

# Assignment 3 – The Article

## Paper

**Title:** Selenium-Jupiter: A JUnit 5 extension for Selenium WebDriver

**Authors:** Boni García, Carlos Delgado Kloos, Carlos Alario-Hoyos, Mario Munoz-Organero

---

### **Abstract (Copied from the paper)**

Selenium WebDriver is a library that allows controlling web browsers (e.g., Chrome, Firefox, etc.) programmatically. It provides a cross-browser programming interface in several languages used primarily to implement end-to-end tests for web applications. JUnit is a popular unit testing framework for Java. Its latest version (i.e., JUnit5) provides a programming and extension model called Jupiter. This paper presents Selenium-Jupiter, an open-source JUnit 5 extension for Selenium WebDriver. Selenium-Jupiter aims to ease the development of Selenium WebDriver tests thanks to an automated driver management process implemented in conjunction with the Jupiter parameter resolution mechanism. Moreover, Selenium-Jupiter provides seamless integration with Docker, allowing the use of different web browsers in Docker containers out of the box. This feature enables cross-browser testing, load testing, and troubleshooting (e.g., configurable session recordings). This paper presents an example case in which Selenium-Jupiter is used to evaluate the performance of video conferencing systems based on WebRTC. This example case shows that Selenium-Jupiter can build and maintain the required infrastructure for complex tests effortlessly.

©2022 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

---

- Why? What problem are the author(s) trying to solve?

They want to provide a comprehensive programming model for developing end-to-end tests for web applications using Selenium WebDriver on top of JUnit 5 since as they say this contribution is completely missing in the literature as far as they know. With this they aim to solve current (2022) challenges in end-to-end testing. It's especially the maintainability and flakiness that seem to be the most relevant challenges in end-to-end testing.

They are also trying to solve the difficulty in creating load tests. Apache JMeter that is commonly used for load tests is not suitable when actual browsers, implementing the WebRTC stack, are required to generate the load.

The driver management is also an issue due to the relatively fast updates of modern browsers due to automated updates which, eventually, leads to incompatibilities between the browsers and the driver versions used in manual tests.

Finally they are also trying to solve the problem with troubleshooting (aka failure analysis) for the Selenium WebDriver.

- How? What method has been used to answer the question?

They are using Docker containers set up to run Selenium WebDriver to drive browsers used in the test. Selenium WebDriver is a collection of tools that are designed to automate web application testing. It allows you to write code that can perform actions in a browser in the same way a human does.

To manage the different drivers used in the Docker containers for the browsers they used WebDriverManager a Java library for automated driver management.

Apache JMeter has been commonly used to evaluate the performance of web applications but it's not suitable for this kind of tests where actual browsers are required to generate the load. The solution they proposed is to integrate Docker in the Jupiter programming model.

In the discussed example case, the research questions were:

- RQ1. How can Selenium WebDriver be used to evaluate the end-to-end performance of WebRTC videoconference applications?
- RQ2. What are the benefits and limitations of using Selenium-Jupiter to implement these kinds of tests?
- What is the result from the method?

In regards to RQ1 they conclude that the WebRTC stats are meaningful mechanisms to evaluate different performance metrics such as Bit rate, Jitter delay, Packet loss etc. They can be gathered using Selenium WebDriver and webrtc-internals a tool available in Chrome.

For RQ2 the main benefit of Selenium-Jupiter is the use of Docker, in the example case. This makes it possible to choose the type and number of required browsers. They regard scalability as the main drawback of this approach. Since Selenium-Jupiter uses a single Docker engine to handle browsers in containers it is constrained by the physical resources of the hardware used, i.e., RAM and CPU.

- What is the validity of the result according to the author?

They mention that there are certain limitations regarding the validity of their results. They mention their experimental case does not prove that the costs for development and maintenance are lower. Troubleshooting is another area that needs further validation.

- Does the research solve the problem/answer the question?

Their research in the example case that was provided shows that Jupiter's extension model when used with instrumented Docker container is a workable solution for complex test scenarios, e.g., end-to-end load tests for WebRTC applications.

- What are to be done next? future work? and why?

Further studies on the potential benefits of Selenium-Jupiter for maintainability, flakiness, and troubleshooting requires more research in the future. In this test scalability was also significant limitation as the use of a single Docker engine. This limits the number of browsers due to the limitations of the hardware used. To solve this limitation, they plan to support the use of Docker clusters through e.g., Kubernetes in a future release of Selenium-Jupiter.

- And lastly something from you. What do you think and why? If you make claims support those with evidence or logic.

I found this interesting especially since my primary interest has been in web development. Being able to use Selenium WebDriver to control browsers and using Docker containers to test different browsers in end-to-end tests is something I wish I had known about or that the technology had been available in the late 90's and early 2000's. Being able to do automated end-to-end tests and stress tests is highly interesting. End-to-end testing the way, I have known it has always been manual, just observing the result in one-after-the-other browser so I am looking forward to put this new won knowledge to some practical use in future projects.