

## Exercise 1: Due December 20

Note: The questions are specified in sloppy way to encourage you to formalize and prove the meaning of these questions and their answers.

### Galois Connections

1. Prove that the two alternative definitions of Galois connections are indeed equivalent.
2. Let  $L$  be a lattice of abstract elements. Let  $\beta: \text{State} \rightarrow L$  be the extraction function, i.e.,  $\beta(\sigma)$  is the most precise conservative approximation of  $\sigma$  in  $L$  (as defined in class). Show the Galois connection from  $P(\text{States}) \rightarrow L$  induced by  $\beta$  and prove that it is indeed a Galois connection.
3. Show that the opposite direction of 2. also holds, i.e., for every Galois connection from  $P(\text{States})$  to  $L$  there exists such an extraction function  $\beta$ .

### Pointer Analysis

1. Show that the abstract transformer of simple assignment  $x := y$  is indeed the best (induced)
2. Show that the abstract transformer of  $x := y$  is distributive (additive)
3. Is the abstract transformer of  $*x := y$  distributive?
4. Is the abstract transformer of  $*x := y$  the best one (induced)?

## Interval Analysis

1. Show that the abstract meaning of the statement  $x := x + c$  in the interval analysis is the best (induced).
2. Generalize the domain of intervals to handle arbitrary number of program variables and show that it is a lattice and the generalized widening and narrowing. Define the Galois connection. Is it a Galois insertion?
3. Apply the Chaotic iteration algorithm with widening and narrowing to the [C program](#) and determine which of the array references to *stack* are guaranteed to be safe and what kind of runtime test is needed to guarantee safety (using the resultant intervals.)
4. Consider the following generalized [C program](#) which illustrates the usage of dynamic arrays in C (Java offers better facilities to define such arrays). Apply interval analysis to determine the potential values of the variable *top*. You can ignore statements that cannot affect the values of *top*.

(Bonus) Develop an abstract domain which is precise enough to show that no array violations in C (and Java) programs with dynamic arrays. For simplicity, you can assume that the program manipulates a single array allocated using malloc with a designated variable, say *size*. Hint: one way to do that is to combine the lattice of signs with a domain which includes binary relationships between program variables. In the example program, we need to know that inside the print loop just before `stack[i]` is accessed,  $0 \leq i < top \leq size$ . This can be represented using three components:

- a. All the variables are positive
- b. The set  $\{(i, i), (i, top), (i, size), (top, top), (top, size), (size, size)\}$  which represents the inequalities:  
 $i \leq i, i \leq top, i \leq size, top \leq top, top \leq size, size \leq size$
- c. The set  $\{(i, top), (i, size)\}$  which represents the

inequalities:  $i < top$ ,  $i < size$ .

Define the domain and the Galois connection. Apply chaotic iterations to the example program with dynamic arrays.