

# Principles of Software Construction: Objects, Design, and Concurrency

## Test case design

Claire Le Goues

Vincent Hellendoorn



# Administrative issues


- Canvas submissions
  - “Submit a link to your checkpoint commit here on Canvas in the form `https://github.com/CMU-17-214/<reponame>/commit/<commitid>.`”
- Quizzes will move to Canvas once the waitlisted students are on Canvas
- Homework 2 is due next week: testing
  - lots of useful stuff in recitation on Wednesday

# Last Week

- Contracts
- Exceptions
- Unit testing: small, simple, per-method tests

# Little Quiz

<https://forms.gle/NyCauRczqJZdSzm8>



# Today

- Specifications
- Specification vs. Structural testing
- Testing Strategies
  - Structural Testing: Statement, branch, path coverage; limitations
  - Specification Testing: Boundary value analysis, combinatorial testing, decision tables
- Writing testable code & good tests

# Specifications and testing are closely related

Q: What exactly do you test when given a method?

- What it claims to do: specification testing – the contract (last week)
- What it does: structural testing – coverage

# Structural Testing: a closer look

Takes into account the internal mechanism of a system (IEEE, 1990).

- Approaches include tracing data and control flow through a program

# Case Study

Assume various Wallets

```
public interface Wallet {  
    boolean pay(int cost);  
    int getValue();  
}
```



# DebitWallet.pay()

What should we test in this code?

```
public boolean pay(int cost) {  
    if (cost <= this.money) {  
        this.money -= cost;  
        return true;  
    }  
    return false;  
}
```

# DebitWallet.pay()

```
public boolean pay(int cost) {  
    if (cost <= this.money) {  
        this.money -= cost;  
        return true;  
    }  
    return false;  
}  
  
new DebitWallet(100).pay(10);
```

# DebitWallet.pay()

```
public boolean pay(int cost) {  
    if (cost <= this.money) {  
        this.money -= cost;  
        return true;  
    }  
    return false;  
}  
  
new DebitWallet(0).pay(10);
```

# CreditWallet.pay()

How about now?

```
public boolean pay(int cost, boolean useCredit) {  
    if (useCredit) {  
        if (this.credit + cost <= this.maxCredit) {  
            this.credit += cost;  
            return true;  
        }  
    }  
    if (cost <= this.cash) {  
        this.cash -= cost;  
        return true;  
    }  
    return false;  
}
```

# CreditWallet.pay()

```
public boolean pay(int cost, boolean useCredit) {  
    if (useCredit) {  
        if (enoughCredit) {  
            return true;  
        }  
    }  
    if (enoughCash) {  
        return true;  
    }  
    return false;  
}
```

Exercise: think about as many test scenarios as you can

# CreditWallet.pay()

```
public boolean pay(int cost, boolean useCredit) {  
    if (useCredit) {  
        if (enoughCredit) {  
            return true;  
        }  
    }  
    if (enoughCash) {  
        return true;  
    }  
    return false;  
}
```

Test case	useCredit	enough Credit	enough Cash	Result	Coverage
1	T	T	-	Pass	--

# CreditWallet.pay()

```
public boolean pay(int cost, boolean useCredit) {  
    if (useCredit) {  
        if (enoughCredit) {  
            return true;  
        }  
    }  
    if (enoughCash) {  
        return true;  
    }  
    return false;  
}
```

Test case	useCredit	enough Credit	enough Cash	Result	Coverage
1	T	T	-	Pass	--
2	F	-	T	Pass	--
3	F	-	F	Fails	Statement

# Coverage

We have tested every statement; are we done?

Depends on desired **coverage**:


- Provide at least one test for distinct types of behavior
- Typically on control flow paths through the program
- Statement, branch, basis paths, MC/DC




# Structures in Code



sequence




If .. then




If .. then .. else



Do .. While




While .. Do



Switch


# Control-Flow of CreditCard.pay()

```
public boolean pay(int cost, boolean useCredit) {  
    if (useCredit) {  
        if (enoughCredit) {  
            return true;  
        }  
    }  
    if (enoughCash) {  
        return true;  
    }  
    return false;  
}
```




# Control-Flow of CreditCard.pay()

Test case	useCredit	enough Credit	enough Cash	Result	Coverage
1	T	T	-	Pass	--
2	F	-	T	Pass	--
3	F	-	F	Fails	Statement




