**Parallel Particle Swarm Optimization-based**

**Test Data Generation for Path Coverage Testing**

**Abstract**

Automatic test data generation is still a problem attracting much interest in software testing. The Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) approach is a swarm intelligence technique which can be used to generate test data automatically for path coverage testing. This paper proposes the approach of the Parallel Particle Swarm Optimization (PPSO) so that test data can be generated simultaneously for each test path of the given program under test (PUT). The proposed approach is also applied to some PUTs of the given benchmark. Experimental results demonstrate that PPSO which can generate suitable test data has higher path coverage than the previous one.

# 1. Introduction

Software has been increasingly widespread and has appeared in every corner of our daily life and work, which brings back tremendous convenience. However, in the past years, its failure led to many unforeseen consequences in both economic and human lives, such as the explosion incident of the Ariane-V rocket [1] and the BP deep water horizon disaster [2]. Therefore, naturally, software quality has become people’s top concern in today’s informatics society.

Software testing has proved itself to be one of the most efficient methods to assure and improve the software quality in the past few decades. However, most of the tasks of software testing are being executed manually, leading to high effort and laborious cost occurred in software development process. Therefore, how to automate the testing process is still the open problem today.

In recent years, meta-heuristic search techniques has been widely applied in software testing, forming a research trend called search-based software testing (SBST) [3], which is especially applied to automatic test data generation. The general idea behind search-based test data generation is to select a set of test cases from program input space to meet the testing requirement which is usually expressed as a fitness function. When a coverage criterion is selected as the testing requirement, the search activity should attempt to generate a test suite which can cover all construct elements mentioned in the criterion.

Among the existing meta-heuristic search techniques, such as simulated annealing (SA) and generic algorithm (GA), are the most popular algorithms, and have been widely adopted for generating test data. Although they can generate test data with appropriate fault-prone ability [4, 5], they fail to produce them quickly due to their slow evolutionary speed. Recently, as a swarm intelligence technique, particle swarm optimization (PSO) [6, 7, 8] has become a hot research topic in the area of intelligent computing. Its significant feature is the simplicity and fast convergence speed.

Even so, there are still certain limitations in current research related to PSO usage in test data generation. For example, consider one program under test which was used in Mao’s paper [9] as below:

int getDayNum(int year, int month)

{

int maxDay=0;

if(month≥1 && month≤12) //bch1: branch 1

{

if(month=2) //bch2: branch 2

{

if(year%400=0||(year%4=0&&year%100=0))

//bch3: branch 3

maxDay=29;

else //bch4: branch 4

maxDay=28;

}

else if(month=4||month=6||month=9||month=11)

//bch5: branch 5

maxDay=30;

else //bch6: branch 6

maxDay=31;

}

else //bch7: branch 7

maxDay=-1;

return maxDay;

}

Regarding this program under test, Mao used PSO to generate test data through building the one and only fitness function which was the combination of Korel formula [10] and the branch weights. This proposal has two weaknesses: the branch weight function being entirely performed manually and some PUTs not being able to generate test data to cover all test paths. To overcome these weaknesses, we still use PSO to generate the test data for the given PUT. However, unlike Mao [9], our approach is to assign one fitness function for each test path. Then we will use PPSO to find simultaneously the solution corresponding to this fitness function, which also is the one being able to generate test data for this test path.

# 2. Background

## 2.1. Fitness function

When using PSO, a test path coverage test data generation is transformed into an optimization problem. To cover a test path during execution, we must find appropriate values for the input variables which satisfy related branch predicates. The usual way is to use Korel’s branch distance function [10]. As a result, generating test data for a desired branch is transformed into searching input values which minimizes the return value of its Korel function. Table 1 gives some common formulas which are used in branch distance functions. To generate test data for a desired path P, we define a fitness function F(P) as the sum of all related branch distance functions. For these reasons, generating path coverage test data can be converted into searching input values which can minimize the return value of function F(P).

