the converted pointer to be valid, so this example will invoke *undefined behavior*.

```
#include <stdio.h>
int main(void) {
   const char *hello = 'hello, world'; /* bad */
   puts(hello);
   return 0;
}
```

In this example, a string literal is used where a character constant should be used. The pointer converted from the string literal will be converted to an integer in an implementation-defined manner, and it will be converted to char

in an implementation-defined manner. (How to convert an integer to a signed type which cannot represent the value to convert is implementation-defined, and whether char is signed is also implementation-defined.) The output will be some meaningless thing.

```
#include <stdio.h>
int main(void) {
   char c = "a"; /* bad */
   printf("%c\n", c);
   return 0;
}
```

In almost all cases, the compiler will complain about these mix-ups. If it doesn't, you need to use more compiler warning options, or it is recommended that you use a better compiler.

Section 63.20: Recursive function — missing out the base condition

Calculating the factorial of a number is a classic example of a recursive function.

Missing the Base Condition:

```
#include <stdio.h>
int factorial(int n)
{
    return n * factorial(n - 1);
}
int main()
{
    printf("Factorial %d = %d\n", 3, factorial(3));
    return 0;
}
```

Typical output: Segmentation fault: 11

The problem with this function is it would loop infinitely, causing a segmentation fault — it needs a base condition to stop the recursion.

Base Condition Declared:

```
#include <stdio.h>
int factorial(int n)
{
    if (n == 1) // Base Condition, very crucial in designing the recursive functions.
    {
        return 1;
    }
    else
    {
        return n * factorial(n - 1);
    }
}
int main()
{
```

```
printf("Factorial %d = %d\n", 3, factorial(3));
return 0;
}
```

Sample output

```
Factorial 3 = 6
```

This function will terminate as soon as it hits the condition n is equal to 1 (provided the initial value of n is small enough — the upper bound is 12 when <u>int</u> is a 32-bit quantity).

Rules to be followed:

- 1. Initialize the algorithm. Recursive programs often need a seed value to start with. This is accomplished either by using a parameter passed to the function or by providing a gateway function that is non-recursive but that sets up the seed values for the recursive calculation.
- 2. Check to see whether the current value(s) being processed match the base case. If so, process and return the value.
- 3. Redefine the answer in terms of a smaller or simpler sub-problem or sub-problems.
- 4. Run the algorithm on the sub-problem.
- 5. Combine the results in the formulation of the answer.
- 6. Return the results.

Source: Recursive Function

Section 63.21: Overstepping array boundaries

Arrays are zero-based, that is the index always starts at 0 and ends with index array length minus 1. Thus the following code will not output the first element of the array and will output garbage for the final value that it prints.

```
#include <stdio.h>

int main(void)
{
    int x = 0;
    int myArray[5] = {1, 2, 3, 4, 5}; //Declaring 5 elements

for(x = 1; x <= 5; x++) //Looping from 1 till 5.
        printf("%d\t", myArray[x]);

printf("\n");
    return 0;
}</pre>
```

Output: 2 3 4 5 GarbageValue

The following demonstrates the correct way to achieve the desired output:

```
#include <stdio.h>
int main(void)
{
   int x = 0;
   int myArray[5] = {1, 2, 3, 4, 5}; //Declaring 5 elements

   for(x = 0; x < 5; x++) //Looping from 0 till 4.
        printf("%d\t", myArray[x]);</pre>
```

```
printf("\n");
return 0;
}
```

Output: 1 2 3 4 5

It is important to know the length of an array before working with it as otherwise you may corrupt the buffer or cause a segmentation fault by accessing memory locations that are out of bounds.

Section 63.22: Passing unadjacent arrays to functions expecting "real" multidimensional arrays

When allocating multidimensional arrays with malloc, calloc, and realloc, a common pattern is to allocate the inner arrays with multiple calls (even if the call only appears once, it may be in a loop):

```
/* Could also be `int **` with malloc used to allocate outer array. */
int *array[4];
int i;

/* Allocate 4 arrays of 16 ints. */
for (i = 0; i < 4; i++)
    array[i] = malloc(16 * sizeof(*array[i]));</pre>
```

The difference in bytes between the last element of one of the inner arrays and the first element of the next inner array may not be 0 as they would be with a "real" multidimensional array (e.g. int array[4][16];):

```
/* 0x40003c, 0x402000 */
printf("%p, %p\n", (void *)(array[0] + 15), (void *)array[1]);
```

Taking into account the size of int, you get a difference of 8128 bytes (8132-4), which is 2032 int-sized array elements, and that is the problem: a "real" multidimensional array has no gaps between elements.