# Control-Flow of CreditCard.pay()

Test case	useCredit	enough Credit	enough Cash	Result	Coverage
1	T	T	-	Pass	--
2	F	-	T	Pass	--
3	F	-	F	Fails	Statement



# Control-Flow of CreditCard.pay()

Test case	useCredit	enough Credit	enough Cash	Result	Coverage
1	T	T	-	Pass	--
2	F	-	T	Pass	--
3	F	-	F	Fails	Statement



# CreditWallet.pay()

```
public boolean pay(int cost, boolean useCredit) {  
    if (useCredit) {  
        if (enoughCredit) {  
            return true;  
        }  
    }  
    if (enoughCash) {  
        return true;  
    }  
    return false;  
}
```

Test case	useCredit	enough Credit	enough Cash	Result	Coverage	
1	T	T	-	Pass	--	
2	F	-	T	Pass	--	
3	F	-	F	Fails	Statement	
4	T	F	T	Pass	Branch	

# Path Coverage

We have seen every condition ... what else is missing?

# Path Coverage

We have seen every condition ... but not every path.


- 3 conditions, each with two values = 8 permutations
- Some permutations are impossible
- Still one *path* left



# Control-Flow of CreditCard.pay()

Paths:


- {true, true}: pay w/credit
- {false, true}: pay w/cash
- {false, false}: fail



# Control-Flow of CreditCard.pay()

Paths:


- {true, true}: pay w/credit
- {false, true}: pay w/cash
- {false, false}: fail
- {true, false, true}: pay w/cash after failing credit



# Control-Flow of CreditCard.pay()

Paths:

- {true, true}: pay w/credit
- {false, true}: pay w/cash
- {false, false}: fail
- {true, false, true}: pay w/cash after failing credit
- {true, false, false}: try credit, but fail, **and** no cash



# CreditWallet.pay()

```
public boolean pay(int cost, boolean useCredit) {  
    if (useCredit) {  
        if (enoughCredit) {  
            return true;  
        }  
    }  
    if (enoughCash) {  
        return true;  
    }  
    return false;  
}
```


Test case	useCredit	enough Credit	enough Cash	Result	Coverage		
1	T	T	-	Pass	--		
2	F	-	T	Pass	--		
3	F	-	F	Fails	Statement		
4	T	F	T	Pass	Branch		
5	T	F	F	Fails	(Basis) paths		

# BitcoinWallet.pay()

```
public boolean pay(int cost) {  
    int currValue;  
    while ((currValue = getValue()) < cost) {  
        // Just wait.  
    }  
    this.btc -= cost / currValue;  
    return true;  
}  
  
public int getValue() {  
    return (int)  
        (this.btc * Math.pow(2, 20*Math.random()));  
}
```

# Control-flow of BitCoinWallet.pay()


What are all the paths?



# Control-flow of BitCoinWallet.pay()

What are all the paths?

- {true}
- {false, true}
- {false, false, true}
- {false, false, false, true}
- ...




# Control-flow of BitCoinWallet.pay()

Perfect “general” path coverage is elusive

But “adequate” coverage criteria exist:

- Basis paths: each path must cover one new *edge*
  - {true} and {false, true} are sufficient
  - As is just {false, true}
- Loop adequacy: iterate each loop zero, one, and 2+ times






# More Coverage

Many more criteria exist:


- For branches with multiple conditions
  - Modified Condition/Decision Coverage is quite popular
- For loops
  - Boundary Interior Testing
- Branch coverage is by far the most common

# Coverage and Quality




Question 1: Is there a defect?

# Coverage and Quality



Question 2: Can we achieve 100% **statement** coverage and miss the defect?

# Coverage and Quality



Question 3: Can we achieve 100% **branch** coverage and miss the defect?

# Outline

- Structural Testing Strategies
- **Writing testable code & good tests**
- Specification Testing Strategies

# Writing Testable Code

What is the problem with this?

```
public boolean hasHeader(String path) throws IOException {  
    List<String> lines = Files.readAllLines(Path.of(path));  
    return !lines.get(0).isEmpty()  
}  
  
// complete control-flow coverage!  
hasHeader("cards.csv") // true
```

# Writing Testable Code

What is the problem with this?

```
public boolean hasHeader(String path) throws IOException {
    List<String> lines = Files.readAllLines(Path.of(path));
    return !lines.get(0).isEmpty()
}

// to achieve a 'false' output without having a test input file:
try {
    Path tempFile = Files.createTempFile(null, null);
    Files.write(tempFile, "\n".getBytes(StandardCharsets.UTF_8));
    hasHeader(tempFile.toFile().getAbsolutePath()); // false
} catch (IOException e) {
    e.printStackTrace();
}
```