**Table 1.** Korel’s branch functions for several kinds of branch predicates

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No | Predicate | Branch distance function *f*(bch*i*) |
| 1 | Boolean | If *true* then 0 else *k* |
| 2 | ¬*a* | Negation is propagated over *a* |
| 3 | *a* = *b* | If abs(*a* – *b*)= 0 then 0 else abs(*a* − *b*)+ *k* |
| 4 | *a* ≠ *b* | If abs(*a* − *b*)≠ 0 then 0 else *k* |
| 5 | *a* < *b* | If *a* − *b <* 0 then 0 else abs(*a* − *b*)+ *k* |
| 6 | *a* ≤ *b* | If *a* − *b* ≤ 0 then 0 else abs(*a* − *b*)+ *k* |
| 7 | *a* > *b* | If *b* − *a >* 0 then 0 else abs(*b* − *a*)+ *k* |
| 8 | *a* ≥ *b* | If *b* − *a* ≥ 0 then 0 else abs(*b* − *a*)+ *k* |
| 9 | *a* and *b* | *f* (*a*)+ *f*(*b*) |
| 10 | *a* or *b* | min(*f*(*a*)*, f*(*b*)) |

Similar to Mao [9], we also set up the value k = 0.1. Basing on this formula, we will develop a function calculating values at decision node, which is to be explained in the next part.

## 2.2. Particle Swarm Optimization

Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) was first introduced in 1995 by Kennedy and Eberhart [11], and is now widely applied in optimization problems. Comparing to other optimal search algorithms such as GA or SA, PSO has the strength of faster convergent speed and easier coding. PSO is initialized with a group of random particles (solutions) and then searches for optima by updating generations. In every iteration, each particle is updated by following two "best" values. The first one is the best solution (fitness) it has achieved so far. (The fitness value is also stored.) This value is called *pbest*. Another "best" value that is tracked by the particle swarm optimizer is the best value, obtained so far by any particle in the population. This best value is a global best and called *gbest*.

After finding the two best values, the particle updates its velocity and positions with following equation (a) and (b).  
(a)

(b)

*v*[] is the particle velocity, *persent*[] is the current particle (solution). *pbest*[] and *gbest*[] are defined as stated before. *rand*() is a random number between (0,1). *c*1, *c*2 are learning factors, usually *c*1 = *c*2 = 2.

The PSO algorithm is descripted as below:

|  |
| --- |
| **Algorithm 1**: Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) |
| **Input:** *F*: Fitness function |
| **Output:** *gBest*: The best solution |
| 1: **for each** particle |
| 2:    initialize particle |
| 3: **end for** |
| 4: **do** |
| 5: **for each** particle |
| 6: calculate fitness value |
| 7: **if** the fitness value is better than the best fitness value (*pBest*) in history then |
| 8:   set current value as the new *pBest* |
| 9: **end if** |
| 10: **end for** |
| 11: choose the particle with the best fitness value of all the particles as the *gBest* |
| 12: **for each** particle |
| 13: calculate particle velocity according equation (a) |
| 14:   update particle position according equation (b) |
| 15: **end for** |
| 16: **while** maximum iterations or minimum criteria is not attained |

Particles' velocities on each dimension are clamped to a maximum velocity Vmax. If the sum of accelerations would cause the velocity on that dimension to exceed Vmax, which is a parameter specified by the user. Then the velocity on that dimension is limited to Vmax.

# 3. Related work

PSO algorithm proposed by Kennedy and Eberhart [11] in 1995, originally just an algorithm used for optimization problems. However with the advantages of the convergence speed and easier coding than other optimization algorithms, it was promptly adopted as a meta-heuristic search algorithm in the automatic test data generation problem.

Windisch et al. [6] were the first authors to apply PSO in automatic test data generation. They improved the PSO into comprehensive learning particle swarm optimization (CL-PSO) to generate structural test data, but some experiments have confirmed that the convergence speed of CL-PSO is perhaps worse than the basic PSO.

Jia et al. [7] create an automatic test data generating tool named particle swarm optimization data generation tool (PSODGT). The PSODGT is characterized by the following two features. First, the PSODGT adopts the condition-decision coverage (C/DC) as the criterion of software testing, aiming to build an efficient test data set that covers all conditions. Second, the PSODGT uses a particle swarm optimization (PSO) approach to generate test data set. In addition, a new position initialization technique is developed for PSO. Instead of initializing the test data randomly, the proposed technique uses the previously-found test data that can reach the target condition as the initial positions so that the search speed of PSODGT can be further accelerated. The PSODGT is tested on four practical programs.

