**Lab 3 Report**

謝狄烽

110598087

2022/05/09

**Contents**

[**1** **Test Plan** 1](#_Toc103381586)

[**1.1** **Test requirements** 1](#_Toc103381587)

[**1.2** **Test Strategy** 2](#_Toc103381588)

[**1.3** **Test activities** 2](#_Toc103381589)

[**1.4** **Design Approach** 2](#_Toc103381590)

[**1.5** **Success criteria** 3](#_Toc103381591)

[**2** **Test Design** 3](#_Toc103381592)

[**3** **Test Implementation** 4](#_Toc103381593)

[**4** **Test Results** 5](#_Toc103381594)

[**4.1** **JUnit test result snapshot** 5](#_Toc103381595)

[**4.2** **Code coverage snapshot** 6](#_Toc103381596)

[**4.3** **CI result snapshot (3 iterations for CI)** 8](#_Toc103381597)

[**5** **The Coverage Comparison** 9](#_Toc103381598)

[**6** **Summary** 10](#_Toc103381599)

1. **Test Plan**
   1. **Test requirements**

The Lab 3 requires to (1) select 6 methods from 6 classes of the SUT (GeoProject), (2) design Unit test cases by using **basis path or graph coverage** technique for the selected methods, (3) develop test scripts to implement the test cases, (4) execute the test scripts on the selected methods, (5) report the test results, and (6) specify your experiences of designing test cases systematically using the graph coverage technique.

In particular, based on the target coverage criteria (i.e., statement, branch, or others), the **test requirements** for Lab 3 are to design test cases *with* **graph coverage technique**for each selected method so that “*each statement and branch (or path) of the method under test will be covered by at least one test case* and *the both minimum* ***statement*** *(node) and* ***branch*** *(edge) coverage are greater than those of Lab 2 and 90%, respectively*.”

* 1. **Test Strategy**

To satisfy the test requirements listed in Section 1, a proposed strategy is to

1. select **3 methods that were chosen in Lab1 or Lab2** and **3 new methods** that are NOT selected previously. The selected methods MUST contain **predicate** and/or **loop** structures (as many as possible).
2. set the objective of the minimum statement or branch (or path) coverage to be greater than that of Lab 2 and adjust the test objective (e.g., 90%, 95% or 100%) based on the time available (if necessary).
3. design the test cases for those selected methods by using the **basis path or graph coverage** testing technique.
   1. **Test activities**

To implement the proposed strategy, the following activities are planned to perform.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Activity Name** | **Plan hours** | **Schedule Date** |
| 1 | Study GeoProject | 0.5 | 2022/05/08 |
| 2 | Learn **basis path and graph coverage** | 1 | 2020/05/09 |
| 3 | Design test cases for the selected methods | 1 | 2020/05/09 |
| 4 | Implement test cases | 1 | 2020/05/09 |
| 5 | Perform tests and check code coverage. If not satisfy, design more test cases… | 1 | 2020/05/09 |
| 6 | Complete Lab3 report | 1 | 2020/05/09 |

* 1. **Design Approach**

The **basis path and graph coverage** technique will be used to design the test cases. Specifically, the control flow graph (CFG) of each selected method shall be drawn first, and the possible test paths that satisfy the test requirements (i.e., **statement (node), branch (edge), or path coverage**) shall be derived from the CFG. The possible **inputs** and **expected outputs** for the derived test paths shall be computed from the specification of SUT for each method under test. *Add more test cases by considering to satisfy other coverage criteria, such as edge-pair, all-use, or prime-path coverage criteria.*

* 1. **Success criteria**

All test cases designed for the selected methods must pass (or 90% of all test cases must pass) and *both statement and branch (or path) coverage should have achieved at least 90%, respectively.*

1. **Test Design**


To fulfill the test requirements listed in section 1.1, the following methods are selected and corresponding test cases are designed.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Class** | **Method** | **Source Code Links** | **CFG Links** | **Test Paths** | **Inputs** | **Expected Outputs** |
| 1 | Base32 | encodeBase32 | [Links](https://fanatical-pigeon-711.notion.site/Software-Testing-Lab3-dfd6b6a9bf744c4481e696842d8dee59) | | In Lab3.xlsx file | | |
| 2 | Base32 | decodeBase32 |
| 3 | Base32 | padLeftWith ZerosToLength |
| 4 | GeoHash | adjacentHash |
| 5 | GeoHash | adjacentHash |
| 6 | GeoHash | fromLongTo String |


1. **Test Implementation**

The design of test cases specified in Section 2 was implemented using JUnit 4. The test scripts of 3 selected test cases are given below. The rest of the test script implementations can be found in the JUnit files.


***encodeBase32()***




***decodeBase32()***




***padLeftWithZerosToLength()***





1. **Test Results**
   1. **JUnit test result snapshot**








* 1. **Code coverage snapshot**
* Coverage of each selected method under test

















* Total coverage




* 1. **CI result snapshot (3 iterations for CI)**
* CI#1




* CI#2



* CI#3



* CI Pipeline



1. **The Coverage Comparison**

The code coverage of Lab1 (and/or Lab2) and Lab3 are listed in the below Table. The results show that the statement and branch coverage are increased from X% to Y% in Lab3.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Test method** | **Lab1 (or Lab2)** | | **Lab3** | |
| **statement coverage** | **branch coverage** | **statement coverage** | **branch coverage** |
| 1 | adjacentHash | 96% | 75% | 100% | 100% |
| 2 | adjacentHash | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| 3 | fromLongTo String | 100% | 83% | 100% | 83% |

1. **Summary**

In Lab 3, **6 test cases have been designed and implemented using JUnit and the basis path/graph coverage technique**. The test is conducted in 3 CI and **the execution results of the 6 test methods are all passed**. **The total statement and branch coverage of the test are 95% and 100%, respectively.** Thus, the test requirements described in Section 1 are satisfied. Some lessons learned in this Lab are that drawing control flow graph of a method needs to consider every paths of the source code regarding those infeasible path, or it may be not easy to draw the control flow graph, and also may leads to wrong graph, those infeasible path will be drop out while we trying design the test case, so the thing is, we need to do a thing a time then we won’t be confused.