Bad C++ Code

Las Vegas C/C++ Meetup Group - Tuesday October 9th, 2018

Presented by: Ray Imber



Types of Bad C++

- Syntax Errors
- Semantic Errors
- Logic Errors
- Code Design Errors

Generally Easy to Catch by Compiler / Easy to Fix

Generally Hard to Catch by Compiler / Hard to Fix

Syntax Errors

Missing semicolons

```
a = x+y

b = m/n;
```

Missing comment tags

```
/* comment line 1
Statement1;
Statement2;
/* comment line 2 */
Statement 3;
```

- Misplaced semicolons
- Compiler won't catch this one!

```
for(i =1; i<=10; i++);
sum = sum + i;
```

- Missing Braces
- Compiler won't catch this either

```
for(i=1;i<=10;i++)
    sum1=sum1+i;
    sum2=sum2+i*i;
printf("%d%dn",sum1,sum2);</pre>
```

- Precedence of Operators
- Compiler won't catch this one

Omitting Parentheses around Arguments in Macro Definitions

```
#define f(x) x*x+1 y=f(a+b);
```

Omitting Parentheses around Arguments in Macro Definitions

```
#define f(x) x*x+1
y=f(a+b);

Evaluates As:
y=a+b * a+b+1;
```

• Using assignment for equality comparison

```
Char done = 'Y';
while (done = 'Y')
{
    cout << "Continue? (Y/N)"; cin >> done;
}
```

• Using assignment for equality comparison

```
Char done = 'Y';
while (done == 'Y')
{
    cout << "Continue? (Y/N)"; cin >> done;
}
```

Semantic Errors

- Array Bounds / Off by one
- Compiler won't catch this one
- In real world scenarios it's not as obvious (array may be passed in as a parameter or dynamic)

```
int x[10], sum, i;
for(i=1; i<=10; i++)
    sum=sum+x[i];</pre>
```

Using an Uninitialized Pointer

```
main()
{
    int a,*ptr;
    a=25;
    *ptr=a+5;
}
```

Missing/Incorrect Pointer Operators

```
main()
{
    int m;
    int *p1;
    m=25;
    p1=m;
    printf("%d\n",*p1);
}
```

Incorrect Arguments Passed to Scanf()

```
main()
{
    int code;
    scanf("%d", code);
}
```

- Incorrect Arguments Passed to Scanf()
- Scanf() takes pointers!

```
main()
{
    int code;
    scanf("%d", &code);
}
```

Switch Statements and Break Statements

```
int x = 2;
switch(x)
{
    case 2:
        cout << "two" << endl;
    case 3:
        cout << "three" << endl;
}</pre>
```

Switch Statements and Break Statements

```
int x = 2;
switch(x)
{
    case 2:
        cout << "two" << endl;
        break;
    case 3:
        cout << "three" << endl;
        break;
}</pre>
```

Writing to a string literal

```
main() {
    char * c = "hello";
    *c = 'B';
}
```

Writing to a string literal

```
main() {
    char c[] = "hello";
    *c = 'B';
}
```

delete[] on new or delete on new[]

```
main() {
    Foo *bar = new Foo();
    Foo *bars = new Foo[100];
    //....
    delete[] bar;
    delete bars;
}
```

- delete[] on new or delete on new[]
- Don't use new or delete. Use smart pointers / std data structures instead
- Std::uniqe_ptr
- std::Vector

Most vexing parse

```
class Timer {
  public:
    Timer();
};

class TimeKeeper {
    public:
    TimeKeeper(const Timer& t);
    int get_time();
};
```

TimeKeeper time keeper(Timer());

Is it:

Or

a <u>variable</u> definition for variable time_keeper of class
 TimeKeeper, initialized with an anonymous instance of class Timer

 a <u>function declaration</u> for a function time_keeper that returns an object of type TimeKeeper and has a single (unnamed) parameter that is a pointer to function returning type Timer (and taking no input).

Most vexing parse https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Most_vexing_parse

```
class Timer {
  public:
    Timer();
};

class TimeKeeper {
  public:
    TimeKeeper(const Timer& t);
    int get_time();
};
```

TimeKeeper time keeper(Timer());

Believe it or not, the C++ standard requires it to be the second option:

 a <u>function declaration</u> for a function time_keeper that returns an object of type TimeKeeper and has a single (unnamed) parameter that is a pointer to function returning type Timer (and taking no input).

Most vexing parse

Can be fixed by extra parenthesis:

```
TimeKeeper time_keeper( (Timer()) );
```

Or

Variable Initialization

```
TimeKeeper time_keeper = TimeKeeper(Timer());
```

Logic Errors

```
void SomeMethod()
{
   ClassA *a = new ClassA;
   SomeOtherMethod();
   delete a;
}
```

```
void SomeMethod()
{
   ClassA *a = new ClassA;
   SomeOtherMethod();
   delete a;
}
Can throw an exception!
```

Side Note: RAII

Resource acquisition is initialization

It's about Destruction as well as Creation of Objects

Applies to Pointers, but also other resources such as network or file handles

Smart Pointers are the perfect example of RAII

The technique was developed for exception-safe resource management in C++ primarily by Bjarne Stroustrup and Andrew Koenig

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Resource_acquisition_is_initialization

```
class MyString : public std::string
{
      ~MyString() {
       // ...
      }
};
int main()
{
    std::string *s = new MyString();
    delete s;
}
```

Won't call the custom virtual destructor b/c it thinks it's a std::string not a MyString!