Mao [9] and Zhang et al. [8] had the same approach, in which they did not execute any PSO improvement but only built a fitness function by combining the branch functions for branch predicates and the branch weight of a program under test, then applied PSO to find the solution for this fitness function. The experiment result with 1 benchmark having 8 programs under test proved that PSO algorithm was more effective than GA one in generating test data. However, there remained a weakness that the calculation of branch weight for a program under test was still entirely manual work, which reduced the automatic nature of the proposal. In this paper, our proposal can overcome this limitation while being able to assure the efficiency of a PSO-based automatic test data generation method.

# 4. Proprosed approach

Our proposed approach is presented as below chart:



**Fig. 1.** The basic steps for PPSO-based test data generation

## 4.1. Perform statistical analysis to find out all test paths

At first, we perform the statistical analysis to find all test paths of the program under test. It can be done through the below 2 small steps:

*1) Control flow graph generation:* Test case generation from source code directly is more complicated and difficult than from CFG. CFG is a directed graph visualizing logic structures of program simplify [12] and defined as follow:

**Definition 1 (CFG).** *Given a function, a corresponding CFG is defined as a pair G* =(*V*, *E*), *where V* ={*v*0*, v1*,…*vn*} *is a set of vertices representing statements, E =* {(*vi, vj*)*|vi, vj V*}⊂ *V V is a set of edges. Each edge* (*vi*, *vj*) *implies the statement corresponding to vj is executed after vi.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Algorithm 2**: GenerateCFG |
| **Input** : *f* : source code |
| **Output**: *graph*: CFG |
| 1: *B* = a set of blocks by dividing *f* |
| 2: *G* = a graph by linking all blocks in *B* to each other |
| 3: update *graph* by replacing *f* with *G* |
| 4: **if** *G* contains *return/break/continue* statements **then** |
| 5: update the destination of *return/break/continue* pointers in the *graph* |
| 6: **end if** |
| 7: **for** each block *M* in *B* do |
| 8: **if** block *M* can be divided into smaller blocks **then** |
| 9: GenerateCFG(*M*) |
| 10: **end if** |
| 11: **end for** |

With the above mentioned program under test getDayNum, when Generate CFG algorithm is applied, we will get a CFG as in below chart:



**Fig. 2.** CFG of PUT getDayNum

*2) Test paths generation:*

In order to generate test data, a set of feasible test paths is discovered by traversing the given CFG. Path and test path are defined as follows:

**Definition 2 (Path).** *Given a CFG G =* (*V, E*)*, a path is a sequence of vertices* {*v0, v*1*,..., vk |* (*vi, vi*+1) *E,* 0< *k* < *n*}*, where n is the number of vertices.*

**Definition 3 (Test path).** *Given a CFG G =* (*V, E*)*, a test path is a path* {*v*0*, v*1*,..., vk |* (*vi, vi*+1) *E*}*, where v*0 *and vi+*1 *are corresponding to the start vertex and end vertex of the CFG.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Algorithm 3**: TraverseCFG |
| **Input** : *v*: the initial vertex of the CFG  *depth*: the maximum number of iterations for a loop  *path*: a global variable used to store a discovered test path |
| **Output**: *P*: a set of feasible test paths |
| 1: **if** *v* = NULL or *v* is the end vertex then |
| 2: add *path* to *P* |
| 3: **else if** the number occurrences of *v* in *path* ≤ *depth* **then** |
| 4: add *v* to the end of *path* |
| 5: **if** (*v* is not a decision) **or** (*v* is decision and *path* is feasible) **then** |
| 6: **for each** adjacent vertex *u* to *v* **do** |
| 7: TraverseCFG(*u*, *depth*, *path*) |
| 8: **end for** |
| 9: **end if** |
| 10: remove the latest vertex added in *path* from it |
| 11: **end if** |

Apply this algorithm TraverseCFG for the above program under test, we will get 5 test paths which are presented as below decisions:

