Testing Legacy Code

Milton Keynes Perl Mongers, March 14 2006 Nik Clayton, nikc@cpan.org

Testing with Perl

```
% prove -r t  # or "make test"
t/03commandline...ok
t/02basics....ok
t/01compile....ok
t/pod....ok
All tests successful.
Files=4, Tests=34, 3 wallclock secs
( 1.55 cusr + 0.77 csys = 2.31 CPU)
```

200+ Test::* modules

- Test::Simple
- Test::More
- Test::Differences
- Test::Benchmark
- Test::HTML::Content

• ...

Great if....

- You write tests first, or
- The code you're testing is not crack-fuelled

 Some of you may see where I'm going with this

GEMSdb

```
% ls | wc -l
      85
% grep 'use strict' * | wc -l
% grep 'use warnings' * | wc -l
% grep 'my' * | wc -l
      18
```

Some of my favourites...

```
if($testing eq 'TRUE') { ... }

if($testing eq 'FALSE') { ... }

&get_rollup_info(*rolloc,*roolflr,*roldnm,*rolmcd,
*rollhrg,*roliig);

foreach $csrits (keys %incrs) {
next if ($incrs{$csrits} eq "UNDEFINED");
if ($incrsq{$csrits} ne "TRUE") { $cntcrsm++; push
(@CRSM, $crsline{$csrits})
; } }
```

The serious flaws are masked by the superficial flaws

Obvious fixes

- "use strict; use warnings"
- Sane indentation style
- Replace code with CPAN equivalents where possible
- Remove redundant code

Chicken / Egg

- Existing code is hostile to unit testing
- Can't fix code without making changes
- How do I know I've not introduced other bugs?

Hypothesis

- Given the same input, two runs of the same program should produce the same output
- Problem: I don't know this code
- Solution: Other engineers/ops team do

Have them write a test plan

- Input files: gemsdb
- Output files:
 aliases.ssmb.
 virtual.ssmb.

Make a test tree

```
mkdir -p /tmp/test/input
mkdir -p /tmp/test/new
mkdir -p /tmp/test/old
```

- Take snapshot of input file
 cp \$INPUT_FILE /tmp/test/input
- Run old program
 /path/to/old/prog.pl -i /tmp/test/input/gemsdb 2> /tmp/test/old/stderr \
 > /tmp/test/old/stdout
- Snapshot output to /tmp/test/old
- Run new program
 /path/to/new/prog.pl -i /tmp/test/input/gemsdb 2> /tmp/test/new/stderr \ > /tmp/test/new/stdout
- Snapshot output to /tmp/test/new
- "diff -ur /tmp/test/old /tmp/test/new"

Test plan→driver

- Take test plan, write Perl script that implements it
- Each plan becomes a new script
- Most of these scripts look very similar
- Refactor common code in to new script, test plan becomes a config file

Overriding Perl

- Some code is still extremely hostile to testing
- Perl's ability to override core functionality is very useful

Generating output file list

- open(FILE, ">\$foo\$bar\$baz.\$sfx") or die "dead";
- What's the filename?
- Perl can tell us

t.pl

```
#!/usr/bin/perl
use warnings;
use strict;
open(F, '<', '/etc/motd') or die "$!\n";
print while(<F>);
close(F);
open(my $fh, '/etc/motd') or die "$!\n";
print while(<$fh>);
close($fh);
```

OpenWithLogging.pm

```
package OpenWithLogging;
use strict;
use warnings;
sub import {
    *CORE::GLOBAL::open = \&open_with_logging;
}
# ... continued overleaf
```

```
sub open_with_logging (*;$@) {
    my($pkg, $filename, $line) = caller();
    print STDERR "$filename:$line:open('", join("', '", @_), "')\n";
    if(defined(\(\frac{1}{2}\)) {
        use Symbol ();
        my $fh = Symbol::qualify($_[0], $pkg);
        no strict 'refs';
        if(@_ == 1) {
            return CORE::open($fh);
        } elsif(@_ == 2) {
            return CORE::open($fh, $_[1]);
        } else {
            return CORE::open($fh, $_[1], @_[2..$#_]);
   } else {
        if(@_ == 1) {
            return CORE::open($_[0]);
        } elsif(@_ == 2) {
            return CORE::open($_[0], $_[1]);
        } else {
            return CORE::open($_[0], $_[1], @_[2..$#_]);
```

Results

```
% ls
OpenWithLogging.pm t.pl
% perl -MOpenWithLogging ./t.pl > /dev/null
./t.pl:6:open('F', '<', '/etc/motd')
./t.pl:12:open('', '/etc/motd')</pre>
```

Other uses for this

- Force open() to fail, to test that error handling code works
- Change paths on the fly
 - Poor man's chroot(8)

Overriding system()

- Many of the programs spawn external commands
- Download data files using /usr/bin/ftp
- Plays havoc with automated tests

t2.pl

```
#!/usr/bin/perl

use warnings;
use strict;

system qw(echo hello world!); # Canonical greeting
system qw(ftp ftp://ftp.internal/path/to/file);
```

MySystem.pm

```
package MySystem;

use strict;
use warnings;

sub import {
    *CORE::GLOBAL::system = \&my_system;
}

# ... continued overleaf
```

```
use File::Copy;
my %local_from_url = (
  'ftp://ftp.internal/path/to/file' => '/etc/motd',
);
sub my_system {
    if($_[0] =~ /ftp/) {
        print 'Overriding FTP command: "',
            join(' ', @_), "\"\n";
        File::Copy::copy($local_from_url{$_[1]}, '.');
        $? = 0;  # Set return value explicitly
    } else {
        CORE::system(@_);
1;
```

Results

```
% ls
MySystem.pm t2.pl
% perl -MMySystem t2.pl
hello, world!
Overriding FTP command: "ftp ftp://ftp.internal/path/
to/file"
% ls
MySystem.pm motd t2.pl
```

See Also

- Test::MockObject
- Sub::Override

Conclusions

- Still an ongoing project many tests written, many more to write
- Legacy code is difficult to test modularly
- Step back, test at a higher level
- Perl's ability to easily redefine core functionality is very useful

Thanks for listening

Any questions?

Bonus Slides

Subroutine prototypes

- Generally a bad idea
- Necessary to override *CORE::GLOBAL:: open
- perl -e 'print prototype "CORE::open"*;\$@

http://www.perlmonks.org/?node_id=124339

&some_sub;

• These two calls are identical:*

```
&some_sub(); # Empty arg. list
some_sub(); # ditto
```

These two calls are not:

```
&some_sub; # some_sub(@_);
some_sub; # some_sub()
```

^{*} Almost. & also disables prototype checking

Args to import