

Functional Testing Project Organization

Problem 1: Triangle Problem

1. Boundary value testing

- Normal worst case boundary value testing has been applied with total of 125 test cases. The results show that the programme failed in 37 test cases. To calculate the efforts per failure we can have the total effort (which is 120 minutes to generate the test cases + 5 minutes to run the test) divided by the number of founded failures (which is 37) so the effort per failure is about 3.4 minutes per failure.
- We can see that the failures are all about two reasons:

First: all test cases that have $c \geq a + b$ gave wrong output. For example:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
1,1,100	Not a Triangle	Isosceles	Fail
1,1,199	Not a Triangle	Isosceles	Fail
2,2,200	Not a Triangle	Isosceles	Fail

All test cases that has $b < a + c$ or $a < b + c$ have been passed.

Second: some testing data that have $b = c$, gave wrong output. For example:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
200,199,199	Isosceles	Scalene	Fail
199,100,100	Isosceles	Scalene	Fail
100,200,200	Isosceles	Scalene	Fail

Some of the testing data that have $b = c$ with other specifications passed the testing.
For example:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
2,2,2	Equilateral	Equilateral	Pass
200,100,100	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass

- From the results observation we can tell that some changes have to be gone on the code in the next corrective maintenance phase. The first one is about adding the point of C has to be less than the sum of b and a. Another change need to be done which is adding the condition of isosceles triangles (if $b == c$ && $a != b$ then "Isosceles").
- The main benefit that has been added by this method is testing the extremes of the variables. It still has not tested the invalid values so we can put the Robust worst case boundary value testing as a testing improvement plan.

2. Equivalent class testing:

- Normal equivalent class testing has been applied with total of 11 test cases. The results show that the programme failed in 4 test cases. To calculate the efforts per failure we can have the total effort (which is 30 minutes to generate the test cases + 2 minutes to run the test) divided by the number of founded failures (which is 4) so the effort per failure is about 8 minutes per failure. According to type of equivalent class testing we can see that we have some redundant test cases because we are having more than one test case in the same class. For example:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
8,3,4	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	pass
7,3,4	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	pass

There are only 4 mandatory test cases related to 4 classes, so we have 7 extra test cases.

- We can see that the failures are all about three reasons:

First: all test cases that have $c \geq a + b$ gave wrong output. For example:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
3,4,8	Not a Triangle	Isosceles	Fail
3,4,7	Not a Triangle	Isosceles	Fail

All test cases that has $b \geq a + c$ or $a \geq b + c$ have been passed.

Second: some testing data that have $b = c$, gave wrong output. For example:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
3,5,5	Isosceles	Scalene	Fail

Some of the testing data that have $b = c$ with other specifications passed the testing. For example:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
5,5,5	Equilateral	Equilateral	Pass

Third: a special case that is out of the specification. The code should not focus on the type of the triangle based in its angle.

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
3,4,5	Scalene	Right Triangle	Fail

- From the results observation we can tell that some changes have to be gone on the code in the next corrective maintenance phase. The first one is about adding the point of C has to be less than the sum of b and a. Another change need to be done which is adding the condition of isosceles triangles (if $b == c$ && $a != b$ then "Isosceles". Also we need to check if the right triangle case is mentioned clearly in the specifications or not. if not, the third error need to be fixed.
- The main benefit that has been added by this method is reducing the time of testing and minimize the number of test cases while producing good results.

3. Decision table-based testing:

- Normal decision table-based testing has been applied with total of 11 test cases. The results show that the programme failed in 4 test cases. To calculate the efforts per failure we can have the total effort (which is 30 minutes to generate the test cases + 2 minutes to run the test) divided by the number of founded failures (which is 4) so the effort per failure is about 8 minutes per failure.
- We can see that the failures are all about three reasons:

First: all test cases that have $c \geq a + b$ gave wrong output. For example:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
1,2,4	Not a Triangle	Isosceles	Fail

All test cases that has $b \geq a + c$ or $a \geq b + c$ have been passed.

Second: some testing data that have $b = c$, gave wrong output. For example:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
3,2,2	Isosceles	Scalene	Fail

Some of the testing data that have $b = c$ with other specifications passed the testing. For example:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
5,5,5	Equilateral	Equilateral	Pass

Third: a special case that is out of the specification. The code should not focus on the type of the triangle based in its angle.

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
3,4,5	Scalene	Right Triangle	Fail

- From the results observation we can tell that some changes have to be gone on the code in the next corrective maintenance phase. The first one is about adding the point of C has to be less than the sum of b and a. Another change need to be done which is adding the condition of isosceles triangles (if $b == c$ && $a != b$ then "Isosceles". Also we need to check if the right triangle case is mentioned clearly in the specifications or not. if not, the third error need to be fixed.
- The main benefit that has been added by this method providing good coverage and its representation is simple.

Problem 2: Next-Date Problem

1. Boundary value testing

- Normal worst case boundary value testing has been applied with total of 124 test cases. The results show that the programme failed in 27 test cases. To calculate the efforts per failure we can have the total effort (which is 120 minutes to generate the test cases + 2 minutes to run the test) divided by the number of founded failures (which is 27) so the effort per failure is about 4.5 minutes per failure.
- We can see that the failures are all about four reasons:

First: all test cases that have days in Feb > 29 gave wrong output. For example:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
"February",30,1812	Impossible	March 1, 1812	Fail
"February",31,1813	Impossible	March 1, 1813	Fail

Second: All testing data that have days in Jun > 30 and days in Nov > 30 gave wrong output. For example:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
"June",31,2011	Impossible	July 1, 2011	Fail
"November",31,1912	Impossible	December 1, 1912	Fail

Third: After Dec 31, the system is not incrementing the year. For example:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
"December",31,1912	January 1, 1913	January 1, 1912	Fail

Fourth: There are 2 faulty test cases:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
"June",1,1812	June 1, 1812	June 2, 1812	Fail
"June",1,1813	June 1, 1813	June 2, 1812	Fail

- From the results observation we can tell that some changes have to be gone on the code in the next corrective maintenance phase. The first one is about adding the point of days in February has to be less than 30, and the boundary value testing should focus on the values of days in February == 29 and the days in February == 28 in the next regression testing. Another important we need to focus on while editing is focusing on the months that have only 30 days. Also, the year need to be incremented after Dec 31. The test cases in the next testing phase should be more accurate and complete all boundary values. In the provided testing data sheet, we can note that one test case is missing (which is ""January",15,1812"). So added it in a separate sheet and fortunately it has been passed.

