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ABSTRACT

Context-sensitive points-to analysis is the current most scalable technology for constructing a precise control-flow graph for large object-oriented programs. One appealing feature of this framework is that it is parametric thus allowing to trade time for precision. Typical instances of this framework are $k$-CFAs and Agesen’s Cartesian Product Algorithm (CPA). It is common sense that $k$-CFAs (for increasing $k$s) form a hierarchy. Yet, what is the relative precision of $k$-CFA and CPA? Grove and Chambers [2] conjecture that CPA is more precise than $\infty$-CFA. For a core object-oriented language, we formally compare the precision of $\infty$-CFA and CPA. We prove that CPA is indeed strictly more precise than $\infty$-CFA. On a theoretical level, this result confirms the findings of empiric studies concluding the superiority of object-sensitivity with respect to call-string sensitivity.

1. INTRODUCTION

Context-sensitive points-to analysis is a scalable technology for constructing precise control-flow graphs of object-oriented programs. It allows for aggressive inter-procedural optimisations and improves the precision of client analyses [2, 7, 6]. The output of the analysis is a control-flow graph and a points-to graph abstracting the memory heap. For the baseline (context-insensitive) analysis, nodes in the control-flow graph are method names and nodes in the points-to graph are class names. For object-oriented programs such context insensitive graphs are far too imprecise. To improve the accuracy context-sensitive analyses account for the fact that the same method can be run in different call-contexts and that the same class can be instantiated in different allocation-contexts. For context-sensitive analyses, a node in the control-flow graph is a method name tagged by a call-context and a node in the points-to graph is a class name tagged with an allocation-context.

As early as 1991, Palsberg and Schwartzbach [10, 11] propose a theoretical parametric framework for typing object-oriented programs. In their setting, context-sensitivity is obtained by explicit code duplication and typing amounts to analysing the expanded code in a context-insensitive manner. The framework accommodates for both call-contexts and allocation-contexts. In particular, it accommodates for the well-known $k$-CFA hierarchy abstracting the call-context by a call-string made of the last $k$ invocation sites. For Self, a language with multiple dispatch, Agesen [1] proposes the Cartesian Product Algorithm (CPA) which abstracts the call-context by the cartesian product of the abstract objects argument of the call.

To assess the respective merits of different instantiations, scalable implementations are needed. For Cecil and Java programs, Grove et al., [3, 2] have explored the algorithmic design space of contexts for benchmarks of significant size. Latter on, Milanova et al., [7] have evaluated, for Java programs, a notion of context called object-sensitivity which abstracts the call-context by the abstraction of the this pointer\(^1\). More recently, Lhotak and Hendren [6] have extended the empiric evaluation of object-sensitivity using a BDD implementation allowing to cope with benchmarks otherwise out-of-scope. The findings of the more recent empiric studies are consistent and conclude that object-sensitivity performs better than call-string sensitivity – for the Java benchmarks considered.

Hind [4] discusses the difficulty of assessing the merits of a pointer analysis: it depends on various factors including the language, benchmarks and client analyses. Yet, from a theoretical standpoint, there are known facts about the respective precision of context-sensitive points-to analyses. Grove and Chambers [2, Figure 19] picture a comprehensive map of context-sensitive analyses ordered by precision of the computed graph. In this map there are analyses for which the relative precision is only conjectured. In particular, CPA is conjectured to be (strictly) more precise than $\infty$-CFA.

The main contribution of this paper is a formal proof that CPA is strictly more precise than $\infty$-CFA. Other contributions include the definition of a minimal object-oriented calculus modeling standard dispatch mechanisms in a uniform manner; and a generic soundness proof of context-sensitive points-to analyses. Moreover, the formal development is mechanised inside the Coq proof assistant\(^2\).

\(^{\ast}\)This work was partly funded by the IST-FET programme of the European Commission, under the IST-2005-015905 MOBIUS project.

\(^{1}\)At level 1, object-sensitivity is a trimmed down version of the CPA.

\(^{2}\)The commented Coq source code can be browsed at http://www.irisia.fr/celtique/fbesson/CPABeatsCFA
The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Notations are gathered in Section 2. In Section 3, we introduce the syntax and semantics of our core object-oriented language. In Section 4, we present the specification and generic soundness proof of context-sensitive analyses. In Section 5, we formally show how to relate different analyses and prove that CPA is strictly more precise than \( \infty \)-CFA. Section 6 concludes.