Where is the Memory leak?

```
void func(void)
{
    std::unique_ptr<int> my_array(new int[5]);
}
int main()
{
    func();
    Return 0;
}
```

A smart pointer will call a delete operator without [] brackets if you don't tell it that you are pointing to an array!

```
void func(void)
{
    std::unique_ptr<int[]> my_array(new int[5]);
}
int main()
{
    func();
    Return 0;
}
```

```
Complex& SumComplex(const Complex& a, const Complex& b)
{
    Complex result;
    .....
    return result;
}
Complex& sum = SumComplex(a, b);
```

```
Complex& SumComplex(const Complex& a, const Complex& b)
{
    Complex result;
    .....
    return result;
}

Result is a local variable, created on the stack. It will go away as soon as the function returns!

Complex& sum = SumComplex(a, b);
```

```
Complex SumComplex(const Complex& a, const Complex& b)
{
    return Complex(a.real + b.real, a.imaginar + b.imaginar);
}
Complex sum = SumComplex(a, b);
```

For most of today's compilers, if a return line contains a constructor of an object the code will be optimized to avoid all unnecessary copying - the constructor will be executed directly on the "sum" object.

What happens with this code?

writeToLog() throws an exception

two exceptions in parallel, no matter whether they are of the same type or different type the C++ runtime environment does not know how to handle it and will terminate!

The catch is never called!

```
vector<string> v;
v.push_back("string1");
string& s1 = v[0]; // reference
vector<string>::iterator iter = v.begin(); // iterator
v.push_back("string2");
cout << s1; // access to a reference
cout << *iter; // access to an iterator</pre>
```

This is more common in multithreaded code

```
#include <iostream>
#include <fstream>
int main()
  std::ifstream in("input.txt");
  if (!in.is open())
    std::cerr << "Failed to open file\n";</pre>
    return 1;
  int i, j, k;
  in \gg i \gg j \gg k;
  std::cout << calculate(i, j, k);</pre>
```

always check your I/O operations!

What happens if the read operation failed? I,j, and k are just garbage

```
#include <iostream>
#include <fstream>
int main()
  std::ifstream in("input.txt");
  if (!in.is open())
    std::cerr << "Failed to open file\n";</pre>
    return 1;
  int i, j, k;
  in >> i >> j >> k;
  std::cout << calculate(i, j, k);</pre>
  return 0;
```

Common Logic Errors int i, j, k;

always check your I/O operations!

```
if (in \gg i \gg j \gg k)
  std::cout << calculate(i, j, k);</pre>
else
  std::cerr <<
    "Failed to read values from the
file!\n";
  throw std::runtime error("Invalid input
file");
```

```
class A
                                                          void func1(A a)
public:
                                                             std::string name = a.GetName();
   virtual std::string GetName() const {return "A";}
};
                                                          B b;
class B: public A
                                                          func1(b);
public:
   virtual std::string GetName() const {return "B";}
```

The slicing problem:

This code will compile. Calling of the "func1" function will create a partial copy of the object "b", i.e. it will copy only class "A"'s part of the object "b" to the object "a".

```
class A
                                                           void func1(&A a)
public:
                                                              std::string name = a.GetName();
   virtual std::string GetName() const {return "A";}
};
                                                           B b;
class B: public A
                                                           func1(b);
public:
   virtual std::string GetName() const {return "B";}
   . . .
```

The Slicing Problem is common when handling exceptions!

```
using request_id = uint32_t;
using receiver_id = uint32_t;

token remove(request_id req, receiver_id rec);

token init_remove(receiver_id receiver)
{
  auto req = new_request();
  return remove(receiver, req);
}
```

• What's wrong with this code?

```
using request_id = uint32_t;
using receiver_id = uint32_t;

token remove(request_id req, receiver_id rec);

token init_remove(receiver_id receiver)
{
  auto req = new_request();
  return remove(receiver, req);
}
```

The arguments are swapped, But they are both ints! No compiler help!

Strongly Typed C++ / Named Types / Tagged Types

- https://vimeo.com/292931307
- don't use naked ints. Use distinct types to signal intent (units of measure / handles / etc...)
- don't use magic numbers
- times and durations in std::chrono are the perfect example
- Libraries to help with this:
- https://github.com/joboccara/NamedType

Code Design Errors

"Code Smell"

popularised by <u>Kent Beck</u> on <u>WardsWiki</u> in the late 1990s

 certain structures in the code that indicate violation of fundamental design principles or negatively impact code

Not technically bugs (but can be)

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Code_smell

Examples of Code Smell

- Duplicated code: identical or very similar code exists in more than one location.
- Contrived complexity: forced usage of over complicated design patterns where simpler design would suffice.
- Shotgun surgery: a single change needs to be applied to multiple classes at the same time.
- Too many parameters to a function
- Excessively long line of code
- Excessively Long method or Class
- Cyclomatic complexity: too many branches or loops; this may indicate a function needs to be broken up into smaller functions, or that it has potential for simplification.
- Many more....

Good C++

https://cpppatterns.com/

Good Resource for common C++ idioms and patterns with detailed explanations.

https://isocpp.org/faq

The official ISO C++ FAQ
Detailed explanations of common C++ questions written by the
Very people in charge of C++



Resources

- https://isocpp.org/faq
- https://cpppatterns.com/
- http://wiki.c2.com/?ClassicOoAntiPatterns
- https://www.toptal.com/c-plus-plus/top-10-common-c-plus-plus-developer-mistakes
- https://www.learncpp.com/cpp-programming/eight-c-programming-mistakes-the-compiler-wontcatch/
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Most vexing parse
- https://www.reddit.com/r/cpp/comments/489f9l/open source projects with examples of good modern/
- https://speakerdeck.com/rollbear/ndc-techtown-type-safe-c-plus-plus-lol
- https://vimeo.com/292931307
- https://www.boost.org/doc/libs/1 68 O/libs/gil/doc/html/index.html
- https://github.com/NVIDIA/cuda-samples
- https://github.com/GPUOpen-Tools