- The main benefit that has been added by this method is testing the extremes of the variables. It still has not focused on the invalid values so we can put the Robust worst case boundary value testing as a testing improvement plan.

2. Equivalent class testing:

- Strong normal equivalent class testing has been applied with total of 22 test cases. The results show that the programme failed in 8 test cases. To calculate the efforts per failure we can have the total effort (which is 45 minutes to generate the test cases + 2 minutes to run the test) divided by the number of founded failures (which is 8) so the effort per failure is about 5.7 minutes per failure. According to type of equivalent class testing we can see that we have some redundant test cases in the sheet provided and some missing test cases, so we are having more than one test case in the same class. For example:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
April,15,1993	April 16, 1993	April 16, 1993	Fail!
April,28,1993	April 29, 1993	April 29, 1993	Fail!

There are also many missing test cases, like the ones related to the class of Year = 2000, and the ones related to the class of a leap year (has been mentioned once with Feb).

- We can see that the failures are all about 5 reasons:

First: all test cases that have days in Feb > 29 gave wrong output. For example:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
February,30,1993	Impossible	March 1, 1993	Fail
February,31,1993	Impossible	March 1, 1993	Fail

Second: Testing data that has day in April > 30 gave wrong output:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
April,31,1993	Impossible	May 1, 1993	Fail

Third: After Dec 31, the system is not incrementing the year:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
December,31,1993	January 1, 1994	January 1, 1993	Fail

Fourth: There are 3 faulty test cases, where the actual output is identical to the expected output but the system considers that as a Fail:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
April,15,1993	April,16,1993	April,16,1993	Fail
April,28,1993	April,29,1993	April,29,1993	Fail
April,29,1993	April,30,1993	April,30,1993	Fail

Fifth: when February with a non-leap year and day = 29, the system is not showing that it is impossible:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
February,29,1993	Impossible	March 1, 1993	Fail

- From the results observation we can tell that some changes have to be gone on the code in the next corrective maintenance phase. The first one is about adding the point of days in February has to be less than 30, and the testing should focus on the values of days in February = 29 and the days in February = 28 in the next regression testing. Another important we need to focus on while editing is focusing on the months that have only 30 days. Also, the year need to be incremented after Dec 31. The test cases in the next testing phase should be more accurate and cover all classes.
- The main benefit that has been added by this method is reducing the time of testing and minimize the number of test cases while producing good results.

3. Decision table-based testing:

- Normal decision table-based testing has been applied with total of 22 test cases. The results show that the programme failed in 5 test cases. To calculate the efforts per failure we can have the total effort (which is 30 minutes to generate the test cases + 2 minutes to run the test) divided by the number of founded failures (which is 5) so the effort per failure is about 6.4 minutes per failure.
There are also many missing test cases, like the ones related to the class of Year = 2000, and the ones related to the class of a leap year (has been mentioned once with Feb).
- We can see that the failures are all about 4 reasons:

First: all test cases that have days in Feb > 29 gave wrong output. For example:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
February,30,1993	Impossible	March 1, 1993	Fail
February,31,1993	Impossible	March 1, 1993	Fail

Second: Testing data that has day in April > 30 gave wrong output:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
April,31,1993	Impossible	May 1, 1993	Fail

Third: After Dec 31, the system is not incrementing the year:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
December,31,1993	January 1, 1994	January 1, 1993	Fail

Fourth: when February with a non-leap year and day = 29, the system is not showing that it is impossible:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
February,29,1993	Impossible	March 1, 1993	Fail

- From the results observation we can tell that some changes have to be gone on the code in the next corrective maintenance phase. The first one is about adding the point of days in February has to be less than 30, and the testing should focus on the values of days in February = 29 and the days in February = 28 in the next regression testing. Another important we need to focus on while editing is focusing on the months that have only 30 days. Also, the year need to be incremented after Dec 31. The test cases in the next testing phase should be more accurate and cover all classes.
- The main benefit that has been added by this method providing good coverage and its representation is simple.

Problem 3: Commission Problem

1. Boundary value testing

- Normal worst case boundary value testing has been applied with total of 40 test cases. The results show that the programme failed in 30 test cases. To calculate the efforts per failure we can have the total effort (which is 50 minutes to generate the test cases + 2 minutes to run the test) divided by the number of founded failures (which is 30) so the effort per failure is about 1.7 minutes per failure. Regarding to the type of testing we have, there are 27 mandatory test cases, but we are also having some robust test cases:

Testing data	Expected output	Actual output	Result
71,40,45	964	1084	Fail
35,81,45	886	1006	Fail
35,40,91	870	990	Fail
35,40,0	415	535	Fail
35,0,45	400	520	Fail
0,40,45	325	445	Fail

- We can see that the failures are many categories:

First: Some test cases that have Sales close to 1000 gave wrong output. For example:

Testing data	Sales	Expected output	Actual output	Result
10,11,9	1005	100.75	100.5	Fail
1,1,38	1025	103.75	102.5	Fail

Second: All testing data that have sales > 1800 and gave wrong output. For example:

Testing data	Sales	Expected output	Actual output	Result
1,1,70	1825	225	345	Fail
35,40,89	5000	860	980	Fail

Third: There are some faulty test cases, For example:

Testing data	Sales	Expected output	Actual output	Result
10,9,11	995	99.52	99.5	Fail
1,31,1	1000	10	100	Fail

- From the results observation we can tell that some changes have to be done on the code in the next corrective maintenance phase. The first one is about checking the algorithm of calculating the commission in the case of the sales are more than 1800. Also, the algorithm in case of the sales is around 1000. Moreover, the test cases need to be more accurate while we are doing the regressing testing.

