## **TestCopilot**



# **TestCopilot Analysis Report**

#### **Codebase Analysis**

Codebase reliability rating: D - Moderate Risk (score: 58.0)

Analyzed 3 test files.

🛮 3 file(s) contain patterns that may cause flakiness or unreliable results.

Improving flagged files will make your test suite more stable and trustworthy for the whole team.

#### File: C:\Users\ishie\Documents\Projects\testcopilot\test-files\sample.cy.js

Checker: raceConditionAnalysis Score: 26.7 (E - High Risk)

Issue	Severit y	Line	Context	Explanation	Suggested Fix
User action "cy.click()" is not followed by a check to confirm the app responded.	medium	14	cy.get('#notific ations')	The test simulates a user interaction using "cy.click()", but it doesn't verify whether the app responded correctly. Without a follow-up check, the test might pass even if the application fails to react — leading to false confidence in test results.	After calling "cy.click()", add a UI assertion such as "cy.get().should()" to confirm the expected change happened. This helps ensure the app responded as intended.
User action "cy.click()" is not followed by a check to confirm the app responded.	medium	23	cy.get('#notific ations')	The test simulates a user interaction using "cy.click()", but it doesn't verify whether the app responded correctly. Without a follow-up check, the test might pass even if the application fails to react — leading to false confidence in test results.	After calling "cy.click()", add a UI assertion such as "cy.get().should()" to confirm the expected change happened. This helps ensure the app responded as intended.
User action "cy.click()" is not followed by a check to confirm the app responded.	medium	32	cy.get('#notific ations')	The test simulates a user interaction using "cy.click()", but it doesn't verify whether the app responded correctly. Without a follow-up check, the test might pass even if the application fails to react — leading to false confidence in test results.	After calling "cy.click()", add a UI assertion such as "cy.get().should()" to confirm the expected change happened. This helps ensure the app responded as intended.
User action "cy.click()"	medium	41	cy.get('#notific	The test simulates a user	After calling "cy.click()", add

Issue	Severit y	Line	Context	Explanation	Suggested Fix
is not followed by a check to confirm the app responded.			ations')	interaction using "cy.click()", but it doesn't verify whether the app responded correctly. Without a follow-up check, the test might pass even if the application fails to react — leading to false confidence in test results.	a UI assertion such as "cy.get().should()" to confirm the expected change happened. This helps ensure the app responded as intended.
User action "cy.click()" is not followed by a check to confirm the app responded.	medium	50	cy.get('#notific ations')	The test simulates a user interaction using "cy.click()", but it doesn't verify whether the app responded correctly. Without a follow-up check, the test might pass even if the application fails to react — leading to false confidence in test results.	After calling "cy.click()", add a UI assertion such as "cy.get().should()" to confirm the expected change happened. This helps ensure the app responded as intended.

This test file was rated E - High Risk for async reliability (score: 26.7).

 $\[mathbb{I}\]$  It contains patterns that may cause flakiness, such as hardcoded waits, missing intercepts, or UI actions without follow-up checks.

These issues mean the tests might pass even when the app is broken, or fail when the app is actually working — leading to wasted time debugging false results.

Improving these tests will make them more stable, trustworthy, and maintainable for both developers and QA teams.

### File: C:\Users\ishie\Documents\Projects\testcopilot\test-files\sample.cy copy.js

Checker: raceConditionAnalysis Score: 47.3 (D - Moderate Risk)

Issue	Severit y	Line	Context	Explanation	Suggested Fix
User action "cy.click()" is not followed by a check to confirm the app responded.	medium	14	cy.get('#notific ations')	The test simulates a user interaction using "cy.click()", but it doesn't verify whether the app responded correctly. Without a follow-up check, the test might pass even if the application fails to react — leading to false confidence in test results.	After calling "cy.click()", add a UI assertion such as "cy.get().should()" to confirm the expected change happened. This helps ensure the app responded as intended.
User action "cy.click()" is not followed by a check to confirm the app responded.	medium	23	cy.get('#notific ations')	The test simulates a user interaction using "cy.click()", but it doesn't verify whether the app responded correctly. Without a follow-up check, the test might pass even if the application fails to react — leading to false confidence in test results.	After calling "cy.click()", add a UI assertion such as "cy.get().should()" to confirm the expected change happened. This helps ensure the app responded as intended.

This test file was rated D - Moderate Risk for async reliability (score: 47.3).

It contains patterns that may cause flakiness, such as hardcoded waits, missing intercepts, or UI actions without follow-up checks.

These issues mean the tests might pass even when the app is broken, or fail when the app is actually working - leading to wasted time debugging false results.

Improving these tests will make them more stable, trustworthy, and maintainable for both developers and QA teams.

# File: C:\Users\ishie\Documents\Projects\testcopilot\test-files\sample-playwright.spec.ts

Checker: samplePlaywrightChecker

Score: 100 (A - Excellent)

Issue	Severit y	Line	Explanation	Suggested Fix
This is a sample Playwright checker output.	info	1		

Sample Playwright checker ran.