Verification and Validation Report: ImgBeamer

Joachim de Fourestier

April 3, 2023

1 Revision History

Date	Version	Notes
2023/03/26	0.1.0	Creation
2023/04/02	0.1.1	Start requirements testing sections
2023/04/03	0.2.0	Fill in the Functional Requirements Evaluation section, along with test images

2 Symbols, Abbreviations and Acronyms

symbol	description
GUI	Graphical User Interface
SRS	Software Requirements Specification
T	Test
VnV	Verification and Validation

See the SRS [3], VnV Plan [4], MG [1], and MIS [2] Documentation for additional items.

Contents

1 Revision History i

2 Symbols, Abbreviations and Acronyms ii

3 Report Purpose 1

4 Functional Requirements Evaluation 1

4.1 Image Import and Export (R1 and R6) . . . 1

4.1.1 T1: Test import for PNG/JPG/BMP format (R1) . . . 1

4.1.2 T2: Test PNG Image Export (R6) . . . 1

4.2 Spot Profile and Imaging Parameters (R2, R3, R4, and R5) . . . 1

4.2.1 T3: Spot Width and Height - Exact-sampling (R2 and R5) . . . 1

4.2.2 T4: Spot Width and Height - Under-sampling (R2 and R5) . . . 3

4.2.3 T5: Spot Width and Height - Over-sampling (R2 and R5) . . . 4

4.2.4 T6: Spot Rotation - Astigmatism (R2 and R5) . . . 4

4.2.5 T7: Raster Grid / Pixel Size (R3 and R5) . . . 4

4.2.6 T8: Subregion / ROI (R4 and R5) . . . 5

4.2.7 T9: Ground Truth Reproduction (R1, R2, R3, and R6) . . . 5

4.3 Image Quality Metric (R7) . . . 6

4.3.1 T10: High metric value (approximate to exact-sampling) . . . 7

4.3.2 T11: Low metric value (under-sampling) . . . 8

4.3.3 T12: Low metric value (over-sampling) . . . 8

4.3.4 T13: Control metric value . . . 8

5 Nonfunctional Requirements Evaluation 11

5.1 Usability . . . 11

5.1.1 T14: Usability Survey (NFR2) . . . 11

5.2 Accuracy . . . 11

5.2.1 T15: Image Metric Survey (NFR1) . . . 11

5.3 Maintainability . . . 11

5.3.1 T16: Static code analysis (NFR3) . . . 11

5.3.2 T17: Code Review (NFR3) . . . 11

5.4 Portability . . . 11

5.4.1 T18: Various Platforms and Environments (NFR4) . . . 11

6 Comparison to Existing Implementation 12

7 Unit Testing 12

8 Changes Due to Testing **12**

9 Automated Testing **12**

10 Trace to Requirements **12**

11 Trace to Modules **12**

12 Code Coverage Metrics **12**

List of Tables

List of Figures

1 An example loaded test image. 2
2 The image was faithfully reproduced (in grayscale with some imaging parameters change for clarity). 2
3 The ground truth image used for testing with the subregion set to cover the entire image. 3
4 The spot layout and resulting image matching the expected test result: Spot size of 100 by 100%. 3
5 The spot layout and resulting image matching the expected test result: Spot size of 10 by 10%. 4
6 The spot layout and resulting image matching the expected test result: Spot size of 500 by 500%. 4
7 The spot layout and resulting image matching the expected test result: Spot size of 60 by 500% at 45 degrees rotation. 5
8 The spot layout and resulting image matching the expected test result: an 8 by 8 pixel image. 5
9 The spot layout, subregion, and resulting image matching the expected test result. 6
10 The expected test result: the ground image and resulting image are visually identical. 7
11 The spot layout, spot profile, subregion, and resulting image with a score equal or greater to the expected test result of a “0.8501” minimum. 7
12 The spot layout, spot profile, subregion, and resulting image with a score less or equal to the expected test result of a “0.8501” maximum. 8
13 The spot layout, spot profile, subregion, and resulting image with a score less or equal to the expected test result of a “0.8501” maximum. 9

14 The spot layout, spot profile, subregion, and resulting image with a score greater or equal to the expected test result of a “0.9500” minimum. 10

3 Report Purpose

This purpose of this report is to document the tasks accomplished and testing results as part the verification and validation process of ImgBeamer as laid out in the VnV Plan [4]. The code documentation along with notes on developer setup and testing is available at: https://joedf.github.io/ImgBeamer/jsdocs/index.html The software design documentation is available at: https://github.com/joedf/CAS741_w23. The source code is available at: https://github.com/joedf/ImgBeamer/tree/cas741

4 Functional Requirements Evaluation

In this section, we report the measures that were taken to evaluate whether the functional requirements (as listed in the SRS [3]) were met. Most of these tests were executed manually due to the complex nature of visual information, GUI testing, and the subjectivity of image quality.

4.1 Image Import and Export (R1 and R6)

This section is focused on testing the image import and export functionalities.

4.1.1 T1: Test import for PNG/JPG/BMP format (R1)

The software could successfully load or import valid (non-corrupt) images files in the PNG, JPG, and BMP formats. An example is shown in figure 1.

4.1.2 T2: Test PNG Image Export (R6)

The software could successfully export valid PNG image files of the resulting image (see figure 2).

4.2 Spot Profile and Imaging Parameters (R2, R3, R4, and R5)

This section focuses on testing the sampling and image rendering based on the given imaging parameters and subregion / ROI. The ground truth / input image used for these tests is depicted in figure 3 with the cyan overlay depicting the subregion area.

