Testing

Role in Unified Approach

Coverage:
  Structural/Coverage
  Model Based
  Test Generation from Model Checking (project)

Interaction of Coverage/Model Based Testing

Will Not Cover
  Statistical Methods
  Partition Methods
  Functional Testing
Role of Testing

Most Accessible and Common Method of V&V

Thorough testing should precede application of formal methods.

Some properties may be rigorously verified by testing.

(particularly at the component level)
Interaction and Relationships with Other V&V Methods

• Functional testing may (should) based on property specifications

• Structural/Coverage testing based on static analysis

• Model checking can be used for test generation

• Model checking and testing are a continuum

• Runtime monitoring is continuous testing

• Open Issues:
  
  Derivation of structural/coverage tests from property specifications.

  Unification of model-based and coverage testing
Component/Unit Test

Requires precise specification at component level.

Functionality defined as properties or pre-conditions/post-conditions.

Pre-conditions (test cases) must be defined

Exceptions to preconditions must be defined

Coverage tests may be readily derivable.
Oracle Problems

Post-Condition verifiers (Oracles) must be constructed

Complete oracle is correct implementation!

Common oracles are not complete.

Most oracles are human inspectors

Oracles for specific properties??
Coverage Analyses

Control Flow
- Statement coverage
- Decision coverage
- Condition coverage
  single/multiple
- Condition/Decision coverage
  variants of C/D coverage
- Path coverage

Data Flow
Use/Def relations
coverage (other)

  Function coverage
  Call coverage
  Loop
  Race
  Mutation coverage
  Table coverage
  Relational operator coverage
Structural/Coverage Testing

Establishes that a given execution “covers” some set of program structures or functions.

Why useful?

Errors are likely to arise from control flow.

Errors are likely to arise from widely separated definition and use of variables

Challenges

Generating test cases conforming to coverage cases

Cost of creating test cases
Issues:

Integration of property specification and coverage specification.

Construction of property specific coverage, abstraction and state space specification.

Combining abstraction with coverage testing
Role of Design in Testing

Formal model for component
  Components with precise definitions
  Implementation should follow model
Simple control structures
  State machine structure
Prescribed ranges for variables
Web Resources

http://www.testing.com/
http://www.bullseye.com/
http://www.codecoveragetools.com/
http://www.semdesigns.com/Products/TestCoverage/CTestCoverage.html
function P return INTEGER is
begin
  X, Y: INTEGER;
  READ(X); READ(Y); -- definition of X and Y
  while (X > 10) loop
    X := X – 10;
    exit when X = 10;
  end loop;
  if (Y < 20 and then X mod 2 = 0) then-- “short circuit” and operator
    Y := Y + 20;
  else
    Y := Y – 20;
  end if;
  return 2 * X + Y;
end P;
P's Control Flow Graph (CFG)
Branch Coverage of P

At least 2 test cases needed

Example all-branches-adequate test set:
(X = 20, Y = 10)
(X = 15, Y = 30)
Path Coverage of P

Infinitely many test cases needed

Example all-paths-adequate test set:

\((X = 5, Y = 10)\)
\((X = 15, Y = 10)\)
\((X = 25, Y = 10)\)
\((X = 35, Y = 10)\)

...
Condition Coverage of P

At least 3 test cases needed

Example all-edges-adequate test set:

- \((X = 20, Y = 10)\)
- \((X = 5, Y = 30)\)
- \((X = 21, Y = 10)\)
P’s CFG with a Data Flow Edge
P’s Control and Data Flow Graph
All-Uses Coverage of P

How many test cases are needed?
Structural Testing

- Data-flow based adequacy criteria

  • All definitions criterion
    - Each definition to some reachable use

  • All uses criterion
    - Definition to each reachable use

  • All def-use criterion
    - Each definition to each reachable use
Data-flow Testing

1: \texttt{read}(x, y)

2: \( x := x \cdot 2 \)

3: \( y := 2 \)

4: \( y := y \cdot 2 \)

5: \( x := x \cdot 2 \)

6: \( x := y \cdot 2 \)

7: \( x := y \cdot 2 \)

8: \( x := x \cdot y \cdot 2 \)
All Definitions Criterion

- A set $P$ of execution paths satisfies the all-definitions criterion iff
  - for all definition occurrences of a variable $x$ such that
    - there is a use of $x$, which is feasibly reachable from that definition,
  - there is at least one path $p$ in $P$ such that
    - $p$ includes a subpath through which the definition of $x$ reaches some use occurrence of $x$

```
1: read($x, y$)
2: $x := x + 2$
3: $y := 2$
4: $x := y + 2$
5: $x := x + 2$
6: $y := x + 2$
7: $y := y + 2$
8: $x := x + y + 2$
```
All Uses Criterion

1: \text{read}(x, y, 2)

2: \quad x := x + 2;

3: \quad y := 2;

4: \quad y := y \times 2;

5: \quad x := x + 2;

6: \quad x := y + 2;

7: \quad x := y + z + 2;

8: \quad x := x + y + 2;
All DU-paths criterion

- A set $P$ of execution paths satisfies the all-DU paths criterion iff
  - for all definitions of a variable $x$ and all paths $q$ through which that definition reaches a use of $x$,
  - there is at least one path $p$ in $P$ such that
  - $q$ is a subpath of $p$ and $q$ is cycle-free
Subsumption

- Criteria C1 subsumes criteria C2, iff
  - For all programs p being tested with specifications s
  - All test sets t
  - t is adequate according to C1 for testing p with respect to s implies that t is adequate according to C2 for testing p with respect to s

- Path subsumes branch
- Path subsumes statement
Subsumption and Covers

• C1 *subsumes* C2 if any C1-adequate T is also C2-adequate –
  But some T1 satisfying C1 may detect fewer faults than some T2 satisfying C2

• C1 *properly covers* C2 if each subdomain induced by C2 is a union of subdomains induced by C1

Challenges in Structural Coverage

Interprocedural and gross-level coverage
  – e.g., interprocedural data flow, call-graph coverage

Regression testing

Late binding (OO programming languages)
  – coverage of actual and apparent polymorphism

Fundamental challenge: Infeasible behaviors
  – underlies problems in inter-procedural and polymorphic coverage, as well as obstacles to adoption of more sophisticated coverage criteria and dependence analysis
The Infeasibility Problem

- Syntactically indicated behaviors (paths, data flows, etc.) are often impossible
  - Infeasible control flow, data flow, and data states
- Adequacy criteria are typically impossible to satisfy
- Unsatisfactory approaches:
  - Manual justification for omitting each impossible test case (esp. for more demanding criteria)
  - Adequacy “scores” based on coverage
    example: 95% statement coverage, 80% def-use coverage
Coverage and Components
State and Encapsulation

- Procedural programming
  - Basic component: Subroutine
  - Testing method: Subroutine input/output based

- Object-oriented and component programming
  - Basic component: Class = Data structure + Set of operations
  - Objects are instances of classes
  - The data structure defines the state of the object. Correctness is not based only on output, but also on the state.
  - The data structure is not directly accessible, but can only be accessed using the class public operations (Encapsulation).

- Problems:
  - What are the basic elements to test?
  - Is it enough to observe input/output relations?
  - How is it possible to observe the state without violating encapsulation?
  - What if the source code is not available (for a third-party component)?