

Think-piece

You are given a class, `Container` and the following methods signatures:

```
public Container(); /* a constructor returns Container object*/
public int put(int n) /* returns 1 and adds n to the Container if n not
    in the Container, otherwise returns 0*/
public int get(int n); /* returns 1 if n is in the Container, 0
    otherwise */
public int remove(int n); /* returns 1 if n was in the Container;
    after return n is not in the Container! */
public int size() /* returns the number of elements in this Container.*/
```

You don't have source code, and the file isn't compiled with debugging information. Attached is a note: "We would like to use this (it's really fast) in our new system, but it needs to work well – a bug in this could be catastrophic. Can you give me a plan/approach for thorough testing? I don't want to share our test generation code with the company that wrote this, and they won't share source, but you can give them test cases. Can I get a short white paper on this by this afternoon's 2:35 project meeting? I know it's short notice, and you're not really a test engineer, but we need something.

Think-piece

You are given a class, Container and the following methods signatures:

```
public Container();/* a constructor returns Container object*/
public int put(int n)/* returns 1 and adds n to the Container if n not
    in the Container, otherwise returns 0*/
public int get(int n);/* returns 1 if n is in the Container, 0
    otherwise */
Public int remove(int n); /* returns 1 if n was in the Container;
    after return n is not in the Container! */
public int size()/* returns the number of elements in this Container.*/
```

You don't have source code, and the file isn't compiled with debugging information. Attached is a note: "We would like to use this (it's really fast) in our new system, but it needs to work well – a bug in this could be catastrophic. Can you give me a plan/approach for thorough testing? I don't want to share our test generation code with the company that wrote this, and they won't share source, but you can give them test cases. Can I get a short white paper on this by this afternoon's 2:35 project meeting? I know it's short notice, and you're not really a test engineer, but we need something.

A bug! Missing quotation mark!

Think-piece

You are given a class, Container and the following methods signatures:

```
public Container();/* a constructor returns Container object*/
public int put(int n)/* returns 1 and adds n to the Container if n not
    in the Container, otherwise returns 0*/
public int get(int n);/* returns 1 if n is in the Container, 0
    otherwise */
Public int remove(int n); /* returns 1 if n was in the Container;
    after return n is not in the Container! */
public int size()/* returns the number of elements in this Container.*/
```

You don't have source code, and the file isn't compiled with debugging information. Attached is a note: "We would like to use this (it's really fast) in our new system, but it needs to work well – a bug in this could be catastrophic. Can you give me a plan/approach for thorough testing? I don't want to share our test generation code with the company that wrote this, and they won't share source, but you can give them test cases. Can I get a short white paper on this by this afternoon's 2:35 project meeting? I know it's short notice, and you're not really a test engineer, but we need something."

What Matters Here?

- Simplify the problem
- What we have:

```
public Container();  
    returns Container object
```

```
public int put(int n);  
    returns 1 and adds n to the Container if n not in the Container,  
    otherwise returns 0
```

```
public int get(int n);  
    returns 1 if n is in the Container, 0 otherwise
```

```
Public int remove(int n);  
    returns 1 if n was in the Container; after return n is not in  
    the Container!
```

```
public int size()  
    returns the number of elements in this Container.
```

The API (Interface) We're Testing

- What is the goal of testing?

- We want to see if this code does what it says it does

- How can we do that?

```
public Container();  
    returns Container object
```

```
public int put(int n);  
    returns 1 and adds to the Container if n not in the  
Container, otherwise returns 0
```

```
public int get(int n);  
    returns 1 if n is in the Container, 0 otherwise
```

```
Public int remove(int n);  
    returns 1 if n was in the Container; after return  
n is not in the Container!
```

```
public int size()  
    returns the number of elements in this Container.
```

Test Data Generation

- Given a function/method to test, how do we derive/generate inputs to the function/method that test its behaviour?
 1. Manual Testing (Think)
 2. Random Testing (Guess)
 3. Search-based Testing (Search)
 4. Symbolic execution (Deduce)

Manual Unit Tests (Think)

- Manual testing includes testing a software manually, i.e., without using any automated tool or any script.
- The tester takes over the role of an end-user and tests the software to identify any unexpected behavior or bug.
- There are different stages for manual testing such as unit testing, integration testing, system testing, and user acceptance testing.