- The main benefit that has been added by this method providing good coverage and its representation is simple, but it was not enough to catch all the problems.

2. Equivalent class testing:

- Normal equivalent class testing has been applied with total of 3 test cases. The results show that the programme failed in 1 test cases. To calculate the efforts per failure we can have the total effort (which is 15 minutes to generate the test cases + 1 minutes to run the test) divided by the number of founded failures (which is 1) so the effort per failure is about 16 minutes per failure.
- We can see that the failure is related to the case of sales > 1800.
- From the results observation we can tell that there is a problem in the algorithm of calculating the commission when the sale is more than 1800.
- The main benefit that has been added by this method is testing the extremes of the variables. We can improve the testing plan by adding the test cases that have the combination of the invalid values.

3. Decision table-based testing:

- A decision table based class testing has been applied with total of 7 test cases. The results show that the programme failed in 7 test cases. To calculate the efforts per failure we can have the total effort (which is 20 minutes to generate the test cases + 2 minutes to run the test) divided by the number of founded failures (which is 7) so the effort per failure is about 3.14 minutes per failure.
- The test cases were focusing on the invalid values without taking the Cartesian product of them. Only one of the test cases had all valid values and it was testing the case of sales is more than 1800.
- I cannot tell what is the benefit that has been added by this methodology because it need to cover more test cases that are more accurate.

At the end of this report, I need to mention that it is very difficult to guess the reason of the faults related to the commission problem without having access to the code. In this case, white box testing will be very helpful.

Appendix:

Complete Test Sets and results:

Problem 1: Triangle Problem

1. Boundary value testing

Testing Data:

A	B	C	Expected Output
1	1	1	Equilateral
1	1	2	Not a Triangle
1	1	100	Not a Triangle
1	1	199	Not a Triangle
1	1	200	Not a Triangle
1	2	1	Not a Triangle
1	2	2	Isosceles
1	2	100	Not a Triangle
1	2	199	Not a Triangle
1	2	200	Not a Triangle
1	100	1	Not a Triangle
1	100	2	Not a Triangle
1	100	100	Isosceles
1	100	199	Not a Triangle
1	100	200	Not a Triangle
1	199	1	Not a Triangle
1	199	2	Not a Triangle
1	199	100	Not a Triangle
1	199	199	Isosceles
1	199	200	Not a Triangle
1	200	1	Not a Triangle
1	200	2	Not a Triangle
1	200	100	Not a Triangle
1	200	199	Not a Triangle
1	200	200	Isosceles
2	1	1	Not a Triangle
2	1	2	Isosceles
2	1	100	Not a Triangle
2	1	199	Not a Triangle
2	1	200	Not a Triangle
2	2	1	Isosceles
2	2	2	Equilateral
2	2	100	Not a Triangle
2	2	199	Not a Triangle
2	2	200	Not a Triangle

Reem Ezeddin
IT814 - Fall 2022
Mini project 1

2	100	1	Not a Triangle
2	100	2	Not a Triangle
2	100	100	Isosceles
2	100	199	Not a Triangle
2	100	200	Not a Triangle
2	199	1	Not a Triangle
2	199	2	Not a Triangle
2	199	100	Not a Triangle
2	199	199	Isosceles
2	199	200	Scalene
2	200	1	Not a Triangle
2	200	2	Not a Triangle
2	200	100	Not a Triangle
2	200	199	Scalene
2	200	200	Isosceles
100	1	1	Not a Triangle
100	1	2	Not a Triangle
100	1	100	Isosceles
100	1	199	Not a Triangle
100	1	200	Not a Triangle
100	2	1	Not a Triangle
100	2	2	Not a Triangle
100	2	100	Isosceles
100	2	199	Not a Triangle
100	2	200	Not a Triangle
100	100	1	Isosceles
100	100	2	Isosceles
100	100	100	Equilateral
100	100	199	Isosceles
100	100	200	Not a Triangle
100	199	1	Not a Triangle
100	199	2	Not a Triangle
100	199	100	Isosceles
100	199	199	Isosceles
100	199	200	Scalene
100	200	1	Not a Triangle
100	200	2	Not a Triangle
100	200	100	Not a Triangle
100	200	199	Scalene
100	200	200	Isosceles
199	1	1	Not a Triangle
199	1	2	Not a Triangle
199	1	100	Not a Triangle

Reem Ezeddin
IT814 - Fall 2022
Mini project 1

199	1	199	Scalene
199	1	200	Not a Triangle
199	2	1	Not a Triangle
199	2	2	Not a Triangle
199	2	100	Not a Triangle
199	2	199	Isosceles
199	2	200	Scalene
199	100	1	Not a Triangle
199	100	2	Not a Triangle
199	100	100	Isosceles
199	100	199	Isosceles
199	100	200	Scalene
199	199	1	Isosceles
199	199	2	Isosceles
199	199	100	Isosceles
199	199	199	Equilateral
199	199	200	Isosceles
199	200	1	Not a Triangle
199	200	2	Scalene
199	200	100	Scalene
199	200	199	Isosceles
199	200	200	Isosceles
200	1	1	Not a Triangle
200	1	2	Not a Triangle
200	1	100	Not a Triangle
200	1	199	Not a Triangle
200	1	200	Isosceles
200	2	1	Not a Triangle
200	2	2	Not a Triangle
200	2	100	Not a Triangle
200	2	199	Scalene
200	2	200	Isosceles
200	100	1	Not a Triangle
200	100	2	Not a Triangle
200	100	100	Not a Triangle
200	100	199	Scalene
200	100	200	Isosceles
200	199	1	Not a Triangle
200	199	2	Scalene
200	199	100	Scalene
200	199	199	Isosceles
200	199	200	Isosceles
200	200	1	Isosceles

