# Advanced Programming Property-based Testing – Introduction

Ken Friis Larsen kflarsen@diku.dk

Department of Computer Science University of Copenhagen

October, 2021

### Part I

Pre-lecture – QuickCheck Introduction

## **Testing – Challenges with Unit-testing**

- Testing is a cost-effective way to help us assess the correctness of our code. However, writing test cases are boring (and sometimes hard).
- Unit tests can be hugely beneficial when developing, even as part of the development process. Writing a few tests can do wonders for your understanding of the problem domain.
- Writing many test-cases quickly get repetitive.
- Ultimately we end up with a set of examples of expected result from some given inputs. But with no specification telling us why we should expect those results.

## OuickCheck in One Slide

- Property-based testing is a way to test against a specification, rather than a set of examples.
- If it is repetitive and hard to come up with good input data, we should automate it.
  - We should *generate* random input data (from a suitable distribution).
- Often we write many test for the same underlying idea instead, write down that underlying idea (property) and generate test cases from that.
- QuickCheck motto: don't write a unit test-suite *generate* it.

### **Properties for Some Well-known Function**

Plus distribute over max:

$$\forall k \ x \ y. \ k + max(x,y) = max(k+x,k+y)$$

▶ Plus is associative:

$$\forall x \ y \ z. \ x + (y + z) = (x + y) + z$$

We now write these as Haskell function using the QuickCheck library/EDSL:

```
import Test.QuickCheck
```

```
prop_plusmax :: Int -> Int -> Int -> Property
prop_plusmax k x y =
    k + (max x y) === max (k + x) (k + y)

prop_int_plus_associative :: Int -> Int -> Int -> Property
prop_int_plus_associative x y z =
    x + (y + z) === (x + y) + z
```

## **Testing The Properties**

```
> quickCheck prop_plusmax ()
+++ OK, passed 100 tests. ()
> verboseCheck prop_int_plus_associative ()
Passed:
0 == 0
Passed:
38
-67
82
53 == 53
+++ OK, passed 100 tests.
```

#### **Property for List Function**

- QuickCheck also works for data-structures
- For list reversal we have the property: ∀xs.reverse(reverse(xs)) = xs
- As code:

```
prop_reverse :: [Int] -> Property
prop_reverse xs = reverse(reverse xs) === xs
```

Checking:

```
> quickCheck prop_reverse
+++ OK, passed 100 tests.
```

## **Some Non-Properties**

- Let's try something that'll fail.
  For instance, that minus distribute over max, or that plus is associative for floating point numbers
- As code:

```
prop_minusmax :: Int -> Int -> Int -> Property
prop_minusmax k x y =
   k - (max x y) === max (k - x) (k - y)
```

## **Finding Failures**

```
> quickCheck prop_minusmax
*** Failed! Falsified (after 3 tests and 5 shrinks):
0
-1 /= 0 ()
> quickCheck prop_double_plus_associative
*** Failed! Falsified (after 2 tests and 6 shrinks):
-0.1
0.3
0.5
0.7000000000000001 /= 0.7
```

## QuickCheck in Erlang

- For Erlang we'll use Quviq Erlang QuickCheck Mini (see installation instructions on Absalon)
   Another popular alternative is PropEr.
- In Haskell we use overloading via type-classes to make a nice library for writing tests.
- In Erlang we use macros to make a nice library for writing tests.

## The Same Properties in Erlang – The Good Ones

```
-include_lib("eqc/include/eqc.hrl").
prop_plusmax() ->
  ?FORALL({K, X, Y}, {int(), int(), int()},
          eqc:equals(K + max(X, Y),
                     \max(K + X, K + Y)).
prop_int_plus_associative() ->
  ?FORALL({X, Y, Z}, {int(), int(), int()},
          eqc:equals(X + (Y + Z),
                     (X + Y) + Z).
prop_reverse() ->
  ?FORALL(XS, list(int()),
         egc:equals(lists:reverse(lists:reverse(XS)),
                    XS)).
```

## The Same Properties in Erlang – The Bad Ones

## **Testing the Properties**

```
2> egc:quickcheck(intro:prop_plusmax()).
egc:guickcheck(intro:prop_plusmax()).
OK, passed 100 tests
3> eqc:quickcheck(intro:prop_real_plus_associative()).
egc:quickcheck(intro:prop_real_plus_associative()).
  .....Failed! After 22 tests.
2.333333333333333333333333333333333333
false
```

## **Today's Program**

- Property based testing
- QuickCheck building blocks
- QuickCheck in Haskell
- QuickCheck in Erlang

## Part II

## Morse Code

#### **Morse Code**

- One of the exercises from exercise set 1 is about decoding morse code.
- ► That is, write the functions

```
encode :: String -> String
decode :: String -> [String]
```

For instance, "...-" could be the encoding for both Sofia and Eugenia.

