

A Fourier Series Library: System Verification and Validation Plan for FSL

Bo Cao

October 31, 2019

1 Revision History

| Date | Version | Notes |
|---------------|---------|--------------|
| Oct. 28, 2019 | 1.0 | First draft. |
| Date 2 | 1.1 | Notes |

Contents

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 1 | Revision History | i |
| 2 | Symbols, Abbreviations and Acronyms | iii |
| 3 | General Information | 1 |
| 3.1 | Summary | 1 |
| 3.2 | Objectives | 1 |
| 3.3 | Relevant Documentation | 1 |
| 4 | Plan | 1 |
| 4.1 | Verification and Validation Team | 1 |
| 4.2 | CA Verification Plan | 2 |
| 4.3 | Design Verification Plan | 2 |
| 4.4 | Implementation Verification Plan | 2 |
| 4.5 | Software Validation Plan | 2 |
| 5 | System Test Description | 2 |
| 5.1 | Tests for Functional Requirements | 2 |
| 5.1.1 | Module 1: Basic comparison function | 2 |
| 5.1.2 | Module 2: Fourier transformation and approximation | 4 |
| 5.1.3 | Module 3: Operations and functions | 5 |
| 5.1.4 | Test of conversion | 6 |
| 5.2 | Tests for Nonfunctional Requirements | 7 |
| 5.2.1 | Speed evaluation | 7 |
| 5.3 | Traceability Between Test Cases and Modules | 7 |

List of Tables

List of Figures

2 Symbols, Abbreviations and Acronyms

Some symbols, abbreviations and acronyms are defined in the Common Analysis (CA) document ¹. For simplicity and maintainability, they are not re-defined here. Readers shall refer to the CA documents when a certain item is not defined here.

| symbol | description |
|--------|-------------|
| T | Test |

¹This document is available at <https://github.com/caobo1994/FourierSeries/blob/master/docs/SRS/CA.pdf>.

This document provides an overview of the Verification and Validation (VnV) plan for the Fourier Series Library (FSL). It lays out the purpose, methods, and test cases for the VnV procedure.

3 General Information

3.1 Summary

The library to be tested is called the Fourier Series Library (FSL). This library performs a set of computations, transformations, and/or input/output at the request of the library user.

3.2 Objectives

The intended objective of the VnV procedure is to verify that this library has generally met the requirements described in the CA document. These requirements include the functional requirements (FRs) and the non-functional requirements (NFRs).

Note that if a small part of the NFRs has not been met, the library is still acceptable when the not-met NFRs' impact has been analyzed and deemed non-essential.

3.3 Relevant Documentation

As we said before, this document relies on the CA document. This document is also the base of the Unit Test Plan document.

4 Plan

4.1 Verification and Validation Team

The major member of the team is the author himself. Other contributors might assist in the VnV procedure, but their contributions are not guaranteed.

4.2 CA Verification Plan

The verification of the CA document mainly consists of the feedback from reviewers, and the author's experience in developing and verifying this library.

4.3 Design Verification Plan

The design of this library will be verified by reviewing how the functions in this library relies on each other, and how they are integrated.

4.4 Implementation Verification Plan

The verification of the implementation of this library is mainly done by unit testing. The detail of unit testing can be found in the Unit Test Plan document. Mainly, the unit test will be done by first testing the basic functions in this library, and then testing the advanced functions. Please note that the test result of any function in this library is acceptable, if and only if the reliant functions of this function is tested to be right.

4.5 Software Validation Plan

The transformation part of this library will be validated by comparing its result with the MATLAB pseudo-oracle.

5 System Test Description

5.1 Tests for Functional Requirements

5.1.1 Module 1: Basic comparison function

The tests here are selected to cover the tolerated comparison function and its base, subtraction operation and amplitude function. The tolerated comparison function will be used in later tests to compare the resulted CFS of the tested function with its (pseudo-)oracle counterpart, so we need to test this function first to ensure that the following test results are reliable.

NOTE: Do not proceed with other modules unless you have succeed in this module. For each round of test, the result of other modules is trustworthy if and only if the test results of this module are all successes.

1. Test of subtraction:

Type: Automatic

Initial State: The subtract function of the loaded FSL library.