2. NOTATIONS

Given sets \( A \) and \( B \), we write \( A \rightarrow B \) for the set of partial functions from \( A \) to \( B \). Let \( f : A \rightarrow B, f[x \mapsto v] \) is the function identical to \( f \) everywhere except for \( x \) for which it returns \( v \). For a function \( f : A \rightarrow B \), when we write \( f(x) = y \), \( y \) is (implicitly) an element of \( B \) i.e., \( y \neq \perp \). Tuples with \( k \) elements are written \((e_1, \ldots, e_k)\). When it is clear from the context, brackets are dropped. We write \( A^* \) for the sets of lists with elements in \( A \). The empty list is written \( \epsilon \) and \( e::l \) is the list whose head is \( e \) and tail is \( l \). The null pointer, written \( 0 \), is always distinct from any other addresses \( Addr \). Therefore, we shall write \( Addr_0 \) for the set of addresses extended with the null pointer. We write \( \alpha \) for an arbitrary address distinct from \( 0 \).

3. A CORE O-O LANGUAGE

In this section we define a minimal core language for reasoning about the inter-procedural control-flow of imperative object-oriented languages. Unlike e.g., Featherweight Java [5], our language is not about high-level object-oriented concepts such as classes and inheritance. Even methods are absent and a program is simply given by a list of statements and a dynamic method lookup function.

3.1 Syntax and semantics

We consider (finite) sets of class names \( Class \), method names \( Meth \), field names \( Field \) and variables names \( Var \) \((\{v_0, v_1\} \subseteq Var)\). A program \( p \in Prog \) is a list of statements together with a lookup function.

\[
\begin{align*}
S & \triangleq copy(v, v') \mid new(c) \mid read(f) \mid write(f) \\
Lkup & \triangleq (Var \rightarrow Class) \rightarrow Meth \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \\
Prog & \triangleq S^* \times Lkup
\end{align*}
\]

where \( v, v' \in Var, c \in Class, f \in Field, m \in Meth \).

Our statements are a restricted form of 3 address code. To give them an intuitive meaning, the syntactic translation between these formats is given below.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{copy}(v, v') & \leadsto v := v' \\
\text{new}(c) & \leadsto v_0 := \text{new}(c) \\
\text{read}(f) & \leadsto v_0 := v_0.f \rightarrow v_0.f := v_1
\end{align*}
\]

Because the lookup function has type \((Var \rightarrow Class) \rightarrow Meth \rightarrow \mathbb{N}\), it models uniformly different kinds of dispatch. In general, we get multiple-dispatch for which the target of the call depends on all of the arguments of the caller. Single dispatch is obtained if only the receiver, say \( v_0 \), selects the target of the call. Function pointers are degenerated cases of single dispatch for which \( Class = \mathbb{N} \) and \( Meth = \{\bullet\} \). A static method call is a further specialisation for which only the method name \( m \) is used to resolve the call.

The language is equipped with a standard small-steps operational semantics. A program state is a pair \((b, (pc, e)::f) \in Heap \times Frame^+\) where \((1) p \in \mathbb{N} \) is the current program counter i.e., the index in the program of the instruction to be executed next; \((2) e \in Env \) is a local environment mapping variables to addresses; \((3) h \in Heap \) maps allocated addresses to objects; \((4) f \in Frame^* \) is a stack of frames recording caller contexts. Formal definitions of the semantics domains are given below:

\[
\begin{align*}
Env & \triangleq Var \rightarrow Addr_0 \\
Frame & \triangleq \mathbb{N} \times Env \\
Object & \triangleq Class \times (Field \rightarrow Addr_0) \\
Heap & \triangleq Addr \rightarrow Object_\bot \\
State & \triangleq Heap \times Frame^+ \\
\end{align*}
\]

We consider an uninterpreted infinite set of addresses \( Addr \). An object is a pair \((c, o) \in Object\) where \( c \) is a class name and \( o \) is a mapping from fields to addresses. The heap is a partial mapping from addresses to objects.