4.2.1 T3: Spot Width and Height - Exact-sampling (R2 and R5)

The test was passed as shown in figure 4.



Figure 1: An example loaded test image.



Figure 2: The image was faithfully reproduced (in grayscale with some imaging parameters change for clarity).



Figure 3: The ground truth image used for testing with the subregion set to cover the entire image.



Figure 4: The spot layout and resulting image matching the expected test result: Spot size of 100 by 100%.

4.2.2 T4: Spot Width and Height - Under-sampling (R2 and R5)

The test was passed as shown in figure 5.



Figure 5: The spot layout and resulting image matching the expected test result: Spot size of 10 by 10%.

4.2.3 T5: Spot Width and Height - Over-sampling (R2 and R5)

The test was passed as shown in figure 6.



Figure 6: The spot layout and resulting image matching the expected test result: Spot size of 500 by 500%.

4.2.4 T6: Spot Rotation - Astigmatism (R2 and R5)

The test was passed as shown in figure 7.

4.2.5 T7: Raster Grid / Pixel Size (R3 and R5)

The test was passed as shown in figure 8.



Figure 7: The spot layout and resulting image matching the expected test result: Spot size of 60 by 500% at 45 degrees rotation.



Figure 8: The spot layout and resulting image matching the expected test result: an 8 by 8 pixel image.

4.2.6 T8: Subregion / ROI (R4 and R5)

The test was passed as shown in figure 9.

4.2.7 T9: Ground Truth Reproduction (R1, R2, R3, and R6)

The test was passed as shown in figure 10.



Figure 9: The spot layout, subregion, and resulting image matching the expected test result.

4.3 Image Quality Metric (R7)

This section focuses on testing the image quality metric general cases. Naturally, this is no flawless or foolproof image quality metric. Over 20 different image metrics have been reviewed and compared by Jagalingam and Hegde in a 2015 paper, each with their different strengths and weaknesses [5].



Figure 10: The expected test result: the ground image and resulting image are visually identical.

4.3.1 T10: High metric value (approximate to exact-sampling)

The test was passed as shown in figure 11.



Figure 11: The spot layout, spot profile, subregion, and resulting image with a score equal or greater to the expected test result of a “0.8501” minimum.

4.3.2 T11: Low metric value (under-sampling)

The test was passed as shown in figure 12.



Figure 12: The spot layout, spot profile, subregion, and resulting image with a score less or equal to the expected test result of a “0.8501” maximum.

4.3.3 T12: Low metric value (over-sampling)

The test was passed as shown in figure 14.

4.3.4 T13: Control metric value

The test was passed as shown in figure 14.



Figure 13: The spot layout, spot profile, subregion, and resulting image with a score less or equal to the expected test result of a “0.8501” maximum.



Figure 14: The spot layout, spot profile, subregion, and resulting image with a score greater or equal to the expected test result of a “0.9500” minimum.

5 Nonfunctional Requirements Evaluation

This section focuses on the testing results verifying whether the nonfunctional requirements (as defined in the SRS [3]) are met. Emphasis is put on the *usability* and by extension *portability*: The software should be easy to set up and use without having to worry about any technicalities that could otherwise hinder or completely prohibit non "tech-savvy" individuals from using the software.

5.1 Usability

5.1.1 T14: Usability Survey (NFR2)

The usability survey was not completed. The software was casually reviewed in verbal discussion with the expert consultants (as listed in the VnV Plan [4]) throughout the development of the software. Suggested features and minor issues has been implemented into the software such as: the ability to set a spot size by numeric input, draw the resulting row-by-row for responsiveness, and a display for spot shape eccentricity.

5.2 Accuracy

5.2.1 T15: Image Metric Survey (NFR1)

The image quality survey was not executed, but shall be some time in the future.

5.3 Maintainability

5.3.1 T16: Static code analysis (NFR3)

...

5.3.2 T17: Code Review (NFR3)

...

5.4 Portability

5.4.1 T18: Various Platforms and Environments (NFR4)

...

6 Comparison to Existing Implementation

This section will not be appropriate for every project.

7 Unit Testing

8 Changes Due to Testing

1. The passing value for T13 (see 4.3.4) had to be changed from "0.9800" to '0.9500' since the resulting images look identical. The resulting value of '0.9617' seemed satisfactory and the original expected test value was perhaps too constrained.

9 Automated Testing

10 Trace to Requirements

11 Trace to Modules

12 Code Coverage Metrics

References

[1] J. de Fourestier. Module guide for ImgBeamer, 2023. URL https://github.com/joedf/CAS741_w23/blob/main/docs/Design/SoftArchitecture/MG.pdf.

[2] J. de Fourestier. Module interface specification for ImgBeamer, 2023. URL https://github.com/joedf/CAS741_w23/blob/main/docs/Design/SoftDetailedDes/MIS.pdf.

[3] J. de Fourestier. Software requirements specification for ImgBeamer: Scanning electron microscope image formation, 2023. URL https://github.com/joedf/CAS741_w23/blob/main/docs/SRS/SRS.pdf.

[4] J. de Fourestier. Verification and validation plan for ImgBeamer, 2023. URL https://github.com/joedf/CAS741_w23/blob/main/docs/VnVPlan/VnVPlan.pdf.

[5] P. Jagalingam and Arkal Vittal Hegde. A review of quality metrics for fused image. *Aquatic Procedia*, 4:133–142, 2015. ISSN 2214-241X. doi: https://doi.

org/10.1016/j.aqpro.2015.02.019. URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214241X15000206.

Appendix — Reflection

The information in this section will be used to evaluate the team members on the graduate attribute of Lifelong Learning. Please answer the following questions:

1.

2.