200	200	2	Isosceles
200	200	100	Isosceles
200	200	199	Isosceles
200	200	200	Equilateral

Results:

A	B	C	Expected Output	Actual Output	Result
1	1	1	Equilateral	Equilateral	Pass
1	1	2	Not a Triangle	Isosceles	Fail
1	1	100	Not a Triangle	Isosceles	Fail
1	1	199	Not a Triangle	Isosceles	Fail
1	1	200	Not a Triangle	Isosceles	Fail
1	2	1	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
1	2	2	Isosceles	Scalene	Fail
1	2	100	Not a Triangle	Scalene	Fail
1	2	199	Not a Triangle	Scalene	Fail
1	2	200	Not a Triangle	Scalene	Fail
1	100	1	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
1	100	2	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
1	100	100	Isosceles	Scalene	Fail
1	100	199	Not a Triangle	Scalene	Fail
1	100	200	Not a Triangle	Scalene	Fail
1	199	1	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
1	199	2	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
1	199	100	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
1	199	199	Isosceles	Scalene	Fail
1	199	200	Not a Triangle	Scalene	Fail
1	200	1	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
1	200	2	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
1	200	100	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
1	200	199	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
1	200	200	Isosceles	Scalene	Fail
2	1	1	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
2	1	2	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
2	1	100	Not a Triangle	Scalene	Fail
2	1	199	Not a Triangle	Scalene	Fail
2	1	200	Not a Triangle	Scalene	Fail
2	2	1	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
2	2	2	Equilateral	Equilateral	Pass
2	2	100	Not a Triangle	Isosceles	Fail
2	2	199	Not a Triangle	Isosceles	Fail
2	2	200	Not a Triangle	Isosceles	Fail

Reem Ezeddin
IT814 - Fall 2022
Mini project 1

2	100	1	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
2	100	2	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
2	100	100	Isosceles	Scalene	Fail
2	100	199	Not a Triangle	Scalene	Fail
2	100	200	Not a Triangle	Scalene	Fail
2	199	1	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
2	199	2	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
2	199	100	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
2	199	199	Isosceles	Scalene	Fail
2	199	200	Scalene	Scalene	Pass
2	200	1	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
2	200	2	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
2	200	100	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
2	200	199	Scalene	Scalene	Pass
2	200	200	Isosceles	Scalene	Fail
100	1	1	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
100	1	2	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
100	1	100	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
100	1	199	Not a Triangle	Scalene	Fail
100	1	200	Not a Triangle	Scalene	Fail
100	2	1	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
100	2	2	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
100	2	100	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
100	2	199	Not a Triangle	Scalene	Fail
100	2	200	Not a Triangle	Scalene	Fail
100	100	1	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
100	100	2	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
100	100	100	Equilateral	Equilateral	Pass
100	100	199	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
100	100	200	Not a Triangle	Isosceles	Fail
100	199	1	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
100	199	2	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
100	199	100	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
100	199	199	Isosceles	Scalene	Fail
100	199	200	Scalene	Scalene	Pass
100	200	1	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
100	200	2	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
100	200	100	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
100	200	199	Scalene	Scalene	Pass
100	200	200	Isosceles	Scalene	Fail
199	1	1	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
199	1	2	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
199	1	100	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass

Reem Ezeddin
IT814 - Fall 2022
Mini project 1

199	1	199	Scalene	Isosceles	Fail
199	1	200	Not a Triangle	Scalene	Fail
199	2	1	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
199	2	2	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
199	2	100	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
199	2	199	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
199	2	200	Scalene	Scalene	Pass
199	100	1	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
199	100	2	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
199	100	100	Isosceles	Scalene	Fail
199	100	199	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
199	100	200	Scalene	Scalene	Pass
199	199	1	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
199	199	2	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
199	199	100	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
199	199	199	Equilateral	Equilateral	Pass
199	199	200	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
199	200	1	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
199	200	2	Scalene	Scalene	Pass
199	200	100	Scalene	Scalene	Pass
199	200	199	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
199	200	200	Isosceles	Scalene	Fail
200	1	1	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
200	1	2	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
200	1	100	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
200	1	199	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
200	1	200	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
200	2	1	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
200	2	2	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
200	2	100	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
200	2	199	Scalene	Scalene	Pass
200	2	200	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
200	100	1	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
200	100	2	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
200	100	100	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
200	100	199	Scalene	Scalene	Pass
200	100	200	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
200	199	1	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
200	199	2	Scalene	Scalene	Pass
200	199	100	Scalene	Scalene	Pass
200	199	199	Isosceles	Scalene	Fail
200	199	200	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
200	200	1	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass

200	200	2	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
200	200	100	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
200	200	199	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
200	200	200	Equilateral	Equilateral	Pass

2. Equivalent class testing

Testing Data:

A	B	C	Expected Output
5	5	5	Equilateral
5	5	3	Isosceles
5	3	5	Isosceles
3	5	5	Isosceles
3	4	5	Scalene
8	3	4	Not a Triangle
7	3	4	Not a Triangle
3	8	4	Not a Triangle
3	7	4	Not a Triangle
3	4	8	Not a Triangle
3	4	7	Not a Triangle

Results:

A	B	C	Expected Output	Actual Output	Results
5	5	5	Equilateral	Equilateral	Pass
5	5	3	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
5	3	5	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
3	5	5	Isosceles	Scalene	Fail
3	4	5	Scalene	Right Triangle	Fail
8	3	4	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
7	3	4	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
3	8	4	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
3	7	4	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
3	4	8	Not a Triangle	Scalene	Fail
3	4	7	Not a Triangle	Scalene	Fail

3. Decision table-based testing

Testing Data:

A	B	C	Expected Output
4	1	2	Not a Triangle

1	4	2	Not a Triangle
1	2	4	Not a Triangle
5	2	3	Not a Triangle
3	5	2	Not a Triangle
2	3	5	Not a Triangle
5	5	5	Equilateral
2	2	3	Isosceles
2	3	2	Isosceles
3	2	2	Isosceles
3	4	5	Scalene

Results:

A	B	C	Expected Output	Actual Output	Result
4	1	2	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
1	4	2	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
1	2	4	Not a Triangle	Scalene	Fail
5	2	3	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
3	5	2	Not a Triangle	Not a Triangle	Pass
2	3	5	Not a Triangle	Scalene	Fail
5	5	5	Equilateral	Equilateral	Pass
2	2	3	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
2	3	2	Isosceles	Isosceles	Pass
3	2	2	Isosceles	Scalene	Fail
3	4	5	"Scalene"	Right Triangle	Fail

Problem 2: Next-Date Problem

1. Boundary value testing

Testing Data:

Input	Expected Output
January 1 1812	January 2, 1812
January 1 1813	January 2, 1813
January 1 1912	January 2, 1912
January 1 2011	January 2, 2011
January 1 2012	January 2, 2012
January 2 1812	January 3, 1812
January 2 1813	January 3, 1813
January 2 1912	January 3, 1912
January 2 2011	January 3, 2011
January 2 2012	January 3, 2012
January 15 1813	January 16, 1813
January 15 1912	January 16, 1912

Reem Ezeddin
IT814 - Fall 2022
Mini project 1

January	15	2011	January 16, 2011
January	15	2012	January 16, 2012
January	30	1812	January 31, 1812
January	30	1813	January 31, 1813
January	30	1912	January 31, 1912
January	30	2011	January 31, 2011
January	30	2012	January 31, 2012
January	31	1812	February 1, 1812
January	31	1813	February 1, 1813
January	31	1912	February 1, 1912
January	31	2011	February 1, 2011
January	31	2012	February 1, 2012
February	1	1812	February 2, 1812
February	1	1813	February 2, 1813
February	1	1912	February 2, 1912
February	1	2011	February 2, 2011
February	1	2012	February 2, 2012
February	2	1812	February 3, 1812
February	2	1813	February 3, 1813
February	2	1912	February 3, 1912
February	2	2011	February 3, 2011
February	2	2012	February 3, 2012
February	15	1812	February 16, 1812
February	15	1813	February 16, 1813
February	15	1912	February 16, 1912
February	15	2011	February 16, 2011
February	15	2012	February 16, 2012
February	30	1812	Impossible
February	30	1813	Impossible
February	30	1912	Impossible
February	30	2011	Impossible
February	30	2012	Impossible
February	31	1812	Impossible
February	31	1813	Impossible
February	31	1912	Impossible
February	31	2011	Impossible
February	31	2012	Impossible
June	1	1812	June 1, 1812
June	1	1813	June 1, 1813
June	1	1912	June 2, 1912
June	1	2011	June 2, 2011
June	1	2012	June 2, 2012
June	2	1812	June 3, 1812

Reem Ezeddin
IT814 - Fall 2022
Mini project 1

June	2	1813	June 3, 1813
June	2	1912	June 3, 1912
June	2	2011	June 3, 2011
June	2	2012	June 3, 2012
June	15	1812	June 16, 1812
June	15	1813	June 16, 1813
June	15	1912	June 16, 1912
June	15	2011	June 16, 2011
June	15	2012	June 16, 2012
June	30	1812	July 1, 1812
June	30	1813	July 1, 1813
June	30	1912	July 1, 1912
June	30	2011	July 1, 2011
June	30	2012	July 1, 2012
June	31	1812	Impossible
June	31	1813	Impossible
June	31	1912	Impossible
June	31	2011	Impossible
June	31	2012	Impossible
November	1	1812	November 2, 1812
November	1	1813	November 2, 1813
November	1	1912	November 2, 1912
November	1	2011	November 2, 2011
November	1	2012	November 2, 2012
November	2	1812	November 3, 1812
November	2	1813	November 3, 1813
November	2	1912	November 3, 1912
November	2	2011	November 3, 2011
November	2	2012	November 3, 2012
November	15	1812	November 16, 1812
November	15	1813	November 16, 1813
November	15	1912	November 16, 1912
November	15	2011	November 16, 2011
November	15	2012	November 16, 2012
November	30	1812	December 1, 1812
November	30	1813	December 1, 1813
November	30	1912	December 1, 1912
November	30	2011	December 1, 2011
November	30	2012	December 1, 2012
November	31	1812	Impossible
November	31	1813	Impossible
November	31	1912	Impossible
November	31	2011	Impossible

Reem Ezeddin
IT814 - Fall 2022
Mini project 1

November	31	2012	Impossible
December	1	1812	December 2, 1812
December	1	1813	December 2, 1813
December	1	1912	December 2, 1912
December	1	2011	December 2, 2011
December	1	2012	December 2, 2012
December	2	1812	December 3, 1812
December	2	1813	December 3, 1813
December	2	1912	December 3, 1912
December	2	2011	December 3, 2011
December	2	2012	December 3, 2012
December	15	1812	December 16, 1812
December	15	1813	December 16, 1813
December	15	1912	December 16, 1912
December	15	2011	December 16, 2011
December	15	2012	December 16, 2012
December	30	1812	December 31, 1812
December	30	1813	December 31, 1813
December	30	1912	December 31, 1912
December	30	2011	December 31, 2011
December	30	2012	December 31, 2012
December	31	1812	January 1, 1813
December	31	1813	January 1, 1814
December	31	1912	January 1, 1913
December	31	2011	January 1, 2012
December	31	2012	January 1, 2013