Input: $CFSf = [n = 2, \omega = 1.0, A = \{1.0, 0.0, 0.0\}, B = \{0.0, 1.0\}]$ and
 $CFSg = [n = 2, \omega = 1.0, A = \{0.0, 2.0, 1.0\}, B = \{1.0, 0.0\}]$

Output: $CFSf - CFSg$, which should be $[n = 2, \omega = 1.0, A = \{1.0, -2.0, -1.0\}, B = \{-1.0, 1.0\}]$

Test Case Derivation: Manual computation

How test will be performed: Feed function with the aforementioned input, and compare the function output to the aforementioned standard output by comparing its n , ω , A_i 's and B_i 's variable-by-variable.

2. Test of amplitude function:

Type: Automatic

Initial State: None.

Input: $CFSf = [n = 2, \omega = 1.0, A = \{1.0, 0.0, 2.0\}, B = \{2.0, 0.0\}]$ and
 $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$.

Output: $|Amp(CFSf) - 3.0| \leq \epsilon$, which should be **True**.

Test Case Derivation: Manual computation

How test will be performed: Compute and compare.

3. Test of tolerated comparison (**True** result):

Type: Automatic

Initial State: Verified amplitude function.

Input: $CFSf = [n = 2, \omega = 1.0, A = \{1.0, 0.0, 0.0\}, B = \{0.0, 1.0\}]$,
 $CFSg = [n = 2, \omega = 1.0, A = \{0.0, 2.0, 1.0\}, B = \{1.0, 0.0\}]$, and error
 $\epsilon = 10.0$

Output: Comparison result which should be **True**

Test Case Derivation: Manual computation

How test will be performed: Compute and compare.

4. Test of tolerated comparison (**False** result):

Same as *Test of tolerated comparison (True result)*, but with $\epsilon = 1.0$ and Output as **False**.

5.1.2 Module 2: Fourier transformation and approximation

This module tests the functions that compute Fourier transformation and approximated values of functions.

1. Test of coefficient (even function):

Type: Automatic

Initial State: Verified tolerated equality function.

Input: $f(t) = t^2$, $\omega = 1$, $n = 2$, $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$, $CFSstd = [n = 2, \omega = 1, A = \{\pi^2/3, -4.0, 1.0\}, B = \{0.0, 0.0\}]$

Output: $TolEq(CFSf, CFSstd, \epsilon)$, which should be **True**.

Test Case Derivation: Manual Computation, verified by MATLAB computation.

How test will be performed: Compute and compare.

2. Test of coefficient (odd function):

Type: Automatic

Initial State: Verified tolerated equality function.

Input: $f(t) = t$, $\omega = 1$, $n = 2$, $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$, $CFSstd = [n = 2, \omega = 1, A = \{0.0, 0.0, 0.0\}, B = \{-2.0, 1.0\}]$

Output: $TolEq(CFSf, CFSstd, \epsilon)$, which should be **True**.

Test Case Derivation: Manual Computation, verified by MATLAB computation.

How test will be performed: Compute and compare.

3. Test of approximated function value:

Type: Automatic

Initial State: None.

Input: $CFSf = [n = 2, \omega = 1, A = \{0.0, 2.0, 0.0\}, B = \{-2.0, 1.0\}],$
 $t = \pi/4, \epsilon = 10^{-6}.$

Output: $|App(CFSf, t) - (2 + \sqrt{2}/2)| \leq \epsilon$, which should be **True**.

Test Case Derivation: Manual Computation, verified by MATLAB computation.

How test will be performed: Compute and compare.

5.1.3 Module 3: Operations and functions

1. Test of addition:

Type: Automatic

Initial State: Verified tolerated equality function.

Input: $CFSf = [n = 2, \omega = 1, A = \{0.0, 2.0, 0.0\}, B = \{-2.0, 0.0\}],$
 $CFSg = [n = 2, \omega = 1, A = \{1.0, 0.0, 2.0\}, B = \{0.0, 1.0\}],$ $CFSstd =$
 $[n = 2, \omega = 1, A = \{1.0, 2.0, 1.0\}, B = \{-2.0, 1.0\}], \epsilon = 10^{-6}$

Output: $TolEq(CFSf + CFSg, CFSstd, \epsilon)$, which should be **True**.

