

# A Replication Study on Test Case Failure Prediction in the Context of Test Case Prioritization

Francis Palma  
Data Science Lab,  
Department of Mechanical and  
Industrial Engineering,  
Ryerson University  
Toronto, ON, Canada  
francis.palma@ryerson.ca

Tamer Abdou  
Data Science Lab,  
Department of Mechanical and  
Industrial Engineering,  
Ryerson University  
Toronto, ON, Canada  
tamer.abdou@ryerson.ca

Ayse Bener  
Data Science Lab,  
Department of Mechanical and  
Industrial Engineering,  
Ryerson University  
Toronto, ON, Canada  
larst@affiliation.org

John Maidens  
Data Science Lab,  
Department of Mechanical and  
Industrial Engineering,  
Ryerson University  
Toronto, ON, Canada  
maidens@ryerson.ca

Jimmy Lo  
IBM Canada Lab  
Toronto, ON, Canada  
jimmylo@ca.ibm.com

Stella Liu  
IBM Canada Lab  
Toronto, ON, Canada  
Stella.Liu@ibm.com

## ABSTRACT

This paper provides a sample of a  $\LaTeX$  document which conforms, somewhat loosely, to the formatting guidelines for ACM SIG Proceedings.<sup>1</sup>

## KEYWORDS

ACM proceedings,  $\LaTeX$ , text tagging

### ACM Reference Format:

Francis Palma, Tamer Abdou, Ayse Bener, John Maidens, Jimmy Lo, and Stella Liu. 2018. A Replication Study on Test Case Failure Prediction in the Context of Test Case Prioritization. In *Proceedings of* . ACM, New York, NY, USA, 7 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

A few examples of in-text equations in context. Notice how this equation:  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x = 0$ , set here in in-line math style, looks slightly different when set in display style. (See next section).

First, consider the equation, shown as an inline equation above:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x = 0 \quad (1)$$

Notice how it is formatted somewhat differently in the **display-math** environment. Now, we'll enter an unnumbered equation:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} x + 1$$

<sup>1</sup>This is an abstract footnote

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

© 2018 Association for Computing Machinery.  
ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM...\$15.00  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

Table 1: Frequency of Special Characters

Non-English or Math	Frequency	Comments
$\emptyset$	1 in 1,000	For Swedish names
$\pi$	1 in 5	Common in math
$\$$	4 in 5	Used in business
$\Psi_1^2$	1 in 40,000	Unexplained usage

and follow it with another numbered equation:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} x_i = \int_0^{\pi+2} f \quad (2)$$

just to demonstrate  $\LaTeX$ 's able handling of numbering.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Dr. Yuhua Li for providing the MATLAB code of the *BEPS* method.

The authors would also like to thank the anonymous referees for their valuable comments and helpful suggestions. The work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No.: 61273304 and Young Scientists' Support Program (<http://www.nnsf.cn/youngscientists>).

## 2 INFORMATION ABOUT THE ORIGINAL STUDY


## 3 INFORMATION ABOUT THE REPLICATION

## 4 COMPARISON OF REPLICATION RESULTS TO ORIGINAL RESULTS

## REFERENCES

**Table 2: Some Typical Commands**


Command	A Number	Comments
\author	100	Author
\table	300	For tables
\table*	400	For wider tables

**Figure 1: The Ranks of the First Failing Test Cases using TM, CMC, MC, ST, and the Replicated Regression Model for each Version of the Project.****Table 3: Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test for Replicated Traditional Metrics-based and Modified Traditional Metrics-based Models.**

Projects	Treatment Groups	p-value	VD.A
Closure Compiler	Traditional2 Traditional	0.7167	0.4847091 (negligible)
Commons Lang	Traditional2 Traditional	0.6197	0.47375 (negligible)
Commons Math	Traditional2 Traditional	0.9552	0.5037858 (negligible)
JFreeChart	Traditional2 Traditional	0.6271	0.4583333 (negligible)
Joda Time	Traditional2 Traditional	1	0.5008 (negligible)

**Table 4: Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test for Replicated Similarity Metrics-based and Replicated Traditional Metrics-based Models.**

Projects	Treatment Groups	p-value	VD.A
Closure Compiler	Similarity Traditional	0.3468	0.5395568 (negligible)
Commons Lang	Similarity Traditional	0.8283	0.4884722 (negligible)
Commons Math	Similarity Traditional	0.8121	0.4848567 (negligible)
JFreeChart	Similarity Traditional	0.469	0.4383681 (negligible)
Joda Time	Similarity Traditional	0.7468	0.4728 (negligible)



**Figure 2: The bBxplots of the Effect Size Measures for Finding the First Fault using CMC, MC, ST, TM and the Regression Model for each Version of the Project.**

**Table 5: Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test for Replicated Similarity Metrics-based and Modified Similarity Metrics-based Models.**


Projects	Treatment Groups	p-value	VD.A
Closure Compiler	Similarity2 Similarity	0.803	0.4894737 (negligible)
Commons Lang	Similarity2 Similarity	0.8967	0.4930556 (negligible)
Commons Math	Similarity2 Similarity	0.8934	0.5086533 (negligible)
JFreeChart	Similarity2 Similarity	0.8931	0.4878472 (negligible)
Joda Time	Similarity2 Similarity	0.9221	0.5088 (negligible)

**Table 6: Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test for Modified Similarity Metrics-based and Replicated Similarity Metrics-based Models.**


Projects	Treatment Groups	p-value	VD.A
Closure Compiler	Similarity2 Traditional	0.506	0.5279778 (negligible)
Commons Lang	Similarity2 Traditional	0.7389	0.4823611 (negligible)
Commons Math	Similarity2 Traditional	0.9277	0.4940508 (negligible)
JFreeChart	Similarity2 Traditional	0.2871	0.4097222 (small)
Joda Time	Similarity2 Traditional	0.822	0.4808 (negligible)

**Table 7: Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test for Replicated Similarity Metrics-based, Modified Similarity Metrics-based, and Replicated Traditional Metrics-based Models.**


Projects	Treatment Groups	p-value
Closure Compiler	Similarity2 Similarity Traditional	0.963
Commons Lang	Similarity2 Similarity Traditional	0.942
Commons Math	Similarity2 Similarity Traditional	0.9714
JFreeChart	Similarity2 Similarity Traditional	0.5647
Joda Time	Similarity2 Similarity Traditional	0.9423




**Figure 3: The Ranks of the First Failing Test Cases using TM, CMC, MC, ST, and the Replicated Regression Model for each Version of the Project.**




**Figure 4: The Boxplots of the Effect Size Measures for Finding the First Fault using the Two Prediction Models for each Version of each Project.**



**Figure 5: The Comparison among the Ranks of the First Failing Test Cases using TM Model, CMC Model, MC Model, ST Model, the Replicated Traditional Metrics-based Regression Model, and the Modified Traditional Metrics-based Regression Model for each Version of the Project.**



**Figure 6: The Comparison among the Ranks of the First Failing Test Cases using Traditional Metrics Model, Similarity Metrics Model, and Modified Similarity Metric Model for each Version of the Project.**



**Figure 7: The Comparison of Ranks of the First Failing Test Cases using Original Traditional Metrics-based Model, Replicated Traditional Metrics-based Model, Modified Traditional Metrics-based Model, Original Similarity Metrics-based Model, Replicated Similarity Metrics-based Model, Modified Similarity Metrics-based Model for each Version of the Project.**