If you need to use a dynamically allocated array with a function expecting a "real" multidimensional array, you should allocate an object of type int * and use arithmetic to perform calculations:

```
void func(int M, int N, int *array);
...

/* Equivalent to declaring `int array[M][N] = {{0}};` and assigning to array4_16[i][j]. */
int *array;
int M = 4, N = 16;
array = calloc(M, N * sizeof(*array));
array[i * N + j] = 1;
func(M, N, array);
```

If N is a macro or an integer literal rather than a variable, the code can simply use the more natural 2-D array notation after allocating a pointer to an array:

```
void func(int M, int N, int *array);
#define N 16
void func_N(int M, int (*array)[N]);
...
int M = 4;
int (*array)[N];
array = calloc(M, sizeof(*array));
array[i][j] = 1;
```

```
/* Cast to `int *` works here because `array` is a single block of M*N ints with no gaps,
    just like `int array2[M * N];` and `int array3[M][N];` would be. */
func(M, N, (int *)array);
func_N(M, array);
Version ≥ C99
```

If N is not a macro or an integer literal, then array will point to a variable-length array (VLA). This can still be used with func by casting to int * and a new function func_vla would replace func_N:

```
void func(int M, int N, int *array);
void func_vla(int M, int N, int array[M][N]);
...
int M = 4, N = 16;
int (*array)[N];
array = calloc(M, sizeof(*array));
array[i][j] = 1;
func(M, N, (int *)array);
func_vla(M, N, array);
Version ≥ C11
```

Note: VLAs are optional as of C11. If your implementation supports C11 and defines the macro __STDC_N0_VLA__ to 1, you are stuck with the pre-C99 methods.

Credits

Thank you greatly to all the people from Stack Overflow Documentation who helped provide this content, more changes can be sent to web@petercv.com for new content to be published or updated

<u>2501</u> Chapters 23, 28, 33, 34 and 36

<u>3442</u> Chapter 4

4386427 Chapters 11, 19 and 46

AB Chapter 19

<u>abacles</u> Chapters 61 and 63

Aleksi Torhamo Chapter 12
Aleksi Torhamo Chapter 28
Alex Chapter 55
Alex Garcia Chapter 30

alk Chapters 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 21, 24, 25, 28, 30, 37, 40, 43,

44, 46, 49 and 63

Altece Chapter 22
Amani Kilumanga Chapter 4

<u>AnArrayOfFunctions</u> Chapters 10 and 44

<u>Andrea Corbelli</u> Chapter 4

Andrey MarkeevChapters 6 and 46AnkushChapters 1, 2, 46 and 61Antti HaapalaChapters 22, 28 and 46ArmaliChapters 23, 28 and 54

<u>ArturFH</u> Chapter 1

AShelly Chapters 10 and 33

Bakhtiar HasanChapter 4Ben SteffanChapter 28BenGChapter 4

<u>bevenson</u> Chapters 6, 11, 16, 20, 30, 37, 38 and 63

Blacksilver Chapters 37 and 44

Blagovest Buyukliev Chapters 3, 14, 33, 41 and 43

blatinoxChapter 4BobChapter 5Braden BestChapter 5

bta Chapters 22, 28 and 33

BurnsBA Chapter 28
Buser Chapter 42
catalogue_number Chapter 6
cdrini Chapter 10

<u>Chandrahas Aroori</u> Chapters 2, 42 and 61

chqrlieChapter 1Chris SpragueChapter 6ChristophChapter 28

<u>Chrono Kitsune</u> Chapters 6, 13, 43 and 63

CimbaliChapter 35clearlightChapter 63Cody GrayChapter 6cshuChapter 28cSmoutChapter 10c□L□s□□□Chapter 59DaBlerChapter 28

