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Abstract. We discuss the use of abstract interpretation in the contextin
3 Efficiency versus Precision

Among applications of abstract interpretation there have been many where somewhat imprecise answers to undecidable questions are tolerable provided all answers are sound and the imprecision rate remains low (typically 5 to 15%). This is the case for static program analysis when applied to program optimization (such as static elimination of run-time array bound checks where imprecision means delaying few array bound checks at run-time [13]), typing (where some programs which cannot go wrong are not typable) [8] or to program transformation (such as partial evaluation where any static value can always be considered dynamic, the transformed program being simply less efficient) [12], etc. In that case the analysis must be more efficient than precise. So coarse abstractions can be used which allow for the design of time and memory efficient static analyzers scaling up for very large programs.

4 Precision versus Efficiency

In the context of automatic program verification where human interaction must be reduced to a strict minimum, false alarms are undesirable. A 5% rate of false alarms on a program of a few hundred thousand lines would require several person-years effort to manually prove that no error is possible.

Fortunately, the abstract interpretation theory shows that for any program (or finite set of programs), it is possible to achieve full precision and great efficiency [14] by discovering an appropriate abstract domain. In the following we discuss the user-guided design of such abstract domains leading to precise and efficient analyzes.

5 Program-Specific Finite Abstraction

The use of a specific abstraction for a given hardware or software computer system (often called a model [15]) explains the popularity of abstract model checking [16]: it is always possible to provide an appropriate model of a given computer system which will model-check for the given property to be verified. The difficulty is how to get this appropriate model from a formal specification of the computer system such as a program. Most fully automatic methods, such as software model-checking [17,18], do not proceed directly on the software but on a user-provided finite and small model, which is difficult to design when e.g. sharp data properties must be taken into account. Moreover models for one program are hardly reusable for another program so efforts to design different models for different programs can hardly be cumulated.

6 Foundations of Predicate Abstraction

Predicate abstraction, which consists in specifying a boolean abstraction of software by providing the atomic elements of the abstract domain in logical form
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[19], is certainly the most studied alternative [20,21,22]. Using a theorem prover, it is possible to automatically generate the abstract model in boolean form from the user-provided basic predicates and then to reuse existing model checkers. Moreover most implementations incorporate an automatic refinement process by success and failure [20,23] so that the abstraction can be partly automated.

We will first recall that predicate abstraction is an abstract interpretation and show why.

7 Predicate Abstraction in the Large

Then we will discuss a number of difficulties which in light of a recent experience in software verification [24] seem insurmountable to automate this design process in the present state of the art of deductive methods:

**Problems of Semantics:** for C programs, the prover which is used to automatically design abstract transfer functions has to take the machine-level semantics into account (e.g. floating-point arithmetic with rounding errors as opposed to real numbers). For example ESC is simply unsound with respect to modulo arithmetics [25].

**State Explosion Problem:** for large programs, the number of needed basic predicates can be huge. One difficulty is that model checking algorithms have worst-case behavior that is exponential in the number of predicates in the model which leads to state explosion. Another difficulty is to anticipate a priori which set of predicates introduced in the abstraction will be ultimately useful in the program analysis. The main successes seem to be when the full program can be abstracted very roughly into a small skeleton [15].

**Refinement Problem:** predicate abstraction per se uses a finite domain and is therefore of limited expressive power in comparison with the use of infinite abstract domains [6]. Therefore predicate abstraction is often accompanied by a refinement process to cope with false alarms [20,23]. Under specific conditions, this refinement can be proved equivalent to the use of an infinite abstract domain with widening [26]. This result is of limited scope since these specific conditions (essentially that the widening is by constraint elimination) are not satisfied e.g. by the staged widening with thresholds of [24]. Formally this counterexample-based refinement is a fixpoint computation [14,27] at the concrete semantics level, whence introduces new elements in the abstract domain state by state. In general, this process is very costly so that the needed predicates have to be provided by hand which introduces prohibitive human and computational costs for end-users.

8 Generic Abstractions

Finally we discuss a more synthetic general point of view based on the use of adequate parameterized abstract domains and iteration strategies with efficient implementations. This can be used to generate abstractions for specific classes
of programs and properties to get efficient generic analyzers producing few or none false alarms [24].
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