

# SE 3XA3: Test Report

## GrateBox

Team 8, Grate  
Kelvin Lin (linkk4)  
Eric Chaput (chaputem)  
Jin Liu (liu456)

December 8, 2016

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Functional Requirements Evaluation</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Nonfunctional Requirements Evaluation</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	Nonfunctional Tests . . . . .	2
2.1.1	Look and Feel . . . . .	2
2.1.2	Usability . . . . .	2
2.1.3	Performance . . . . .	3
2.2	Overall Evaluation valuation based on tests and user survey . . . . .	3
<b>3</b>	<b>Comparison to Existing Implementation</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Unit Testing</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Changes Due to Testing</b>	<b>4</b>
5.1	Changes to functional requirements . . . . .	4
5.2	Changes to non-functional requirements . . . . .	4
<b>6</b>	<b>Automated Testing</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Trace to Requirements</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Trace to Modules</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Code Coverage Metrics</b>	<b>9</b>

## List of Tables

1	<b>Revision History</b> . . . . .	i
2	Trace between functional requirements and tests (set 1) . . . . .	6
3	Trace between functional requirements and tests (set 2) . . . . .	7
4	Trace between non-functional requirements and tests . . . . .	8

## List of Figures

Table 1: **Revision History**

Date	Version	Notes
Dec 6	1.0	Document creation
Dec 7	1.1	Document completion

This document will make frequent reference to the Development, Test Plan, SRS and Design documents of the GrateBox project. They can be found [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#) respectively.

# 1 Functional Requirements Evaluation

An evaluation of functional requirements reveals near complete coverage by the functional test cases. The tests written for GrateBox caught bugs that would have gone otherwise unnoticed by the development team. Those will be discussed below. Many of the more mundane or generic functional requirements were fulfilled well before testing began, so they will not be addressed, as their verification would be redundant at this point.

Functional requirements are listed by the number given to them in the Software Requirements Specification document. Note that these functional requirements are laid out in more detail in the SRS document linked above, and it should be referred to for further elaboration.

**Requirement #5/6:** Testing revealed inconsistent masses across similar cars in different generations. This was revealed to be a conceptual problem with the code. Initially, mass was treated as a fixed value common to all cars. While this technically fulfilled the functional requirements for mass, later generations would trend towards the extremes of and eventually past the range of viable mass values dictated by the requirements. The development team elected to remedy this problem by making the mass value of cars a variable dependant on density and volume. With a constant density value set across all cars, and a much stricter range of possible volumes that cars could possess, mass values in test cases after this fix fulfilled these mass requirements far more consistently.

**Requirement #8:** While testing did not reveal a problem with the actual display of fitness values required by this requirement, it did reveal a flaw in the creation of these values. Initially, the fitness of a car was determined by the distance along the x-axis of the road that the car had traveled. This solution did not account for vertical displacement, which became ever more important as GrateBox incorporated more sloped roads, to the point where many cars that were technically traveling a shorter distance along the road were receiving higher fitness values, skewing the results and threatening the integrity of GrateBox itself. The development team was quick to implement a more nuanced fitness algorithm that rated cars off of both their vertical and horizontal displacement and also accounted for the lifetime and durability of the car.

**Requirement #10/11:** Whenever the user enters a new value into any of the fields that are able to be changed by the user, a new simulation begins with those values. While this seemed obvious to the development team, user surveys revealed that this process confused users. To this end, the functionality of these user changeable fields was updated to require the user to select enter following the entrance of a new value into the field. The following

user feedback revealed that this change in functionality resulted in a better product.

**Requirement #13/14:** Testing revealed that many users felt the need to enter impossible values into user changeable variables. For example, many users attempted to simulate generations of cars with negative amounts of cars per generation. Others simply attempted to enter strings of text into these fields. GrateBox, at the time incapable of processing these invalid inputs, failed as a result. The development team quickly implemented error messages and try/catch exceptions into the code in order to thwart user attempts to circumvent the functionality of the program.