# Writing Testable Code

Exercise: rewrite to make this easier

- And: what would you test?

```
public boolean hasHeader(String path) throws IOException {  
    List<String> lines = Files.readAllLines(Path.of(path));  
    return !lines.get(0).isEmpty()  
}
```



# Writing Testable Code

Aim to write easily testable code

- Which is almost by definition more modular

```
public List<String> getLines(String path) throws IOException {  
    return Files.readAllLines(Path.of(path));  
}  
  
public boolean hasHeader(List<String> lines) {  
    return !lines.get(0).isEmpty()  
}  
  
// Test:  
// - hasHeader with empty, non-empty first line  
// - getLines (if you must) with null, real path
```

# Writing Testable Code

What is the problem with this?

```
public String[] getHeaderParts(List<String> lines) {  
    if (!lines.isEmpty()) {  
        String header = lines.get(0);  
        if (header.contains(",")) {  
            return header.split(",");  
        } else {  
            return new String[0];  
        }  
    } else {  
        return null;  
    }  
}
```

# Writing Testable Code

Split functionality into easily testable units

```
public String getFirstLine(List<String> lines) {  
    if (!lines.isEmpty()) {  
        return lines.get(0);  
    } else {  
        return null;  
    }  
}  
  
public String[] getHeaderParts(String header) {  
    if (header.contains(",")) {  
        return header.split(",");  
    } else {  
        return new String[0];  
    }  
}
```

# Clean Testing

What is the problem with this?

```
public String[] getHeaderParts(String header) {  
    if (header.contains(",")) {  
        return header.split(",");  
    } else {  
        return null;  
    }  
}  
  
@Test  
public void testGetHeaderParts() {  
    for (String header : List.of("line", "", "one,two")) {  
        String[] parts = getHeaderParts(header);  
        if (header.contains(",")) assertNull(parts);  
        else assertEquals(header.split(","), parts.length);  
    }  
}
```

# Clean Testing

Keep tests simple, small

```
public String[] getHeaderParts(String header) {  
    if (header.contains(",")) {  
        return header.split(",");  
    } else {  
        return null;  
    }  
}
```

```
@Test  
public void testGetHeaderPartsNoComma() {  
    String[] parts = getHeaderParts("line");  
    assertNull(parts);  
}
```

```
@Test
```

```
...
```

# Testing Best Practices

Coverage is useful, but no substitute for your insight

- Cannot capture all paths
  - Especially beyond “unit”
  - Write testable code
- You may be testing buggy code
  - (add regression tests)
- Aim for at least branch coverage
  - And think through scenarios that demand more

# Bonus: Coding like the tour the france

```
public boolean foo() {  
    try {  
        synchronized () {  
            if () {  
            } else {  
                for () {  
                    if () {  
                        if () {  
                            if () {  
                                {  
                                    if () {  
                                        for () {  
                                        }  
                                    }  
                                }  
                            } else {  
                                if () {  
                                    for () {  
                                        if () {  
                                        } else {  
                                            if () {  
                                            } else {  
                                                if () {  
                                                }  
                                            }  
                                        }  
                                    }  
                                }  
                            }  
                        }  
                    }  
                }  
            }  
        }  
    }  
}
```

<https://thedailywtf.com/articles/coding-like-the-tour-de-france>

# Outline

- Structural Testing Strategies
- Writing testable code & good tests
- **Specification Testing Strategies**



# Back to Specification Testing

What would you test differently in this situation?

- Previously identified five paths through the code.
  - Are there still five given only specification?
- Should we test anything new?

```
/** Pays with credit if useCredit is set and enough  
 * credit is available; otherwise, pays with cash if  
 * enough cash is available; otherwise, returns false.  
 */  
public boolean pay(int cost, boolean useCredit);
```

# Back to Specification Testing

What would you test differently in this situation?