The definition of the transition relation \( \triangleright \subseteq State \times State \) is in Figure 1. The function \( nth : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow S_0 \) is such that \( nth(pc) \) is either the \( pc^{th} \) statement of the program or \( \perp \) if the index is out-of-bounds. Therefore, the execution blocks when the program counter \( pc \) is indexing a non-existent statement. The statements \( copy, new, read \) and \( write \) are intra-procedural and do not modify the stack of frames. After executing an intra-procedural statement, execution continues in sequence from the next instruction. The \( new(c) \) statement picks in the heap an unallocated address \( \alpha \) and allocates at that address an object of class \( c \) whose fields are all null. The statements \( read \) and \( write \) require addresses to be non-null. In our model, the de-reference of null pointers is thus blocking. To resolve a method call \( call(m) \), the dispatch \( dp \) first computes a (finite) function mapping variables to the class name of the object they point to – the null pointer being mapped to the undefined class \( udf \). Then, the lookup function is called with as argument thesis classes and the method name \( m \). It returns the index of the first statement of the callee.

The semantics starts from an undefined heap \( b_0 = \lambda o.\bot \) and an environment mapping all variables to \( 0 \) \((e_0 = \lambda e.0)\). The set of reachable states \( Acc \) is the set of states accessible from the initial state \( s_0 = (b_0, (0, e_0)::x) \) by the reflexive transitive closure of the relation \( \triangleright \).

\[
Acc = \{s \mid s_0 \triangleright^* s\}
\]

4. POINTS-TO ANALYSIS

An instance of a context-sensitive analysis is obtained by defining a domain \( CC \) of call-contexts, a domain \( \mathbb{AC} \) of allocation contexts – or abstract addresses – an initial call context \( \bullet \in CC \) and two functions \( alloc \) modeling abstract object creation and \( push \) abstracting the push operation on frames at the level of call contexts.

\[
\begin{align*}
alloc & : CC \times \mathbb{N} \times CC \times (Var \rightarrow \mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathbb{AC} \\
push & : CC \times \mathbb{N} \times Meth \times (Var \rightarrow \mathbb{AC}) \rightarrow CC
\end{align*}
\]

It is worth noticing that the soundness of the analysis does not depend on the actual definitions of \( alloc \) and \( push \). For CPA and \( \infty \)-CFA objects are abstracted by their creation site. CPA and \( \infty \)-CFA differ in their abstraction of the call context. For CPA, the call-context is either the initial call-context \( \bullet \) or a pair made-of the current method being executed and its abstract arguments. For infinite CFA, the
call-context is a call-string made of the invocation sites of the callers. As a result, we have:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nth}(pc) &= \text{call}(m) \\
\text{pe'} &= \text{lk}(dp(h,e),m) \\
\text{h}, (pc,e)::f &\triangleright h, (pc,e)::-f \\
\text{nth}(pc) &= \text{new}(c) \\
\text{h}(\alpha) &= \perp \\
h' &= h[\alpha \mapsto (c,\text{\lambda}f,0)] \\
h,(pc,e)::f &\triangleright h', (pc,e)::-f
\end{align*}
\]

4.1 Context-sensitive instrumentation

In order to state and prove correct context-sensitive analyses, the standard approach consists in instrumenting the semantics with an address cache [8, 9]. The address cache is used to dynamically map addresses to their allocation context.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Acache} &\triangleq \text{Addr} \rightarrow \text{AC}_0 \\
\text{Iframe} &\triangleq \text{Frame} \times \text{CC} \\
\text{IState} &\triangleq \text{Heap} \times \text{Iframe}^+ \times \text{Acache}
\end{align*}
\]

At the intra-procedural level, all statements except object allocation keep the environment unchanged. The \text{new}(c) statement maps the newly allocated address to its allocation context computed by the alloc function. At the inter-procedural level, the address cache is threaded along the execution while call contexts follow the stack discipline. The modified transitions are given in Figure 2. For an address cache \text{ac} : \text{Addr} \rightarrow \text{AC}_0, we write \text{ac}_0 : \text{Addr}_0 \rightarrow \text{AC}_0 an extended address cache mapping null to null and \text{e}_0 = \lambda v.e_0(c(v)) the abstraction of the environment with respect to the address cache. \text{Iacc} is the set of instrumented reachable states from \text{is}_0 = (\lambda a,\perp, (0,\lambda 0,0,\bullet),c) by the reflexive transitive closure of the instrumented semantics relation.