**Requirement #18:** The algorithm that was designed to determine at what exact point along the road a car was deemed to be non-moving evolved over the course of the testing process. The first set of tests illuminated the need for larger health bars for each car to account for some cars stopping temporarily along the road as they attempted to circumvent terrain challenges. This was followed by a number of bugs in Java's graphics libraries, which caused cars to be deemed non-moving far before the graphics indicated this. These bugs were eventually ironed out of the program.

## 2 Nonfunctional Requirements Evaluation

### 2.1 Nonfunctional Tests

The exact details of non-functional requirements can be found in the Test Plan document in section 3.2.

#### 2.1.1 Look and Feel

LF-1

Majority of users agreed that the visual aesthetic of the program rated favourable. Test successful.

LF-2

Majority of users agreed that the style of the program rated favourable. Test successful.

#### 2.1.2 Usability

US-1

Users performed all tasks in allotted time. Test successful.

US-2

Users performed all tasks in allotted time. Test successful.

US-3

Majority of users agreed that the program's usability rated favourable. Test successful.

### **2.1.3 Performance**

PF-1

Time restriction for tasks performed met. Test successful.

PF-2

Majority of users agreed that the program's usability rated favourable. Test successful.

PF-3

Numerical values and equations determined to be accurate and valid. Test successful.

PF-4

Majority of users agreed that the program's usability rated favourable. Test successful.

## **2.2 Overall Evaluation valuation based on tests and user survey**

Overall evaluation of non-functional requirements takes into account the results of the final user surveys and the results of the above test cases. The nebulous nature of non-functional requirements means that exact evaluation is difficult. With this in mind, the GrateBox project achieved most of the goals set out by non-functional requirements. GrateBox looks and feels good, is highly usable, and performs as expected. All fit criterion were met or exceeded and users agreed that our product excelled non-functionally. Stress testing, while not directly applicable to GrateBox (GrateBox is a simple program executed by one machine by one user), has been undertaken indirectly through a 2 hour execution of GrateBox on two different machines, demonstrating the robustness of the program.

## **3 Comparison to Existing Implementation**

The original implementation contained no testing of its own. One test conducted by Grate (GR-1.1) required a comparison to the original implementation. This comparison helped

validate the results of the test as seen in section 1.2.1.

## 4 Unit Testing

All unit testing for this project can be found in the test folder found [here](#). The tests.java file contains the source code for all testing. The Test.html file contains the output of this code. All test were conducted using the third party testing software QUnit, outlined in the Design document.

## 5 Changes Due to Testing

Several changes were made to GrateBox as a result of testing. They have been divided below according to their related requirements.

### 5.1 Changes to functional requirements

Initial car design was predicated on the creation of vectors from a centre point and then the connecting of the end of these vectors to form a polygon that would serve as the body of the car. However, testing for car creation using this method proved prohibitively difficult. To this end, car bodies were redesigned to be composed of a series of connected vertexes. This change also affected how car chromosomes were created and manipulated.

User surveys revealed the need for a pause button in GrateBox as users felt a lack of control over the program at times. This was added to the parameters section of GrateBox.

The initial values of the user variables (number of cars per generation, number of parents, and mutation rate) all increased as a result of user input. The initial values resulted in cars that were too slow in evolving, and would often require ten or more generations for a moderately successful car to emerge.

### 5.2 Changes to non-functional requirements

User feedback told Grate that the UI of GrateBox was too minimal, and that look and feel requirements were not being met. To this end, an html visual enhancer, Bootstrap, was used to satisfy this user need. Users opinions' of GrateBox's look and feel increased dramatically following this change.

It was observed during user trials that many users had trouble grasping the exact nature of genetic algorithms quickly. To this end text was added to GrateBox to give users the most very basic background with which to use the program. It was important to Grate that this text not be overly extensive, as it was believed that this could go a long way to turning

users off of our product. The exact amount and content of text was modified extensively over GrateBox's development cycle via user input.