Results:

Input			Expected Output	Actual Output	Results
January	1	1812	January 2, 1812	January 2, 1812	Pass
January	1	1813	January 2, 1813	January 2, 1813	Pass
January	1	1912	January 2, 1912	January 2, 1912	Pass
January	1	2011	January 2, 2011	January 2, 2011	Pass
January	1	2012	January 2, 2012	January 2, 2012	Pass
January	2	1812	January 3, 1812	January 3, 1812	Pass
January	2	1813	January 3, 1813	January 3, 1813	Pass
January	2	1912	January 3, 1912	January 3, 1912	Pass
January	2	2011	January 3, 2011	January 3, 2011	Pass
January	2	2012	January 3, 2012	January 3, 2012	Pass
January	15	1813	January 16, 1813	January 16, 1813	Pass
January	15	1912	January 16, 1912	January 16, 1912	Pass
January	15	2011	January 16, 2011	January 16, 2011	Pass
January	15	2012	January 16, 2012	January 16, 2012	Pass

Reem Ezeddin
IT814 - Fall 2022
Mini project 1

January	30	1812	January 31, 1812	January 31, 1812	Pass
January	30	1813	January 31, 1813	January 31, 1813	Pass
January	30	1912	January 31, 1912	January 31, 1912	Pass
January	30	2011	January 31, 2011	January 31, 2011	Pass
January	30	2012	January 31, 2012	January 31, 2012	Pass
January	31	1812	February 1, 1812	February 1, 1812	Pass
January	31	1813	February 1, 1813	February 1, 1813	Pass
January	31	1912	February 1, 1912	February 1, 1912	Pass
January	31	2011	February 1, 2011	February 1, 2011	Pass
January	31	2012	February 1, 2012	February 1, 2012	Pass
February	1	1812	February 2, 1812	February 2, 1812	Pass
February	1	1813	February 2, 1813	February 2, 1813	Pass
February	1	1912	February 2, 1912	February 2, 1912	Pass
February	1	2011	February 2, 2011	February 2, 2011	Pass
February	1	2012	February 2, 2012	February 2, 2012	Pass
February	2	1812	February 3, 1812	February 3, 1812	Pass
February	2	1813	February 3, 1813	February 3, 1813	Pass
February	2	1912	February 3, 1912	February 3, 1912	Pass
February	2	2011	February 3, 2011	February 3, 2011	Pass
February	2	2012	February 3, 2012	February 3, 2012	Pass
February	15	1812	February 16, 1812	February 16, 1812	Pass
February	15	1813	February 16, 1813	February 16, 1813	Pass
February	15	1912	February 16, 1912	February 16, 1912	Pass
February	15	2011	February 16, 2011	February 16, 2011	Pass
February	15	2012	February 16, 2012	February 16, 2012	Pass
February	30	1812	Impossible	March 1, 1812	Fail
February	30	1813	Impossible	March 1, 1813	Fail
February	30	1912	Impossible	March 1, 1912	Fail
February	30	2011	Impossible	March 1, 2011	Fail
February	30	2012	Impossible	March 1, 2012	Fail
February	31	1812	Impossible	March 1, 1812	Fail
February	31	1813	Impossible	March 1, 1813	Fail
February	31	1912	Impossible	March 1, 1912	Fail
February	31	2011	Impossible	March 1, 2011	Fail
February	31	2012	Impossible	March 1, 2012	Fail
June	1	1812	June 1, 1812	June 2, 1812	Fail
June	1	1813	June 1, 1813	June 2, 1813	Fail
June	1	1912	June 2, 1912	June 2, 1912	Pass
June	1	2011	June 2, 2011	June 2, 2011	Pass
June	1	2012	June 2, 2012	June 2, 2012	Pass
June	2	1812	June 3, 1812	June 3, 1812	Pass
June	2	1813	June 3, 1813	June 3, 1813	Pass
June	2	1912	June 3, 1912	June 3, 1912	Pass