**Table 2.** All test paths of PUT getDayNum

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No | PathID | Path’s decision nodes |
| 1 | path1 | [(month ≥ 1 && month ≤ 12), T], [(month = 2), T],  [(year % 400 = 0 | | (year % 4 = 0 && year % 100 = 0)), T] |
| 2 | path2 | [(month≥1 && month≤12), T], [(month=2), T], [(year%400=0||(year%4=0&&year%100=0)), F] |
| 3 | path3 | [(month≥1 && month≤12), T], [(month=2), F], [(month=4||month=6||month=9||month=11), T] |
| 4 | path4 | [(month≥1 && month≤12), T], [(month=2), F], [(month=4||month=6||month=9||month=11), F] |
| 5 | path5 | [(month≥1 && month≤12), F] |

## 4.2. Establish fitness function for each test path

From the branch distance calculation formula in Table 1, we develop the below function *fBchDist* to calculate the value at decision nodes.

|  |
| --- |
| **Algorithm 4**: Branch distance function (*fBchDist*) |
| **Input:** double a, condition type, double b |
| **Output:** Branch distance value |
| 1: **switch** (condition type)  2: **case** “=”: |
| 3: if abs(*a* − *b*) = 0 then retrun 0 else return abs(*a* − *b*) + *k*) |
| 4: **case** “≠”: |
| 5: if abs*(a* − *b)* ≠ 0 then return 0 else return *k* |
| 6: **case** “<”: |
| 7: if *a* − *b <* 0 then return 0 else return (abs*(a* − *b)* + *k*) |
| 8: **case** “≤”: |
| 9: if *a* − *b* ≤ 0 then return 0 else return (abs*(a* − *b)* + *k*) |
| 10: **case** “>”: |
| 11: if *b* − *a >* 0 then return 0 else return (abs*(b* − *a)* + *k*) |
| 12: **case** “≥”: |
| 13 if *b* − *a* ≥ 0 then return 0 else return (abs*(b* − *a)* + *k*) |
| 14: **end switch** |

Since each test path is represented by decision nodes, in order to build the fitness function for the test path, we establish the fitness function for each decision node of that test path. There will be 2 possibilities of TRUE(T) and FALSE(F) for each decision node, so there will be 2 fitness functions for each decision node corresponding to those 2 possibilities. Regarding the calculation formula for the fitness function of each decision node, we apply the above mentioned branch distance calculation algorithm.

**Table 3.** Fitness functions for each decision node of PUT getDayNum

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Decision node | Fitness function | ID |
| 1 | [(month ≥ 1 && month ≤ 12), T] | fBchDist(month, ≥, 1) + fBchDist(month, ≤, 12) | F1T |
| 2 | [(month ≥ 1 && month ≥ 12), F] | min(fBchDist(month, <, 1), fBchDist(month, >, 12)) | F1F |
| 3 | [(month = 2), T] | fBchDist(month, =, 2) | F2T |
| 4 | [(month = 2), F] | fBchDist(month, ≠, 2) | F2F |
| 5 | [(year%400=0||  (year%4=0&&year%100=0)), T] | min(fBchDist(year%400, =, 0),  (fBchDist(year%4, =, 0) + fBchDist(year%100, =, 0))) | F3T |
| 6 | [(year%400=0||  (year%4=0&&year%100=0)), F] | fBchDist(year%400, ≠, 0) + min(fBchDist(year%4, ≠, 0), fBchDist(year%100, ≠, 0)) | F3F |
| 7 | [(month=4||month=6||  month=9||month=11), T] | min(fBchDist(month, =, 4), fBchDist(month, =, 6), fBchDist(month, =, 9), fBchDist(month, =, 11)) | F4T |
| 8 | [(month=4||month=6||  month=9||month=11), F] | fBchDist(month, ≠, 4) + fBchDist(month, ≠, 6) +  fBchDist(month, ≠, 9) + fBchDist(month, ≠, 11) | F4F |

From the formula of calculating fitness value for each decision node, we have the fitness function for each test path as below:

**Table 4.** Fitness functions for test path of PUT getDayNum

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No | PathID | Test path fitness functions |
| 1 | path1 | f1 = F1T + F2T + F3T |
| 2 | path2 | f2 = F1T + F2T + F3F |
| 3 | path3 | f3 = F1T + F2F + F4T |
| 4 | path4 | f4 = F1T + F2F + F4F |
| 5 | path5 | f5 = F1F |