4.2 Context-sensitive points-to analysis

The principle of a context-sensitive points-to analysis is to abstract addresses by their allocation context and the stack of frame by a call-context. Moreover, environments are abstracted in a set-based manner by a mapping from variables to sets of allocation contexts. The abstract domains used by the analysis are summarised below.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Env}^4 &\triangleq \text{Var} \rightarrow \text{P}(\text{AC}_0) \\
\text{CCEnv} &\triangleq \text{CC} \times \text{N} \rightarrow \text{Env}^4 \\
\text{HClass} &\triangleq \text{P}(\text{AC} \times \text{Class}) \\
\text{HObject} &\triangleq \text{P}(\text{AC} \times \text{Field} \times \text{AC}_0) \\
\text{IState}^3 &\triangleq \text{HClass} \times \text{HObject} \times \text{CCEnv}
\end{align*}
\]

The result of the analysis is a triple \((\text{hc}_3, \text{ho}_3, \text{c}_3)^3 \in \text{IState}^3 \triangleq \text{Var} \rightarrow \text{AC}_0 \times \text{Var} \rightarrow \text{Class}) defined as the least solution to the constraints defined in Figure 3. The analysis is demand-driven and only propagates information about reachable code. For this purpose, we use a predicate isdef to ensure that an abstract environment \text{pe} \in \text{Env}^\frac{4}{3} binds all the variables to at least one abstract value. For \text{e} \in \text{Var} \rightarrow \text{AC}_0 and \text{pe} \in \text{Env}^\frac{4}{3}, we write \text{e} \in \text{pe} if \forall v, (e(v) \in \text{pe}(v) and define isdef(\text{pe}) by \exists \text{e}, \text{e} \in \text{pe}. To resolve virtual calls in the abstract, we define the abstract dispatch relation.

\[
\begin{align*}
dp^\frac{4}{3} &\subseteq (\text{Var} \rightarrow \text{AC}_0) \times (\text{Var} \rightarrow \text{Class}) \\
(e,d) &\in dp^\frac{4}{3} \text{ if and only if } \forall v, e(v) = d(v) = udf \\
\text{e}(v) &\in \text{ac} \Rightarrow (\alpha^3, d(v)) \in \text{hc}^3
\end{align*}
\]

We write \subseteq the point-wise ordering \text{i.e., e}_1 \subseteq e_2 if and only if \forall v, e_1(v) \subseteq e_2(v). As a result, a constraint of the form

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{e}(v) &\in \text{ac} \Rightarrow (\alpha^3, d(v)) \in \text{hc}^3
\end{align*}
\]
Given these invariants, the proof is by induction over the length of the derivation.

5. CPA BEATS 00-CFA

In this section, we shall prove that CPA is more precise than ∞-CFA. In the sequel, CPA is identified by a "" subscript and ∞-CFA by a "∞ subscript. In particular, we write \( A_\infty = \langle h_\infty, ho_\infty, e_\infty \rangle \) for the result of CPA and \( A_\infty = \langle h_\infty, ho_\infty, e_\infty \rangle \) for the result of ∞-CFA. CPA is more precise than ∞-CFA if it captures less concrete states. As the soundness of our points-to analyses is stated over instrumented states, to compare their relative precision, we introduce an erasure function \( E : P(IState) \rightarrow P(State) \) which given a set of instrumented states removes their instrumentation i.e., address caches and call-contexts of the stack of frames. Hence, proving that CPA is more precise than ∞-CFA amounts to proving the following theorem.

THEOREM 2.

To structure the proof we introduce another points-to analysis \( \Omega\text{-CFA} \) that keeps more context information than both ∞-CFA and CPA. As far as allocation context is concerned, \( \Omega\text{-CFA} \) is like CPA and ∞-CFA and abstracts addresses by their allocation site \( (alloc(cc, pc, c, e) = pc) \). However, it keeps more information about call-contexts than CPA and ∞-CFA: \( push_{\Omega}(cc, pc, m, e) = (m, e; pc):ccc \). Hence, by construction, \( \Omega\text{-CFA} \) is more precise than both ∞-CFA and CPA. Therefore, to prove our theorem, it remains to prove that CPA is also at least as precise as \( \Omega\text{-CFA} \). To do so, we exhibit a precise translation function \( T : IState^\Omega \rightarrow IState^\text{CPA} \) mapping the result of \( \Omega\text{-CFA} \) to the result of CPA such that:

\[ P_1 : A_\infty \subseteq T(A_\Omega) \]
\[ P_2 : E \circ \gamma_\infty \circ T(A_\Omega) \subseteq E \circ \gamma_\text{CPA}(A_\Omega) \]

Property \( P_1 \) means that the result of \( A_\Omega \) can be plunged (by applying \( T \)) into the CPA domain in such a way that \( A_\infty \) is more precise. There are many imprecise \( T \) functions with this property. Property \( P_2 \) ensures the precision of the translation by requiring that \( T \) is compatible with the concretisations \( \gamma_\infty \) and \( \gamma_\text{CPA} \).