- “if useCredit is set and enough credit is available”:
  - Test both true, either/both false
- “pays with cash if enough cash is available; otherwise”:
  - Test true, false
- Could to this with as few as three test cases

```
/** Pays with credit if useCredit is set and enough  
 * credit is available; otherwise, pays with cash if  
 * enough cash is available; otherwise, returns false.  
 */  
public boolean pay(int cost, boolean useCredit);
```

# Specification Testing

We need a *strategy* to identify plausible mistakes

# Specification Testing

We need a *strategy* to identify plausible mistakes

- Random: avoids bias, but inefficient
  - Yet potentially very valuable, because automatable
  - Not for today

# Boundary Value Testing

We need a *strategy* to identify plausible mistakes

- Boundary Value Testing: errors often occur at boundary conditions
  - E.g.:

```
/** Returns true and subtracts cost if enough
 * money is available, false otherwise.
 */
public boolean pay(int cost) {
    if (cost < this.money) {
        this.money -= cost;
        return true;
    }
    return false;
}
```

# Boundary Value Testing

We need a *strategy* to identify plausible mistakes

- Boundary Value Testing: errors often occur at boundary conditions
  - Identify equivalence partitions: regions where behavior should be the same
    - `cost <= money: true, cost > money: false`
    - Boundary value: `cost == money`

```
/** Returns true and subtracts cost if enough
 * money is available, false otherwise.
 */
public boolean pay(int cost) {
    if (cost < this.money) {
        this.money -= cost;
        return true;
    }
    return false;
}
```

# Boundary Value Testing

We need a *strategy* to identify plausible mistakes

- Boundary Value Testing: errors often occur at boundary conditions
  - Select: a nominal/normal case, a boundary value, and an abnormal case
  - Useful for few *categories* of behavior (e.g., null/not-null) per value
- Test: `cost < credit`, `cost == credit`, `cost > credit`,  
`cost < cash`, `cost == cash`, `cost > cash`

```
/** Pays with credit if useCredit is set and enough  
 * credit is available; otherwise, pays with cash if  
 * enough cash is available; otherwise, returns false.  
 */  
public boolean pay(int cost, boolean useCredit);
```

# Combinatorial Testing

We need a *strategy* to identify plausible mistakes

- Combinatorial Testing: focus on tuples of boundary values
  - Captures bugs in **interactions** between risky inputs
  - Rarely need to test pairs of “invalid” values (cost too high for credit & cash)

```
/** Pays with credit if useCredit is set and enough
 * credit is available; otherwise, pays with cash if
 * enough cash is available; otherwise, returns false.
 */
public boolean pay(int cost, boolean useCredit);
```



# Combinatorial Testing

We need a *strategy* to identify plausible mistakes

- Combinatorial Testing: focus on tuples of boundary values
  - Captures bugs in **interactions** between risky inputs
  - Rarely need to test pairs of “invalid” values (cost too high for credit & cash)
- Include: {cost > credit && cost == cash}
- Maybe: {cost < credit && cost == cash}

```
/** Pays with credit if useCredit is set and enough
 * credit is available; otherwise, pays with cash if
 * enough cash is available; otherwise, returns false.
 */
public boolean pay(int cost, boolean useCredit);
```

# Decision Tables

We need a *strategy* to identify plausible mistakes

- Decision Tables
  - You've seen one already
  - Enumerate condition options
    - Leave out impossibles
    - Identify “don't-matter” values
  - Useful for redundant input domains

Test case	useCredit	enough Credit	enough Cash	Result
1	T	T	-	Pass
2	F	-	T	Pass
3	F	-	F	Fails
4	T	F	T	Pass
5	T	F	F	Fails

# Specification Tests

So what is the right granularity?

- It depends
- We are still aiming for coverage
  - Just of specifications, and their innumerable implementations
  - BVA (& its cousins), decision tables tend to provide good coverage

# Structural Testing vs. Specification Testing

You will *typically have both* code & (prose) specification

- Test specification, but know that it can be underspecified
- Test implementation, but not to the point that it cannot change
- Use testing strategies that leverage both
  - There is a fair bit of overlap; e.g., BVA yields useful branch coverage

# Further Testing Strategies

Many more aspects, some later in this course:

- Stubbing/Mocking, to avoid testing dependencies
  - We'll loop back to this
- Integration testing: scenarios that span units
  - With unit testing one should not test for an expected usage scenario
    - e.g., in HW2: that everything gets called from Main
  - This lets one make some simplifying assumptions
    - e.g., that every card is seen equally often
- Beyond correctness: performance, security

# Summary

Testing comprehensively is hard

- Tailor to your task: specification vs. structural testing
  - Do not assume unstated specifications for HW 2; spend your energy wisely
- Pick a strategy, or a few
  - Be systematic; defend your decisions
- Tomorrow's recitation covers:
  - Unit test best practices
  - Test organization
  - Running tests, coverage