## Morse Code, Implementation

```
import qualified Data.List as L
charMap = [('A', ".-"), ('B', "-..."), ... ]
findChar c = fromMaybe "" $ L.lookup c charMap
encode :: String -> String
encode = concatMap findChar
decode :: String -> [String]
decode "" = [""]
decode input = [ c : rest | (c, code) <- charMap</pre>
                           , code `L.isPrefixOf` input
                           , let clen = length code
                           , rest <- decode $ drop clen input]</pre>
```

## **Unit Testing In Haskell**

```
import Test.Tasty
import Test.Tasty.HUnit
import Morse
testsuite =
  testGroup "Testing Morse encoding decoding"
  [ testGroup "Encoding"
    [ testCase "Encode SOFIA (testing with @=?)"
      ("...-" @=? encode("SOFIA"))
    , testCase "Encode EUGENIA"
     ("...-" @=? encode("EUGENIA")) ]
  , testGroup "Decoding"
    [ testCase "Decode Eugenia"
      (assertBool "EUGENIA is not in decodings of ...---.-"
      ("EUGENIA" `elem` decode "...--.."))]
main = defaultMain testsuite
```

### Part III

# **Property Based Testing**

## **QuickCheck in One Slide**

- Property-based testing is a way to test against a specification, rather than a set of examples.
- If it is repetitive and hard to come up with good input data, we should automate it.
  We should generate random input data (from a suitable distribution)
  - We should *generate* random input data (from a suitable distribution).
- Often we write many test for the same underlying idea instead, write down that underlying idea (property) and generate test cases from that.
- QuickCheck motto: don't write a unit test-suite generate it.

## **Property Based Testing**

- What is a good property to test for the Morse code library?
- For the Morse module we would expect to be able to decode an encoded string:

```
\forall s. \ s = decode(encode(s))
```

Alas, that's too strong a property. Several strings can have the same encoding. Thus the property we are after is

```
\forall s. \ s \in decode(encode(s))
```

## **QuickCheck Property for Morse Code**

We write our property as a predicate, which we can then test with the function quickCheck

```
import Test.QuickCheck
import qualified Morse
```

```
prop_encode_decode s = s `elem` Morse.decode (Morse.encode s)
```

## **QuickCheck Building Blocks**

- QuickCheck is a (EDSL) library for specifying two main data-types: Property and Gen a
- Property for specifying properties, actually uses the Testable prop type-class Some interesting instances:

```
Testable Bool
(Arbitrary a, Show a, Testable prop) => Testable (a -> prop)
From something Testable we can generate test cases
```

Gen a is a generator for values of type a, often by using the Arbitrary a type class.

## **QuickCheck Generator Building Blocks**

QuickCheck generates random values by clever use of the Arbitrary type-class:

```
class Arbitrary a where
  arbitrary :: Gen a
```

That uses the type:

```
newtype Gen a = MkGen { unGen :: QCGen -> Int -> a }
to generate values of type a.
```

- Gen is a monad.
- Functions for combining generators (combinators). E.g.:

```
choose :: Random a => (a, a) -> Gen a
oneof :: [Gen a] -> Gen a
listOf :: Gen a -> Gen [a]
vectorOf :: Int -> Gen a -> Gen [a]
```

## QuickCheck for Morse, Strings with Only Letters

```
import Test.QuickCheck
import qualified Data.Char as C
import qualified Morse
upper = map C.toUpper
prop_encode_decode (LO s) = upper s `elem`
                               Morse.decode (Morse.encode s)
asciiLetter = elements (['a'..'z'] ++ ['A'..'Z'])
newtype LettersOnly = LO String
                    deriving (Eq. Show)
instance Arbitrary LettersOnly where
 arbitrary = fmap LO (listOf asciiLetter)
```

## QuickCheck for Morse, Limit Length

```
import Test.QuickCheck
import qualified Data.Char as C
import qualified Morse
upper = map C.toUpper
prop_encode_decode (LO s) = upper s `elem`
                                Morse.decode (Morse.encode s)
asciiLetter = elements (['a'..'z'] ++ ['A'..'Z'])
newtype LettersOnly = LO String
                    deriving (Eq. Show)
instance Arbitrary LettersOnly where
  arbitrary = fmap LO $ do
    n \leftarrow choose (0, 4)
    vectorOf n asciiletter
```

## **QuickCheck for Morse, Character Frequencies**

```
import Test.QuickCheck
import qualified Data.Char as C
import qualified Morse
upper = map C.toUpper
prop_encode_decode (LO s) = upper s `elem`
                                Morse.decode (Morse.encode s)
weightedLetters = frequency [(2 ^ (max - length code), return c)
                             [ (c,code) <- Morse.charMap]</pre>
  where max = 1 + (maximum $ map (length . snd) Morse.charMap)
newtype LettersOnly = LO String deriving (Eq. Show)
instance Arbitrary LettersOnly where
  arbitrary = fmap L0 \$ do n \leftarrow choose (0, 7)
                            vectorOf n weightedLetters
```

### Part IV

## Testing Algebraic Data Types

## **Testing Algebraic Data Types**

How can be generate random expressions for checking that Add is commutative:

## **Generating Exprs**

Our first attempt

```
instance Arbitrary Expr where
  arbitrary = expr
is correct,
```

- ... but may generate humongous expressions.
- Instead we should generate a sized expression

### Part V

# Testing Libraries – In Erlang

#### **Dictionaries**

- dict: purely functional key-value store
  - ► new()
  - ► store(Key, Value, Dict)
  - ► fetch(Key, Dict)
  - ...