<u>Daksh Gupta</u> Chapter 46 <u>Damien</u> Chapters 4 and 6

DanielChapter 6Daniel JourChapter 28Daniel PorteousChapter 22

<u>Dariusz</u> Chapters 4, 10, 30 and 31

DarkDust Chapter 28 Chapter 24 David Refaeli deamentiaemundi Chapter 26 <u>depperm</u> Chapter 6 **Devansh Tandon** Chapter 61 dhein Chapter 46 <u>dkrmr</u> Chapter 46 **Dmitry Grigoryev** Chapter 63 Chapter 22 Don't You Worry Child **Donald Duck** Chapter 1 doppelheathen Chapter 46 Dreamer Chapter 63

drov Chapters 19 and 61

<u>DrPrltay</u> Chapter 30 <u>Dunno</u> Chapter 63

dvhh Chapters 19 and 46

dylanweberChapter 6e.jahandarChapter 22Ed CottrellChapter 1

Elazar Chapters 10 and 13

Eli Sadoff Chapter 10

elslooo Chapters 22 and 46

embedded guy Chapter 39
EOF Chapter 46
erebos Chapter 22

EsmaeelE Chapters 1, 13, 38 and 45 eush77 Chapters 32 and 33

<u>EvilTeach</u> Chapter 9

<u>Faisal Mudhir</u> Chapters 16 and 22 <u>Fantastic Mr Fox</u> Chapters 4, 9 and 22

<u>fastlearner</u> Chapter 30

FedeWar Chapters 6, 22 and 63

Filip Allberg Chapter 24

Firas Moalla Chapters 10 and 22

<u>fluter</u> Chapter 21

<u>foxtrot9</u> Chapters 18 and 22

Fred Barclay Chapter 63
ganchito55 Chapter 29
ganesh kumar Chapter 25

Gavin Higham Chapters 22 and 63

gdc Chapter 46 George Stocker Chapter 25

Giorgi Moniava Chapters 22, 28 and 63

gmug Chapter 13

GoodDeeds Chapters 15 and 42
gsamaras Chapters 4 and 28
haccks Chapters 6, 8, 22 and 23

haltodeChapter 22Harry JohnstonChapter 22Hemant KumarChapter 22hexwabChapter 29

hlovdal Chapters 24, 30 and 63

<u>hmijail</u> Chapter 28

honk Chapters 28 and 46

hrsChapter 4immerhartChapter 14InsaneChapter 5

iRove Chapters 11 and 20 Ishay Peled Chapters 6 and 63

Iskar JarakChapter 1Iwillnotexist IdonotexistChapter 4Jacob HChapter 28Jasmin SolankiChapter 10

jasoninnn Chapters 6 and 12

javac Chapter 30

<u>Jean</u> Chapters 6, 28, 32, 37, 39 and 43

<u>Jean Vitor</u> Chapter 20

Jens Gustedt Chapters 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34,

35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 55 and 57

<u>Jeremy Thien</u> Chapter 63
<u>Jeremy Thien</u> Chapter 40

Jesferman Chapters 41 and 45

John Bode Chapter 28
Chapter 23

John Bollinger Chapters 6, 10, 28, 35 and 47

John BurgerChapter 24John HascallChapter 63JonasCzChapter 1

Ionathan Leffler Chapters 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 28, 30, 32, 33, 39, 42, 44,

45, 46, 49, 50, 53, 59, 61, 62 and 63

<u>Jonathon Reinhart</u> Chapter 44

<u>lossi</u> Chapters 11, 21, 33, 37 and 56

<u>Juan T</u> Chapter 1

juleslasne Chapters 1 and 46

<u>Justin</u> Chapter 30

jxh Chapters 15, 33 and 37

KamiccoloChapter 28kamoroso94Chapter 13kdopenChapter 4Ken YChapter 3

Kerrek SB Chapters 8 and 18

<u>Klas Lindbäck</u> Chapter 7 <u>Kusalananda</u> Chapter 1

<u>L.V.Rao</u> Chapters 4, 10, 15, 16, 22, 43 and 52

Lanel Chapter 22 lardenn Chapter 21

<u>Leandros</u> Chapters 1, 3, 4, 10, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31 and 33

