

## Lec 6 Validation and Verification

### Objectives

- ☐ White-box testing techniques
  - ☐ Branch conditions testing
  - ☐ Definition usage testing
- ☐ Fault-based testing
  - ☐ Fuzz testing
  - ☐ Mutation testing

---

### Branch condition Testing (White-box testing)

- Test coverage items
  - “Possible Boolean values (i.e. true or false) of the conditions within decisions and the decision outcomes from each decision”

### Exercise

How many tests are required for a 100% branch condition coverage?

```
#include <stdbool.h>
typedef enum direction_e { GO_LEFT, GO_RIGHT, STOP } direction_t;

void update_direction(bool sensor_left, bool sensor_right, direction_t * direction) {
    if(*direction==STOP || (sensor_left && sensor_right))
        *direction = STOP;
    else {
        if(sensor_left)
            *direction = GO_RIGHT;
        else if(sensor_right)
            *direction = GO_LEFT;
        else if(*direction == GO_LEFT)
            *direction = GO_RIGHT;
        else if(*direction == GO_RIGHT)
            *direction = GO_LEFT;
    }
}
```

- if(\*direction==STOP || (sensor\_left && sensor\_right))
  - If A OR (B AND C)
  - A= True, B = whatever, C =whatever → True
  - A = False, B = True, C = False → False
  - A = False, B = True, C = True → True
  - A= False, B = False, C = True → False
  - **4 Test cases**
- if(sensor\_left)
  - **2 Test cases**
- else if (sensor\_right)
  - **2 Test cases**
- else if (\* direction == GO\_LEFT)
  - **2 Test cases**
- else if (\*direction == GO\_RIGHT)
  - **2 Test cases**

**100% Branch condition coverage = 4 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 = 12**

---

### Data Flow Testing

**Test model:** definitions/use of variables

- “Definitions” → where a variable is possibly given a new value
- A “use” is an occurrence of a variable in which the variable is not given a new value

### All-use (All def-use) Testing

- **Test coverage items:** A set of control flow sub-paths from each variable definition to every use of that definition (with no intervening definitions)
  1. Identify a control flow sub-path from a variable definition to a subsequent use of that definition that has not yet been executed during testing
  2. Determine the test inputs that will cause the control flow sub-path from the identified definition to be exercised
  3. Determine the expected result from exercising the control flow sub-path by applying the test inputs to the test basis
  4. Repeat 1. to 2. Until the required level of test coverage is achieved

### Exercise 1

```
#include <stdbool.h>
typedef enum direction_e { GO_LEFT, GO_RIGHT, STOP} direction_t;

void update_direction(bool sensor_left, bool sensor_right,direction_t * direction) {
    1 if(*direction==STOP || (sensor_left && sensor_right))
        2 *direction = STOP;
    else {
        4 if(sensor_left)
            5 *direction = GO_RIGHT;
        6 else if(sensor_right)
            7 *direction = GO_LEFT;
        8 else if(*direction == GO_LEFT)
            9 *direction = GO_RIGHT;
        10 else if(*direction == GO_RIGHT)
            11 *direction = GO_LEFT;
    }
}
```

It is assumed that path 1 is when the parameters are defined.

Variable	Def-Use Pairs
*direction	(1,2), (1,8), (1,10)
sensor_left	(1,2), (1,4)
sensor_right	(1,2), (1,6)

Test	Def-Use Pair Coverage (def, use, variable)
*direction=STOP, sensor_left=0, sensor_right =1	(1,2,*direction)
*direction=GO_LEFT, sensor_left=0, sensor_right =1	(1,8,*direction)
*direction=GO_RIGHT, sensor_left=0, sensor_right =1	(1,10,*direction)
*direction=GO_RIGHT, sensor_left=1, sensor_right =1	(1,2, sensor_left), (1,2,sensor_right)
*direction=GO_RIGHT, sensor_left=1, sensor_right =0	(1,4, sensor_left)

*direction=GO_RIGHT, sensor_left=0, sensor_right =1	(1,6, sensor_right )
--	----------------------

Total test cases for 100% All-use = 6 (Confirmed with Lecturer that the correct answer is 6 not 7)

## Exercise 2

```

1.  // gcd() method, returns the GCD of a and b
2.  static int gcd(int a, int b)
3.  {
4.      // stores minimum(a, b)
5.      int i;
6.      if (a < b)
7.          i = a;
8.      else
9.          i = b;
10.
11.     // take a loop iterating through smaller number to 1
12.     for (i = i; i > 1; i--) {
13.
14.         // check if the current value of i divides both
15.         // numbers with remainder 0 if yes, then i is
16.         // the GCD of a and b
17.         if (a % i == 0 && b % i == 0)
18.             return i;
19.     }
20.
21.     // if there are no common factors for a and b other
22.     // than 1, then GCD of a and b is 1
23.     return 1;
24. }
```

Variable	Def-Use Pairs
int a	(1,6), (1,7), (1,17)
int b	(1,6), (1,9), (1,17)
int i	(7,12), (9,12), (12, 17), (12, 18), (12, 12)

Test	Def-Use Pair Coverage (def, use, variable)
a=5, b=28	(1,6,a), (1,7,a), (1,17,b), (7,12,i), (12,17,i), (12,12,i), (12,18,i)
a=28, b=5	(1,6,b), (1,9,b), (1,17,b), (9,12,i), (12,17,i), (12,12,i), (12,18,i)

Total Test cases for 100% All-use = 2

## All-du-paths testing

- Test Coverage Items: **The set of all loop-free** control flow sub-paths from each variable definition to every use of that definition (**with no intervening definitions**)
- 1) Identify a control flow sub-path from a variable definition to a subsequent p-use or c-use of that definition that has not yet been executed during testing.

- p-use → def-use pairs that covers conditional statements (e.g. if, else)
  - c-use → used in expression statement → value computed or manipulated
- 2) Determine the test inputs that will cause the control flow sub-path from the identified definition to the subsequent p-use or c-use to be exercised
  - 3) Determine the expected result from exercising the control flow sub-path by applying the test inputs to the test basis
  - 4) Repeat steps 1) to 3) until the required level of test coverage is achieved.

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0-YzbA\\_9Ogs](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0-YzbA_9Ogs)

<https://www.inf.ed.ac.uk/teaching/courses/st/2017-18/tutorial3-solutions.html>

### **Faults-based testing → push software to failure**

#### **Checking Software Robustness:**

- Boundary value analysis
- Fuzz Testing

#### **Checking faults caught by test suite**

- Mutation Testing

#### **Fuzz testing**

- **Objective** → improve robustness of software product
  - Push product to the limits and observe behaviour
  - Uncover unexpected behaviour
- **Method** → feed the software with unexpected/malformed/invalid inputs
- **Challenges** → produce lots of non-significant bugs, resource/analysis intensive

#### **Mutation testing**

- **Objective** → Assess test suite quality
- **Method** → injects faults in the source code, test
- **Metric:**
  - Each mutated version is called a *mutant* and tests detect and reject mutants by causing the behaviour of the original version to differ from the mutant. This is called *killing* the mutant
  - Killed mutants/ (killed mutants + surviving mutants)
- **Challenges**
  - Huge “fault injection space”
  - Requires tooling
  - Requires criteria to decide if new test cases must be added or not

### **V&V certification**

#### **Testing certification**

- International Software Testing Qualifications Board (ISTQB)
  - 3 levels: Foundation, Expert, ADvanceds
  - Teaches testing techniques, from foundations to very advanced topics

#### **Warnings:**

- Standards/certification do not imply quality
- Standards should not simply be used by themselves