

For the following function, model the input domain using both the interface-based and the functionality-based approach.

*/\*\**

- \* Given two maps with string keys and integer values,  
return a new map containing only the keys that exist in both maps.*
- \* For each such key, the value should be the  
absolute difference of the two values from the input maps.*

*\**

*\* Example:*

*\* map1 = {"A": 5, "B": 10, "C": 3}*

*\* map2 = {"B": 7, "C": 8, "D": 12}*

*\* Output: {"B": 3, "C": 5}*

*\**

*\* If there are no common keys, return an empty map.*

*\*/*

```
public static Map<String, Integer> computeValueDifferences(Map<String, Integer> map1,  
                                                         Map<String, Integer> map2);
```

## Interface-Based Approach

Two Parameters: map1 & map2

*Defining features and partitioning*

*C1: map1 is null {true, false}*

*C2: map1 is empty (map1.isEmpty()) {true, false}*

C3: map2 is null {true, false}

C4: map2 is empty (map2.isEmpty()) {true, false}

## Functionality-Basec Approach

*Defining features and partitioning*

C5: containAtLeastOneCommonKey {true, false}

## BASE CHOICE COVERAGE (BCC)

C1: map1 is null	C2: map1 is empty	C3: map2 is null	C4: map2 is empty	C5: returns a common key	Expected
F	F	F	F	T	Feasible (returns key)
T	F	F	F	T	infeasible (X)
F	T	F	F	T	infeasible
F	F	T	F	T	infeasible (X)
F	F	F	T	T	infeasible
F	F	F	F	F	feasible ({})

Best Scenario: F F F F T

## Correctness Analysis

(replacing infeasible cases with feasible cases)

C1: map1 is null	C2: map1 is empty	C3: map2 is null	C4: map2 is empty	C5: returns a common key	Corrected Expectation
T	F	F	F	T	Should throw an exception
F	T	F	F	F	Returns empty map
F	F	T	F	T	Should throw an exception
F	F	F	T	F	Returns empty map

## TEST CASES

TEST CASE – 1: COMMON KEYS EXIST:

map1 = {"A": 2, "B": 3, "C": 5}

map2 = {"B": 6, "C": 2, "D": 8}

Output: {"B": 3, "C": 3}

TEST CASE – 2: NO COMMON KEYS:

map1 = {"X": 1, "Y": 2, "Z": 3}

```
map2 = {"A": 4, "B": 5, "C": 6}
```

Output: {}

TEST CASE – 3: ONE MAP IS EMPTY:

```
map1 = {}
```

```
map2 = {"A": 1, "B": 2, "C": 3}
```

Output: {}

TEST CASE – 4: BOTH MAPS ARE EMPTY:

```
map1 = {}
```

```
map2 = {}
```

Output: {}

TEST CASE – 5: map1 is null (should throw NullPointerException)

```
computeValueDifferences(null, {"A": 1, "B": 2})
```

TEST CASE – 6: map2 is null (should throw NullPointerException)

```
computeValueDifferences({"A": 3, "B": 4}, null)
```

## JUnit testing using AIGen

```
package com.example.auditoryexercises.Example_5.LaboratoryExercises01;
```

```
import java.util.HashMap;
```

```
import java.util.Map;
```

```
public class ComputeValDiffs {
```

```
    public static Map<String, Integer> computeValueDifferences(Map<String, Integer> map1,
```

```

Map<String, Integer> map2) {
    if (map1 == null || map2 == null) {
        throw new NullPointerException("Input maps cannot be null");
    }

```

```

    Map<String, Integer> result = new HashMap<>();
    for (String key : map1.keySet()) {
        if (map2.containsKey(key)) {
            result.put(key, Math.abs(map1.get(key) - map2.get(key)));
        }
    }
    return result;
}
}

```

```

package com.example.auditoryexercises.Example_5.LaboratoryExerciesO1;

```

```

import org.junit.jupiter.api.Test;

```

```

import java.util.*;

```

```

import static org.junit.jupiter.api.Assertions.*;

```

```

class ComputeValueDifferencesTest {

```

```

    @Test

```

```

    void testCommonKeysExist() {

```

```

        Map<String, Integer> map1 = Map.of("A", 2, "B", 3, "C", 5);

```

```

        Map<String, Integer> map2 = Map.of("B", 6, "C", 2, "D", 8);

```

```

        Map<String, Integer> expected = Map.of("B", 3, "C", 3);

```

```

        assertEquals(expected, ComputeValDiffs.computeValueDifferences(map1, map2));

```

```

    }

```

```

    @Test

```

```

    void testNoCommonKeys() {

```

```

        Map<String, Integer> map1 = Map.of("X", 1, "Y", 2, "Z", 3);

```

```
Map<String, Integer> map2 = Map.of("A", 4, "B", 5, "C", 6);
```

```
assertTrue(ComputeValDiffs.computeValueDifferences(map1, map2).isEmpty());  
}
```

```
@Test
```

```
void testOneMapEmpty() {
```

```
    Map<String, Integer> map1 = Collections.emptyMap();
```

```
    Map<String, Integer> map2 = Map.of("A", 1, "B", 2, "C", 3);
```

```
    assertTrue(ComputeValDiffs.computeValueDifferences(map1, map2).isEmpty());  
}
```

```
@Test
```

```
void testBothMapsEmpty() {
```

```
    Map<String, Integer> map1 = Collections.emptyMap();
```

```
    Map<String, Integer> map2 = Collections.emptyMap();
```

```
    assertTrue(ComputeValDiffs.computeValueDifferences(map1, map2).isEmpty());  
}
```

```
@Test
```

```
void testMap1Null() {
```

```
    Map<String, Integer> map2 = Map.of("A", 1, "B", 2);
```

```
    assertThrows(NullPointerException.class, () ->  
ComputeValDiffs.computeValueDifferences(null, map2));  
}
```

```
@Test
```

```
void testMap2Null() {
```

```
    Map<String, Integer> map1 = Map.of("A", 3, "B", 4);
```

```
    assertThrows(NullPointerException.class, () ->  
ComputeValDiffs.computeValueDifferences(map1, null));
```

```
}  
}
```

Once you have defined the characteristics,  
you need to divide them into blocks, and  
answer the following questions:

**A) Is the partitioning of the input parameters such that it ensures that the partitions are disjoint?**

**Why? If not, alter the partitioning to ensure this property is satisfied.**

Features C1, C2, C3, C4 are true/false type expressions.

Accordingly, the partitioning of all four features will be into 2 blocks – true T and false F.

With this division, we are assured that these features and their blocks satisfy the disjoint property,

since a map cannot be both null and not null at the same time.

Also, a map cannot be empty and contain elements at the same time.

Feature C5 also satisfies the disjointness property because we will either not have a common key or we will have at least one.

**B) Is the partitioning of the input parameters such that it ensures that the partitions cover the entire domain? Why? If not, alter the partitioning to ensure this property is satisfied.**

The partitioning of the input parameters satisfies the completeness property. Each of the input states is covered.

**C) Choose a base test and list all the necessary tests to satisfy the Base Choice Coverage (BCC) criterion. How many tests did you get?**

map1 = {"A": 2, "B": 3, "C": 5}

map2 = {"B": 6, "C": 2, "D": 8}

Expected Output: {"B": 3, "C": 3}

The Base Test plus 5 variations give us 6 test cases in total.

*D) Write JUnit tests using the BCC criteria for ISP coverage. Try to use AI tools to help you!*