## **Internal Representation**

```
> D1 = dict:store(1, a, dict:new()).
 {dict, 1, 16, 16, 8, 80, 48,
  > D2 = dict:from_list([{a,1}, {b,2}, {1,abba}]).
 {dict, 3, 16, 16, 8, 80, 48,
  {{[], [[a|1]], [[b|2]],
    [],[],[],[],[],[],[],[],[],[],
    [[1|abba]], [],[],[],[]}}
```

- "No, stop! Don't expose your dict"
  - Complex representation
  - Complex invariants
  - We'll just test the API

## **Keys Should Be Unique**

There should be no duplicate keys

### **Generating dicts**

Generate dicts using the API key() -> oneof([atom(), int(), real()]). value() -> oneof([int(), atom()]). atom() -> elements([a,b,c,d]). dict\_fl() -> ?LET(X, list({key(), value()}), dict:from\_list(X)). dict\_0() -> ?LAZY( oneof([dict:new(), ?LET({K, V, D}, {key(), value(), dict\_0()}, dict:store(K,V,D))]) ).

## How did I get here?

```
> eqc:quickcheck(d:prop_unique_keys()).
             .....Failed! After 67 tests.
{dict, 8, 16, 16, 8, 80, 48,
 \{\{[[-2.0]-13]\}, [],
  [[b|d]], [[c|c], [3.2|-6]], [[d|7]],
  [],[],[],[],[],[[-2|-4],[14|b]],
  {dict, 2, 16, 16, 8, 80, 48,
 {{[[-2.0|0]],[],[],[],[],[],[],[],[],[],[],
  [[-2|0]], [], [], [], [], [], []\}
false
```

## Symbolic Calls

- Rather than executing a call straight away in a generator, build a data structure with the calls.
- ➤ A call is represented as: {call, Module, Function, ArgumentList}
- Examples:

Function call	Symbolic call
dict:new()	{call, dict, new, []}
<pre>dict:store(K,V,D)</pre>	<pre>{call, dict, store, [K,V,D]}</pre>
lists:usort([3,2,1])	{call, lists, usort, [[3,2,1]]}
myfun(X, Y)	{call, <b>?</b> MODULE, myfun, [X, Y]}

## **Generate dicts Symbolically**

## **Properties for Symbolic Values**

A symbolic dict most be evaluated before use

#### How good is our generator

Some properties for measuring the quality of a generator

```
> eqc:quickcheck(d:prop_measure(fun d:dict_1/0)).
OK, passed 100 tests
54% 0
28% 1
8% 2
7% 3
1% 12
1% 6
1% 4
true
```

#### **More Improvements**

We can use frequency to generate more interesting dicts

I need a shrink now

```
> eqc:quickcheck(d:prop_measure(fun d:dict_3/0)).
                  ..... OK, passed 100 tests
18% 0
15% 3
15% 2
14% 1
2% 12
1% 11
true
> eqc:quickcheck(d:prop_aggregate(fun d:dict_3/0)).
            ..... OK, passed 100 tests
79.3% {dict, store, 3}
20.7% {dict, new, 0}
true
```

```
> eqc:quickcheck(d:prop_unique_keys()).
   ....Failed! After 8 tests.
{call, dict, store,
 [1,a, {call,dict,store, [-1.0,a, {call,dict,store, [-2.0,b,
  {call, dict, store, [0, a, {call, dict, store, [1.0, 2,
   {call, dict, store, [a,0, {call, dict, store, [-2,d,
   {call, dict, store, [0, -2, {call, dict, store, [-1.0, d,
    {call, dict, store, [1,0, {call, dict, store, [d,a,
      {call, dict, store, [1,b, {call, dict, store, [-1,1,
       {call, dict, store, [0,2, {call, dict, store, [d,2,
        {call,dict,new,[]}]}]}]}]}]}]}]
{call, dict, store, [0, a,
 {call, dict, store, [0.0,0, {call, dict, new, []}]}}
false
```

## **Back To The Property**

What is the problem with out property:

► In the dict module two keys are different if they do not match =:= The lists:usort/1 function uses == for equality.

```
> 1 =:= 1.0.
false
> 1 == 1.0.
true
```

## Part VI

# **Summary**

## **Summary**

- Use QuickCheck for better testing
- Property-based testing:
  - Identify properties to test
  - Write data-generators (in Haskell using Arbitrary and Gen)
  - When a pro: shrinking
- Be careful with your specification
- We can test complex data structures by generating sequences of API calls, preferbly with symbolic commands
- Remember to measure the quality of your generators