According to Frama-C RTE 4 runtime errors could happen: 01. 1. a memory error when executing T[x]=y if x<02. a memory error when executing T[x]=y if x>=53. an integer overflow when executing x=x+14. an integer overflow when executing y=y+100Q2. Running Frama-C EVA we get the following results: - EVA is not able to prove that error 2 won't occur - EVA is not able to prove that error 4 won't occur The 2 other errors are discharged (they will definitely not occur) Q3. Running a VSA by hand we get the following results at the entry of each babsic block: * without widening, the loop is unrolled up to termination: (note that variable y is *not* constrained by condition of block B1) Entering B0 x=bot, y=bot Entering B1 x=[0,6], y=[0,600] Entering B2 x=[0,5], y=[0,600] Entering B3 x=[1,5], y=[0,600] Entering B4 x=[0,6], y=[0,600] Entering B5 x=[6,6], y=[0,600] We get the same conclusion than Frama-C for error 2, but not for error 4 (no integer overflow when incrementing y) * with widening/narrowing, variables are set to +infty after one iteration: (note that variable y is *not* narrowed by condition of block B1) Entering B0 x=bot, y=bot Entering B1 x=[0,6], y=[0,+infty] Entering B2 x=[0,5], y=[0,+infty] Entering B3 x=[1,5], y=[0,+infty] Entering B4 x=[0,6], y=[0,+infty] Entering B5 x=[6,6], y=[0,+infty] We get the same conclusions than Frama-C. * According to the normal program execution, error 1 may really occur at runtime,

but error 2 will not occur. This last error is therefore a false positive. (Frama-C is not able to discharge because it cannot catch the implicit relation between x and y,

which is caught without using widening/narrowing).

Exo 1

```
Q4. For N=1000 we would get:
Entering B0
      x=bot, y=bot
Entering B1
      x=[0,1001], y=[0,+infty]
Entering B2
      x=[0,1000], y=[0,+infty]
Entering B3
      x=[1,999], y=[0,+infty]
Entering B4
      x=[0,1000], y=[0,+infty]
Entering B5
      x=[1001,1001], y=[0,+infty]
Here error 2 is discharged, because within B3 we have x<1000.
However, error 4 is not discharged, and it is still a false positive ....
Q5.
We want to check under which conditions on N we would get a buffer overflow at
line 11.
To do so we need to express a constraint on N (considered as a symbolic value)
telling whether line 11 can be executed with x<0 or x>=N.
In practice, since the value of N impacts the number of loop iterations, we need
to enumerate several values of N
(since each of them leads to a different path predicate for reaching line 11).
For instance, we should consider the following constraints:
  - no iteration
      N=0 and x=0 and x<N+1 and x%2=1 and (x<0 or x>=N),
      which is not satisfiable
  - 1 iteration
      N=1 and x=0 and x<N+1 and x%2=1 and (x<0 or x>=N) and
      x_{1=x+1} and x_{1<N+1} and x_{1>2=1} and (x_{1<0} \text{ or } x_{1>=N}),
            which is satisfiable since x1=1.
  - 2 iterations
      N=2 and x=0 and x<N+1 and x%2=1 and (x<0 or x>=N) and
      x1=x+1 and x1<N+1 and x1%2=1 and (x1<0 or x1>=N) and
      x2=x1+1 and x2<N+1 and x2%2=1 and (x2<0 or x2>=N)
        which is not satisfiable
  - etc.
In conclusion the best we can do here is to check a *finite* set of constraints
```

(corresponding to each numbers of iterations), and we will get an error whenever N is odd.

But we won't be able to conclude for *any* value of N ...