A Very Simple Test

- This is a typical manual unit test
 - Do something to the software that has a known result
 - *Assert* the result matches what you expect
- How much does this test?

```
c = new Container();  
  
r = c.put(0);  
assertEquals(1, r);  
  
r = c.put(0);  
assertEquals(0, r);  
  
r = c.get(0);  
assertEquals(1, r);  
  
r = c.remove(0);  
assertEquals(1, r);  
  
r = c.get(0);  
assertEquals(0, r);
```


Manual Unit Tests (Think)

- How much does this test?
 - Probably not very much
 - That's ok, we can write more tests...
 - and more tests...
 - and still more tests...
 - How do we know we're done?

```
c = new Container();

r = c.put(0);
assertEquals(1, r);

r = c.put(0);
assertEquals(0, r);

r = c.get(0);
assertEquals(1, r);

r = c.remove(0);
assertEquals(1, r);

r = c.get(0);
assertEquals(0, r);
```

Manual Unit Tests (Think)

- Boredom Sets in Quickly
- Writing each sequence of operations we want to try is tedious
 - We're going to run out of patience before we try very many things
 - Each test takes a long time to write
 - Could we get the computer to do it for us?

Random Testing (Guess)

- Randomly generate inputs to feed in a software.
- (Totally) uninformed search.
- Do not require any preparation & easy to implement
- Works pretty well in many cases
- Problems
 - Semantically redundant inputs
 - E.g., for a simple program $10/x$, providing any input except 0 means the same

Random Testing (Guess)

- Here's an attempt:

```
NUM_TESTS=100;
MAX_VALUE=10;
c = new Container();

for (int i = 0; i < NUM_TESTS; i++) {
    op = random(4);
    v = random(MAX_VALUE);
    if (op == 0)
        r1 = c.put(v);
    if (op == 1)
        r1 = c.get(v);
    if (op == 2)
        r1 = c.remove(v);
    if (op == 3)
        r1 = c.size();
}
```

Random Testing (Guess)

- What kind of bugs can this testing find?

```
NUM_TESTS=100;  
MAX_VALUE=10;
```

```
c = new Container();
```

```
for (int i = 0; i < NUM_TESTS; i++) {  
    op = random(4);  
    v = random(MAX_VALUE);  
    if (op == 0)  
        r1 = c.put(v);  
    if (op == 1)  
        r1 = c.get(v);  
    if (op == 2)  
        r1 = c.remove(v);  
    if (op == 3)  
        r1 = c.size();  
}
```

Differential Testing

- What does the container program act like?
 - A set
 - Do we have any other set implementations?
 - Could we write one that
 - we are pretty sure is correct
 - acts like our tested system is supposed to act?

Differential Testing

- What does the container program act like?
 - A set
 - Do we have any other set implementations?
 - Could we write one that
 - we are pretty sure is correct
 - acts like our tested system is supposed to act?

any idea!

Differential Testing

```
c = new Container();
ref = new HashSet();
for (int i = 0; i < NUM_TESTS; i++) {
    op = random(4);
    v = random(MAX_VALUE);
    if (op == 0) {
        r1 = c.put(v);
        r2 = ref.add(v)?1:0;
    } else if (op == 1) {
        r1 = c.get(v);
        r2 = ref.contains(v)?1:0;
    } else if (op == 2) {
        r1 = c.remove(v);
        r2 = ref.remove(v)?1:0;
    } else if (op == 3) {
        r1 = c.size();
        r2 = ref.size();
    }
    assert (r1 == r2);
}
```


Search-based Software Testing (SBST)

- Search Based Software Testing (**SBST**) is a branch of Search Based Software Engineering (**SBSE**).
- **SBST** is the process of generating the inputs of test cases (i.e., test cases) using search-based optimisation algorithms, guided by a fitness function that captures the current test objective.
- The **fitness function** is used to guide a search-based optimisation algorithm, which searches the space of test inputs to find those that meet the test objectives.
- There are many different search-based optimisation algorithms, such as Genetic algorithm (GA), and Hill Climbing (HC).
- **Problems**
 - Might not always find the best solution.
 - The **effectiveness** of the search algorithms is improved as long as the **fitness function** distinguishes between **better** and **worse** solutions.

Symbolic execution (deduce)

- Symbolic execution is a program analysis technique that analyzes a program's code to automatically generate test data for the program.
- Symbolic execution analyzes the code structure to find out a path to go to a certain statement.
- Symbolic execution analyzes the code structure to find out the constraint of the inputs to let the program follow the path.
- Symbolic execution uses **constraint solver** to provide a value set that satisfies the constraint.
- **Problems:**
 - **Path explosion.**
 - It is difficult to symbolically execute a significantly large subset of all program paths because most real world software have an extremely large number of paths.
 - **Too complex constraint.**
 - It may not always be possible to solve path constraints because solving the general class of constraints is undecidable.

References:

<http://classes.engr.oregonstate.edu/eecs/summer2015/cs362-002/>

Anand, Saswat, et al. "An orchestrated survey of methodologies for automated software test case generation." Journal of Systems and Software 86.8 (2013): 1978-2001.