## **6 Automated Testing**

Automated testing proved difficult for certain elements of GrateBox, as it is by nature a visual product. Still some automated testing was conducted for the benefit of the testing team and to improve accuracy. QUnit, our unit testing software, allows for multiple executions of the same test with some variances, and this was done to ensure the soundness of many aspects of GrateBox. This functionality allows for the entrance of a variable into a field with the instructions to manipulate that variable within a range of possible values and determine many possible outputs (for example negative values, non-integer values, etc.). The genetic algorithm in particular benefited greatly from automated testing, as many different variables could be tested with minimal time investment. While it proved impractical for the project given time constrictions, further elaboration on GrateBox could utilise image analysing on a pixel by pixel basis to improve the quality of the graphical output. Although the overall value of such a time investment is questionable.

## **7 Trace to Requirements**

The requirements are described in more detail in the SRS document. The tests are given by their abbreviated forms. For example GA refers to the Genetic Algorithm tests, which are described in more detail in the Test Plan document.

<b>Req.</b>	<b>Tests</b>
Req 1: Car body parameters	CM
Req 2: Wheel number parameters	CM
Req 3: Wheel radius parameters	CM
Req 4: Wheel position parameters	CM
Req 5: Min weight parameters	CM
Req 6: Max weight parameters	CM
Req 7: Generation display parameters	GR
Req 8: Fitness display parameters	GA, FI
Req 9: Random seed parameters	GA
Req 10: Mutation rate parameters	GA

Table 2: Trace between functional requirements and tests (set 1)



Req.	Tests
Req 11: Cars per generation parameters	GA
Req 12: Road generation parameters	CM
Req 13: Min cars per generation parameters	CM
Req 14: Max cars per generation parameters	CM
Req 15: Top cars parameters	CM, FI
Req 16: Max top cars parameters	CM, GA, FI
Req 17: Min top cars parameters	CM, GA, FI
Req 18: Non-moving parameters	CM, GU
Req 19: Fitness parameters	FI
Req 20: Default value replacement parameters	GU

Table 3: Trace between functional requirements and tests (set 2)

Req.	Tests
Req 21: Appearance Parameters	LF
Req 22: Style Parameters	LF
Req 23: Ease of Use Parameters	US
Req 24: Personalization Parameters	LF
Req 25: Learning Parameters	US
Req 26: Speed and Latency Parameters	PF
Req 27: Precision and Reliability Parameters	PF
Req 28: Longevity Parameters	PF

Table 4: Trace between non-functional requirements and tests

## 8 Trace to Modules

For reference, the modules are as follows. There are displayed with more detail in the Design document. All tests are referred to in their abbreviated form. For example Genetic Algorithm tests are referred to by the short form GA. These are elaborated on in the Test Plan document.

**M1:** Hardware hiding module

**M2:** Car creation module. Tested with the CM tests.

**M3:** Evolve car module. Tested with the CM tests.

**M4:** Road creation module. Tested with the CM tests.

**M5:** Graphics display module. Tested with the GR and GU tests.

**M6:** Genetic Algorithm module. Tested with the GA tests.

**M7:** Random seed generation and manipulation module. Tested with the GA tests.

**M8:** Fitness determination module. Tested with the FI tests.

**M9:** Searching algorithms module. Tested with the GA tests.

**M10:** Sorting algorithms module. Tested with the GA tests.

**M11:** Population generation algorithms module. Tested with the GA tests.

## 9 Code Coverage Metrics

In the Test Plan document, Grate endeavoured to achieve 70% coverage with our automated and unit testing. While not every unit test possible was executed, most were, and Grate feels that this coverage metric was reached, as a large majority of our actual code contains corresponding tests to validate it. The modularized nature of our code reduced the overall usefulness of larger coverage tests. For example, the inclusion of the genetic algorithm in a test for graphical validity achieves very little, as the modularized nature of the code requires little to no interaction between these two modules.