## 4.3. Apply Parallel Particle Swarm Optimization

With each fitness function of each test path, we use one PSO to find its solution. In order to find the solution for all fitness functions at the same time, we perform the Parallel PSO (PPSO). In order to run the PPSO, we have to define it as 1 class extend class Thread of Java as follows:

public class PSOProcess extends Thread {}

The PSO parallelization can be executed through below algorithm:

|  |
| --- |
| **Algorithm 5**: Parallel Particle Swarm Optimization(PPSO) |
| **Input:** list of fitness function |
| **Output:** test data for each fitness function |
| 1: **for each** fitness function *fi*  2: Initialize an object *psoi* of class PSOProcess |
| 3: Assign a fitness function *fi* to object *psoi* |
| 4: Execute object *pso*: *pso.start()*; |
| 5: **end for** |

# 5. Experimental analysis

We compare our experimental result to Mao’s proposal [9] in 2 criteria: the automatic ability of test data generation and the coverage capabilities of each proposal for each program under test of the given benchmark.

## 5.1. Automatic ability

When referring to an automatic test data generation method, the actual coverage of "automatic" ability is one of the key criteria to decide the proposal’s effectiveness. Mao [9] used only 1 fitness to generate test data for all test paths of a PUT, therefore he had to combine branch weight for each test path into the fitness function. The build of a branch weight function is purely manual, and for long and complex PUT, sometimes it is even harder than generating test data for the test paths; therefore it affected the efficiency of his proposed approach.

On the opposite site, taking advantage of the fast convergence of PSO algorithm, we propose the solution of using separate fitness function for each test path. This solution has clear benefits as follows:

1. As there is no need to build the branch weight function, the automatic feature of this proposal will be improved.
2. The fitness functions are automatically built basing on the decision nodes of each test path, and those decision nodes can be entirely generated automatically from a PUT with above mentioned algorithm 2 and 3. This obviously advanced the automatic ability in our proposal.

## 5.2. Coverage ability

The two criteria to be compared to Mao’s result [9] are:

* Success rate (SR) is the probability of all branches which can be covered by the generated test data. In order to check the actual result basing on this criterion, we executed PPSO by 1000 times, and calculated the number of times at which generated test data could cover all test paths of given PUT. The SR formula is calculated as follows:
* Average coverage (AC) is the average of the branch coverage achieved by all test inputs in 1,000 runs. Similar to above, in order to check the actual result basing on this criterion, we executed PPSO by 1000 times, and calculated the average coverage for each run. AC formula is calculated for each PUT as follows:

The detail results of the comparison with PUT benchmark used by Mao [9] in 2 criteria are shown in the following table:

**Table 5.** Comparison between Mao's approach and PPSO

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program under test | Success rate (%) | | Average coverage (%) | |
| Mao[10]’s PSO | PPSO | Mao[10]’s PSO | PPSO |
| triangleType | 99.80 | 100.0 | 99.94 | 100.0 |
| calDay | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| cal | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| remainder | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| computeTax | 99.80 | 100.0 | 99.98 | 100.0 |
| bessj | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| printCalendar | 99.10 | 100.0 | 99.72 | 100.0 |
| line | 99.20 | 100.0 | 99.86 | 100.0 |

From Table 5 it can be see that there are some PUTs which Mao's proposed approach cannot full coverage, while our method can. Because each test path is assigned to a PSO, it ensures that every time the PPSO is run, each PSO can generate test data which can cover the test path it is assigned to.

# 6. Conclusion

This paper has introduced and evaluated a parallel PSO approach for the branch coverage test adequacy criterion of software testing. We propose to assign a fitness function of PSO for each test path of a PUT, and then execute those PSOs simultaneously in order to generate test data to cover test paths of a PUT. The experimental result proves that our proposal is more effective than other current test data generation methods using PSO in terms of both automatic and coverage ability for a PUT.

In future work, some issues should be incorporated into deep investigation. The search capability of PSO algorithm could be enhanced through absorbing some other strategies in intelligent computing. To exploit more reasonable form of fitness function is also a valuable research topic. At present, we only display the results of some benchmark programs from academe. So the experiments on some industrial programs are worthy of being deeply studied.
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