<u>LiHRaM</u> Chapter 1

<u>Liju Thomas</u> Chapters 10, 17 and 45

<u>Lord Farquaad</u> Chapter 63

Luiz Berti Chapter 46 Lundin Chapter 40

<u>madD7</u> Chapters 9, 41, 43 and 46

Madhusoodan P Chapter 30

Malcolm McLean Chapters 6, 15, 19, 20, 22, 24, 26, 29, 33, 46 and 49

MalickChapter 1manav mChapter 14mantalChapter 6

Mark Yisri Chapters 1, 28 and 46

Martin Chapter 28
Matthieu Chapter 46

MC93 Chapters 1 and 37

mhk Chapter 10Michael Fitzpatrick Chapter 22

MikeCAT Chapters 4, 6, 16, 22, 25, 28 and 63

mirabilos Chapters 31 and 32

mpromonetChapter 35Nemanja BoricChapter 28NeoRChapter 16

Neui Chapters 43 and 46
Nitinkumar Ambekar Chapters 22, 30 and 43

Nityesh Agarwal Chapter 62

noamgot Chapters 4 and 16

OiciTrap Chapter 1

OznOg Chapters 10, 12 and 16

<u>P.P.</u> Chapters 1, 4, 6, 16, 17, 22, 28, 43, 46 and 57

<u>pandaman1234</u> Chapters 10, 16, 49 and 60

Parham AlvaniChapter 58PassionInfiniteChapter 53Paul HutchinsonChapter 9Paul VChapter 46Paul92Chapters 4 and 7PeterChapters 4 and 28PhotometricStereoChapters 13 and 42

polarysekt Chapter 21 **PSN** Chapter 1 Chapter 6 **Purag Qrchack** Chapter 37 R. Joiny Chapter 37 Chapter 1 Rakitić RamenChef Chapter 56 Chapter 10 Ray

<u>reshad</u> Chapters 15 and 20 <u>Richard Chambers</u> Chapters 25 and 30

Rishikesh Raje Chapter 9
Robert Baldyga Chapter 30

Roland Illig Chapters 51 and 63

rxantos Chapter 63

Ryan Haining Chapters 10 and 33

Ryan Hilbert Chapter 1
Shog9 Chapter 19
Shrinivas Patgar Chapter 26
Shubham Agrawal Chapter 62

signalChapter 22Sirsireesh KodaliChapter 52skrtbhtngrChapter 1slugonamissionChapter 22SnaipeChapter 20sohnryangChapter 1

someoneigna Chapters 22 and 25

Sourav GhoshChapter 49SpideyChapter 22SrikarChapter 46

<u>stackptr</u> Chapters 1, 4, 6, 10, 20, 22, 24, 27, 30, 33, 46 and 63

StardustGogeta Chapter 21 still_learning Chapter 6 Sun Qingyao Chapter 34

<u>syb0rg</u> Chapters 1, 6, 19, 20, 22, 37, 46 and 49

Chapter 63 **Tamarous** tbodt Chapter 46 techEmbedded Chapter 63 the sudhakar Chapter 46 thndrwrks Chapter 22 Chapter 45 tilz0R **Tim Post** Chapter 33 Chapter 1 tlhIngan

Toby

Chapters 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 22, 28, 29, 32, 37, 42, 46,

49, 51, 52, 53, 56, 58, 59, 60 and 63

tofro Chapters 16, 37 and 46

<u>Turtle</u> Chapter 37

tversteeg Chapters 20, 28 and 41

<u>user45891</u> Chapter 28

<u>user5389107</u> Chapters 4, 5 and 10

v7d8dpo4 Chapter 30

Vality Chapters 13, 22, 54 and 56

vasili111Chapter 1VinChapter 1Vivek SChapter 46

<u>Vraj Pandya</u> Chapters 1 and 37 <u>vuko_zrno</u> Chapters 46 and 60

William Pursell Chapter 20

Wolf Chapters 4 and 6

Woodrow Barlow Chapter 19
Wyzard Chapter 46
Yotam Salmon Chapter 19

<u>Алексей Неудачин</u> Chapters 6, 22 and 37

You may also like

















