Let's look at one example listing from the proposal
containing two test cases that should test an image class:

```
void testWidthRanges() {
  Image img;
  img.setWidth(5);
  assert(img.width() == 5);
  img.setWidth(1);
  assert(img.width() == 1);
  // Passing an invalid value should have no effect
  img.setWidth(0);
  assert(img.width() == 1);
}

void testHeightRanges() {
  Image img;
  img.setHeight(5);
  assert(img.height() == 5);
  img.setHeight(1);
  assert(img.height() == 1);
  // Passing an invalid value should have no effect
  img.setWidth(0);
  assert(img.height() == 1);
}
```

One of the test cases was copy-pasted and adapted from the other,
but the author of the code forgot to change at function call, which makes
the second test case not actually testing the correct behavior.
However, the test case will still compile and doesn't fail,
so this bug has a good chance to stay undiscovered.

The new checker however is able to find this problem and can suggest
how to fix it.
The output for above example would be:

```
FunctionNamesImageTest.cpp:28:3: warning: Possibly faulty code clone.
Maybe you wanted to use 'Image::setHeight' instead of
'Image::setWidth'?
  img.setWidth(0);
  ^~~~~~~~~~~~~~
```