Reem Ezeddin
IT814 - Fall 2022
Mini project 1

June	2	2011	June 3, 2011	June 3, 2011	Pass
June	2	2012	June 3, 2012	June 3, 2012	Pass
June	15	1812	June 16, 1812	June 16, 1812	Pass
June	15	1813	June 16, 1813	June 16, 1813	Pass
June	15	1912	June 16, 1912	June 16, 1912	Pass
June	15	2011	June 16, 2011	June 16, 2011	Pass
June	15	2012	June 16, 2012	June 16, 2012	Pass
June	30	1812	July 1, 1812	July 1, 1812	Pass
June	30	1813	July 1, 1813	July 1, 1813	Pass
June	30	1912	July 1, 1912	July 1, 1912	Pass
June	30	2011	July 1, 2011	July 1, 2011	Pass
June	30	2012	July 1, 2012	July 1, 2012	Pass
June	31	1812	Impossible	July 1, 1812	Fail
June	31	1813	Impossible	July 1, 1813	Fail
June	31	1912	Impossible	July 1, 1912	Fail
June	31	2011	Impossible	July 1, 2011	Fail
June	31	2012	Impossible	July 1, 2012	Fail
November	1	1812	November 2, 1812	November 2, 1812	Pass
November	1	1813	November 2, 1813	November 2, 1813	Pass
November	1	1912	November 2, 1912	November 2, 1912	Pass
November	1	2011	November 2, 2011	November 2, 2011	Pass
November	1	2012	November 2, 2012	November 2, 2012	Pass
November	2	1812	November 3, 1812	November 3, 1812	Pass
November	2	1813	November 3, 1813	November 3, 1813	Pass
November	2	1912	November 3, 1912	November 3, 1912	Pass
November	2	2011	November 3, 2011	November 3, 2011	Pass
November	2	2012	November 3, 2012	November 3, 2012	Pass
November	15	1812	November 16, 1812	November 16, 1812	Pass
November	15	1813	November 16, 1813	November 16, 1813	Pass
November	15	1912	November 16, 1912	November 16, 1912	Pass
November	15	2011	November 16, 2011	November 16, 2011	Pass
November	15	2012	November 16, 2012	November 16, 2012	Pass
November	30	1812	December 1, 1812	December 1, 1812	Pass
November	30	1813	December 1, 1813	December 1, 1813	Pass
November	30	1912	December 1, 1912	December 1, 1912	Pass
November	30	2011	December 1, 2011	December 1, 2011	Pass
November	30	2012	December 1, 2012	December 1, 2012	Pass
November	31	1812	Impossible	December 1, 1812	Fail
November	31	1813	Impossible	December 1, 1813	Fail
November	31	1912	Impossible	December 1, 1912	Fail
November	31	2011	Impossible	December 1, 2011	Fail
November	31	2012	Impossible	December 1, 2012	Fail
December	1	1812	December 2, 1812	December 2, 1812	Pass

December	1	1813	December 2, 1813	December 2, 1813	Pass
December	1	1912	December 2, 1912	December 2, 1912	Pass
December	1	2011	December 2, 2011	December 2, 2011	Pass
December	1	2012	December 2, 2012	December 2, 2012	Pass
December	2	1812	December 3, 1812	December 3, 1812	Pass
December	2	1813	December 3, 1813	December 3, 1813	Pass
December	2	1912	December 3, 1912	December 3, 1912	Pass
December	2	2011	December 3, 2011	December 3, 2011	Pass
December	2	2012	December 3, 2012	December 3, 2012	Pass
December	15	1812	December 16, 1812	December 16, 1812	Pass
December	15	1813	December 16, 1813	December 16, 1813	Pass
December	15	1912	December 16, 1912	December 16, 1912	Pass
December	15	2011	December 16, 2011	December 16, 2011	Pass
December	15	2012	December 16, 2012	December 16, 2012	Pass
December	30	1812	December 31, 1812	December 31, 1812	Pass
December	30	1813	December 31, 1813	December 31, 1813	Pass
December	30	1912	December 31, 1912	December 31, 1912	Pass
December	30	2011	December 31, 2011	December 31, 2011	Pass
December	30	2012	December 31, 2012	December 31, 2012	Pass
December	31	1812	January 1, 1813	January 1, 1812	Fail
December	31	1813	January 1, 1814	January 1, 1813	Fail
December	31	1912	January 1, 1913	January 1, 1912	Fail
December	31	2011	January 1, 2012	January 1, 2011	Fail
December	31	2012	January 1, 2013	January 1, 2012	Fail

2. Equivalent class testing

Testing Data:

Input			Expected Output	
April	15	1993	April 16	1993
May	28	1993	April 29	1993
June	29	1993	April 30	1993
July	30	1993	May 1	1993
August	31	1993	Impossible	
September	15	1993	January 16	1993
October	28	1993	January 29	1993
November	29	1993	January 30	1993
December	30	1993	January 31	1993
January	31	1993	February 1	1993
February	15	1993	December 16	1993
March	28	1993	December 29	1993
April	29	1993	December 30	1993
May	30	1993	December 31	1993

June	31	1993	January 1	1994
July	15	1993	February 16	1993
August	28	1992	February 29	1992
September	28	1993	March 1	1993
October	29	1992	March 1	1992
February	29	1993	Impossible	
February	30	1993	Impossible	
February	31	1993	Impossible	

Results:

Input			Expected Output	Actual Output	Result
April	15	1993	April 16, 1993	April 16, 1993	Fail
April	28	1993	April 29, 1993	April 29, 1993	Fail
April	29	1993	April 30, 1993	April 30, 1993	Fail
April	30	1993	May 1, 1993	May 1, 1993	Pass
April	31	1993	Impossible	May 1, 1993	Fail
January	15	1993	January 16, 1993	January 16, 1993	Pass
January	28	1993	January 29, 1993	January 29, 1993	Pass
January	29	1993	January 30, 1993	January 30, 1993	Pass
January	30	1993	January 31, 1993	January 31, 1993	Pass
January	31	1993	February 1, 1993	February 1, 1993	Pass
December	15	1993	December 16, 1993	December 16, 1993	Pass
December	28	1993	December 29, 1993	December 29, 1993	Pass
December	29	1993	December 30, 1993	December 30, 1993	Pass
December	30	1993	December 31, 1993	December 31, 1993	Pass
December	31	1993	January 1, 1994	January 1, 1993	Fail
February	15	1993	February 16, 1993	February 16, 1993	Pass
February	28	1992	February 29, 1992	February 29, 1992	Pass
February	28	1993	March 1, 1993	March 1, 1993	Pass
February	29	1992	March 1, 1992	March 1, 1992	Pass
February	29	1993	Impossible	March 1, 1993	Fail
February	30	1993	Impossible	March 1, 1993	Fail
February	31	1993	Impossible	March 1, 1993	Fail

3. Decision table-based testing

Testing Data:

Input			Expected Output
April	15	1993	April 16 1993
April	28	1993	April 29 1993
April	29	1993	April 30 1993
April	30	1993	May 1 1993
April	31	1993	Impossible