LEMMA 1. Given \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \), we have \( E \circ \gamma_\infty(A_\infty) \subseteq E \circ \gamma_\text{CPA}(A_\infty) \).

PROOF. By applying the monotonity of \( E \) and \( \gamma_\infty \) over \( P_1 \), we get \( E \circ \gamma_\text{CPA}(A_\infty) \subseteq E \circ \gamma_\infty \circ T(A_\Omega) \). By \( P_2 \) and transitivity of \( \subseteq \) we get \( E \circ \gamma_\text{CPA}(A_\infty) \subseteq E \circ \gamma_\text{CPA}(A_\Omega) \). Because \( A_\Omega \) is more precise than \( A_\infty \), this concludes the proof.

The formal definition of \( T \) is given below: Because the two analyses are sharing the same heap abstraction, no translation occurs for \( h^\text{call} \) and \( ho^\text{call} \). For the environments, the function \( T_E \) merges all the abstract environments for which the top-element of the call-context stack matches the context of CPA. Lemma 2 states that the merging of \( \Omega \)-contexts is benign and does not introduce spurious environments.

LEMMA 2. If \( e \in T_E(e^\infty)((m, a, pc) \circ l, pc) \) then there exists \( l \) and \( pc \circ l \) such that \( nth(pc) = call(m) \) and \( e^\infty((m, a, pc) ; l, pc) \).

PROOF. If \( e \in T_E(e^\infty)((m, a, pc) \circ l, pc) \) then by definition of \( T_E \), we have that for all \( v \), there exists \( l \) and \( pc \circ l \) such that

\[ nth(pc) = call(m), e(v) \in e^\infty((m, a, pc) ; l, pc)(v) \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\gamma_p &: \text{Acache} \to \text{Env}^\flat \to \mathcal{P}(\text{Env}) \\
\gamma_p^\flat(p_c) &= \{ e | e^\flat \in pc \} \\
\gamma_H &: \text{Acache} \to (\text{HClass} \times \text{HObject}) \to \mathcal{P}(\text{Heap}) \\
\gamma_H^\flat(\text{hc}, ho^\flat) &= \left\{ h \mid h(\alpha) = \bot \Rightarrow ac(\alpha) = \bot \right\} \\
\gamma_p &: \text{Acache} \to \text{CCEnv} \to \mathcal{P}(\text{IFrame}^+) \\
\gamma_p^\flat(e^\flat) &= \left\{ pc_n, e_n, cc_n; \ldots ; (pc_0, e_0, \bullet) ; \bullet ; e \mid nth(pc_i) = m_i, e_i \in \gamma_p^\flat(e^\flat)(cc_i, pc_i) \right\} \\
\gamma &: \text{IState}^\flat \to \mathcal{P}(\text{IState}) \\
\gamma(hc^\flat, ho^\flat, e^\flat) &= \{ h, f, ac | h \in \gamma_H^\flat(hc^\flat, ho^\flat) \land f \in \gamma_p^\flat(e^\flat) \} \\
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 3:** Points-to analysis

**Figure 4:** Concretisation functions

\[
\begin{align*}
\tau_E &: \text{CCEnv}_0 \to \text{CCEnv}_\text{ast} \\
\tau_E(e^\flat)(\bullet, pc) &= e^\flat(\bullet, pc) \\
\tau_E(e^\flat)(m, o, pc) &= \bigcup \left\{ e^\flat((m, o, pco); f, pc) \mid l \in \text{CC}_\text{ast} \quad nth(pco) = call(m) \right\} \\
\tau &: \text{IState}_0^\flat \to \text{IState}_\text{ast}^\flat \\
\tau(hc^\flat, ho^\flat, e^\flat) &= (hc^\flat, ho^\flat, \tau_E(e^\flat))
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \bigcup S = \lambda v. \bigcup \{ e(v) | e \in S \} \).