Test Case Derivation: Manual Computation.

How test will be performed: Compute and compare.

2. Test of multiplication:

Type: Automatic

Initial State: Verified tolerated equality function.

Input: $CFSf = [n = 2, \omega = 1, A = \{1.0, 0.0, 1.0\}, B = \{1.0, 0.0\}],$
 $CFSg = [n = 2, \omega = 1, A = \{1.0, 1.0, 0.0\}, B = \{1.0, 0.0\}],$ $CFSstd =$
 $[n = 2, \omega = 1, A = \{2.0, 2.0, 0.0\}, B = \{2.0, 1.0\}], \epsilon = 10^{-6}$

Output: $TolEq(CFSf * CFSg, CFSstd, \epsilon)$, which should be **True**.

Test Case Derivation: Manual Computation.

How test will be performed: Compute and compare.

3. Test of division:

Same as *Test of multiplication*, but swap $CFSf$ and $CFSstd$, while change $*$ to $/$.

4. Test of function of CFS:

Type: Automatic

Initial State: Verified tolerated equality, addition and multiplication function.

Input: $CFSf = [n = 2, \omega = 1, A = \{1.0, 0.0, 1.0\}, B = \{1.0, 0.0\}]$, $g(t) = e^t$, and $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$.

Output: $TolEq(g(CFSf), 1 + CFSf + 0.5CFSf^2, \epsilon)$, which should be **True**.

Test Case Derivation: Manual Computation.

How test will be performed: Compute and compare.

5.1.4 Test of conversion

1. Test of conversion from other data format:

Type: Automatic

Initial State: Verified tolerated equality function

Input: $n = 2, \omega = 1, A = 1.0, 0.0, 2.0, B = 2.0, 0.0$.

Output: constructed CFS

Test Case Derivation: None

How the test will be performed: convert and compare the result with a standard CFS using tolerated equality and $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$.

2. Test of conversion to other data format:

Same as *Test of conversion from other data format*, while exchanging input and output, and compare each coefficients with tolerance as ϵ .

5.2 Test for input constraints

We design input test for detecting mismatch n and ω for functions that accept two CFS's as inputs. For each test in the following list, we derive tests for input constraints based on it.

- Test for addition
- Test for subtraction
- Test for multiplication
- Test for division
- Test for tolerated equality

For each test in this list, we derive two tests. One is to change the ω in the second CFS to the half of its original value, and the other is to change the n in the second CFS to 1, and remove A_2 and B_2 of the second CFS accordingly.

5.3 Tests for Nonfunctional Requirements

5.3.1 Speed evaluation

We test the speed of IM1, IM3, IM4, IM5, IM8 and IM9.

For each test, generate random CFS's with same ω and various n , clock the execution time with the generated CFS's as input, and check whether the relationship between n and the execution time follows the requirements in the NFR.

We will demonstrate how the test is performed by showing one example.

1. Test the speed of addition

Type: Automatic

Initial State: Addition

Input/Condition: Various pair of CFS's, with the same ω , $n = 100 : 100 : 1000$ respectively, and A_i 's and B_i 's generated from a random number generator. In this test, this generator is chosen as the uniform random number generator on $[-1.0, 1.0]$.

Output/Result: Whether the execution time of addition is linear in regards to n .

How test will be performed: For each n , generate 10 pairs of CFS's, clock their execution time to take average value as the execution time for CFS's of size n , find the r value of a linear fitting between n and the execution time. This test succeeds when $|r| > 0.9$, otherwise fails.

5.4 Traceability Between Test Cases and Modules

We show each instance module's covering tests.

- IM1: *Test of transformation (even function) and Test of transformation (odd function).*
- IM2: *Test of approximated function value*
- IM3: *Test of addition*
- IM4: *Test of subtraction*
- IM5: *Test of multiplication*
- IM6: *Test of division*
- IM7: *Test of function of CFS*
- IM8: *Test of amplitude*
- IM9: *Test of tolerated equality*
- IM10: *Test of conversion from other data format*
- IM11: *Test of conversion to other data format*

References