Reem Ezeddin
IT814 - Fall 2022
Mini project 1

January	15	1993	January 16	1993
January	28	1993	January 29	1993
January	29	1993	January 30	1993
January	30	1993	January 31	1993
January	31	1993	February 1	1993
December	15	1993	December 16	1993
December	28	1993	December 29	1993
December	29	1993	December 30	1993
December	30	1993	December 31	1993
December	31	1993	January 1	1994
February	15	1993	February 16	1993
February	28	1992	February 29	1992
February	28	1993	March 1	1993
February	29	1992	March 1	1992
February	29	1993	Impossible	
February	30	1993	Impossible	
February	31	1993	Impossible	

Results:

Input	Expected Output	Actual Input	Results
April 15 1993	April 16, 1993	April 16, 1993	Pass
April 28 1993	April 29, 1993	April 29, 1993	Pass
April 29 1993	April 30, 1993	April 30, 1993	Pass
April 30 1993	May 1, 1993	May 1, 1993	Pass
April 31 1993	Impossible	May 1, 1993	Fail
January 15 1993	January 16, 1993	January 16, 1993	Pass
January 28 1993	January 29, 1993	January 29, 1993	Pass
January 29 1993	January 30, 1993	January 30, 1993	Pass
January 30 1993	January 31, 1993	January 31, 1993	Pass
January 31 1993	February 1, 1993	February 1, 1993	Pass
December 15 1993	December 16, 1993	December 16, 1993	Pass
December 28 1993	December 29, 1993	December 29, 1993	Pass
December 29 1993	December 30, 1993	December 30, 1993	Pass
December 30 1993	December 31, 1993	December 31, 1993	Pass
December 31 1993	January 1, 1994	January 1, 1993	Fail
February 15 1993	February 16, 1993	February 16, 1993	Pass
February 28 1992	February 29, 1992	February 29, 1992	Pass
February 28 1993	March 1, 1993	March 1, 1993	Pass
February 29 1992	March 1, 1992	March 1, 1992	Pass
February 29 1993	Impossible	March 1, 1993	Fail
February 30 1993	Impossible	March 1, 1993	Fail
February 31 1993	Impossible	March 1, 1993	Fail

Problem 3: Commission Problem

1. Boundary value testing

Testing Data:

Locks	Stocks	Barrels	Expected Commission
1	1	1	10
5	5	5	50
10	9	11	99.52
1	1	1	10
1	31	1	10
1	1	37	100
10	10	10	100
10	11	9	100.75
1	1	38	103.75
1	32	1	104.5
22	1	1	106.75
15	15	15	175
38	1	1	214.75
1	57	1	217
18	17	19	219.25
1	1	69	220
18	18	18	220
18	19	17	221
39	1	1	222
1	58	1	222
1	1	70	225
0	40	45	325
1	40	45	334
2	40	45	343
35	0	45	400
35	1	45	406
35	2	45	412
35	40	0	415
35	40	1	420
35	40	2	425
35	40	45	640
35	40	89	860
35	40	90	865
35	40	91	870
35	79	45	874
35	80	45	880
35	81	45	886

Reem Ezeddin
IT814 - Fall 2022
Mini project 1

69	40	45	946
70	40	45	955
71	40	45	964
70	80	90	1420

Results:

Locks	Stocks	Barrels	Expected Commission	Actual Commission	Results
1	1	1	10	10	Pass
5	5	5	50	50	Pass
10	9	11	99.52	99.5	Fail
1	1	1	10	10	Pass
1	31	1	10	100	Fail
1	1	37	100	100	Pass
10	10	10	100	100	Pass
10	11	9	100.75	100.5	Fail
1	1	38	103.75	102.5	Fail
1	32	1	104.5	103	Fail
22	1	1	106.75	104.5	Fail
15	15	15	175	175	Pass
38	1	1	214.75	214.75	Pass
1	57	1	217	217	Pass
18	17	19	219.25	219.25	Pass
1	1	69	220	220	Pass
18	18	18	220	220	Pass
18	19	17	221	341	Fail
39	1	1	222	342	Fail
1	58	1	222	342	Fail
1	1	70	225	345	Fail
0	40	45	325	445	Fail
1	40	45	334	454	Fail
2	40	45	343	463	Fail
35	0	45	400	520	Fail
35	1	45	406	526	Fail
35	2	45	412	532	Fail
35	40	0	415	535	Fail
35	40	1	420	540	Fail
35	40	2	425	545	Fail
35	40	45	640	760	Fail
35	40	89	860	980	Fail
35	40	90	865	985	Fail
35	40	91	870	990	Fail
35	79	45	874	994	Fail

35	80	45	880	1000	Fail
35	81	45	886	1006	Fail
69	40	45	946	1066	Fail
70	40	45	955	1075	Fail
71	40	45	964	1084	Fail
70	80	90	1420	1540	Fail

2. Equivalent class testing

Testing Data:

Locks	Stocks	Barrels	Expected Commission
5	5	5	50
15	15	15	175
25	25	25	360

Results:

Locks	Stocks	Barrels	Expected Commission	Actual Commission	Results
5	5	5	50	50	Pass
15	15	15	175	175	Pass
25	25	25	360	480	Fail

3. Decision table-based testing

Testing Data:

Locks	Stocks	Barrels	Expected Commission
35	40	45	50
35	40	0	"Impossible"
35	40	91	"Impossible"
35	0	45	"Impossible"
35	0	45	"Impossible"
0	40	45	"Impossible"
71	40	45	"Impossible"

Results:

Locks	Stocks	Barrels	Expected Commission	Actual Commission	Results
35	40	45	50	760	Fail
35	40	0	0	535	Fail
35	40	91	0	990	Fail
35	0	45	0	520	Fail

Reem Ezeddin
IT814 - Fall 2022
Mini project 1

35	0	45	0	520	Fail
0	40	45	0	445	Fail
71	40	45	0	1084	Fail