**Figure 5:** Translation function
We prove that it is possible to swap quantifiers and exhibit a single stack $l$ and $pco$ such that $nth(pco) = call(m) \land e \in e^\ell((m, o, pco) :: l, pc)$. The intuition is that the prefix stack $l$ has no impact on abstract environments in the scope of the callees of $m$ – much as in the concrete semantics. For instance, if $pc$ is the target of the call to $m$, the abstract environment is $o$ and is thus independent from $l$. By induction over the depth of subsequent calls, we can conclude that all prefix stacks are equivalent and cannot be distinguished. As a result, we can pick any stack $l$ and $pco$ such that for some $v$, $nth(pco) = call(m) \land e(v) \in e^\ell((m, o, pco) :: l, pc)(v)$. For any other variable $v'$, we will also have $e(v') \in e^\ell((m, o, pco) :: l, pc)(v')$. □

Lemma 3 states that for a given abstract heap, CPA is more precise than $\Omega$-CFA.

**Lemma 3.** Given an abstract heap $(he^s, ho^s)$, we have $e^{\Omega, s} \subseteq T(e^{\Omega, s})$.

**Proof.** The proof is by induction over the definition of $e^{\Omega, s}$. Suppose that $e \in e^{\Omega, s}(m, o, pc)$, by induction hypothesis we have that $e \in T_T(e^\ell)((m, o), pc)$. By Lemma 2 we can exhibit a stack $l$ and $pco$ such that $nth(pco) = call(m) \land e(v) \in e^\ell((m, o, pco) :: l, pc)(v)$. The proof follows by case analysis over the rules defining $e^{\Omega, s}$ and $e^{\Omega, s}$.

It remains to prove that $E \circ \gamma_\infty \circ T(A_\Omega) \subseteq E \circ \gamma_\infty(A_\Omega)$. As $A_\Omega$ and $A_\Omega$ are using the same heap abstraction, they compute the same address cache. Once again, the key argument is Lemma 2 allowing to show that $T(A_\Omega)$ retains enough information to rebuild the call-stack of $A_\Omega$.

5.1 The origin of $\infty$-CFA imprecision

An interesting point not elucidated by the proof is the reason why CPA is strictly more precise than $\infty$-CFA. A reason already discussed in [2] is that the abstraction of environments is set-based thus responsible for a loss of precision. This precision loss is not specific to $\infty$-CFA but shared by all context-sensitive points-to analyses. Yet, an effect of CPA context-sensitivity is that environments often map variables to singletons (a property identified by Agesen [1]) thus minimising the effect of the non-relational abstraction of environments.

**Example 1.** Suppose a function $f(x, y)$ dispatched as follows: $(A, A) \rightarrow f_1; (B, B) \rightarrow f_1; (A, B) \rightarrow f_2; (B, A) \rightarrow f_2$. After running the following pseudo-code,

\[
x := (? : new A()); new B();
\]
\[
y := (? : new A()); new B();
\]
\[
f(x, y)
\]

$f_1$ is called with arguments $\{(A, A), (B, B)\}$.

CPA obtains a precise result concluding that $f_1$ is called in context $(A, A)$ or $(B, B)$. $\infty$-CFA incurs a loss of precision because it considers a single context per call. It thus concludes that $f_1$ is called with arguments $(A, A) \cup (B, B) = ((A, B), (A, B))$ and thus loses precision.

6. CONCLUSION

A few years back, Grove and Chambers [2] conjectured that CPA was more precise than $\infty$-CFA. To our knowledge, our proof is the first to firmly establish this result. As CPA is a form of object-sensitivity and $\infty$-CFA is the ultimate call-string sensitivity, this theoretical result backs up recent empirical studies [7, 6] concluding that object-sensitivity performs better than call-string sensitivity.

Compared to the object-oriented community, researchers in the functional community are better equipped to carry out formal proofs: various flavors of the lambda-calculus, many alternative semantics and a variety of abstract machines. For our formalisation, we introduce a core object-oriented language well-suited for reasoning about control-flow analyses. The language is minimal allowing, with little overhead, a mechanised reasoning into a proof-assistant.

As further work we shall investigate how to effectively compute context-sensitive analyses with an infinite number of contexts. At the top of the list is $\infty$-CFA but other instances such as infinite object-sensitivity of allocation contexts are of interest.
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