

# Error Locating Driven Array\*

Xintao Niu  
State Key Laboratory for Novel  
Software Technology  
Nanjing University  
China, 210023  
niuxintao@gmail.com

Changhai Nie  
State Key Laboratory for Novel  
Software Technology  
Nanjing University  
China, 210023  
changhainie@nju.edu.cn

JiaXi Xu  
School of Mathematics and  
Information Technology  
Nanjing Xiaozhuang University  
China, 211171  
xujiexi@126.com

## ABSTRACT

Combinatorial testing(CT) seeks to handle potential faults caused by various interactions of factors that can influence the Software systems. When applying CT, it is a common practice to first generate a bunch of test cases to cover each possible interaction and then to locate the failure-inducing interaction if any failure is detected. Although this conventional procedure is simple and straightforward, we conjecture that it is not the ideal choice in practice. This is because 1) testers desires to isolate the root cause of failures before all the needed test cases are generated and executed 2) the early located failure-inducing interactions can guide the remaining test cases generation, such that many unnecessary and invalidate test cases can be avoided. For this, we propose a novel CT framework that allows for both generation and localization process to better share each other's information, as a result, both this two testing stages will be more effectively and efficiently when handling the testing tasks. We conducted a series of empirical studies on several open-source software, of which the result shows that our framework can locate the failure-inducing interactions more quickly than traditional approaches, while just needing less test cases.

## Categories and Subject Descriptors

D.2.5 [Software Engineering]: Testing and debugging—*Debugging aids, testing tools*

## General Terms

Reliability, Verification

---

\*This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 61272079), the Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education of China (No.20130091110032), the Science Fund for Creative Research Groups of the National Natural Science Foundation of China(No. 61321491), and the Major Program of National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 91318301)

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. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

WOODSTOCK '97 El Paso, Texas USA

Copyright 20XX ACM X-XXXXX-XX-X/XX/XX ...\$15.00.

## Keywords

Software Testing, Combinatorial Testing, Covering Array, Failure-inducing combinations

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Modern software is designed modular, platform-cross, language-cross and configurable. Although the sophisticated design can make the system more flexible and more powerful, it also makes the testing task a challenging work. This is because the candidate factors that can influence the system's behaviour, e.g., possible configuration options, system inputs, message events and the like, increases rapidly, and what's worse, the interactions between these factors can also crash the system, e.g., the compatibility problems. In consideration of the scale of the possible configurations, inputs, events, and their possible interactions (we call them the interactions space) of the real industrial software, to test all the possible combination of all the possible factors is not feasible, and even it is possible, it is also wasting as numerous interactions do not provide any useful information.

Many empirical studies shows that in real software systems, the effective interaction space, i.e., targeting fault defects, makes up only a small proportion of the overall interaction space. What's more, the number of factors involved in these effective interactions is relatively small, of which 4-6 is usually the upper bonds. With this observation, applying CT in practice is appealing, as it is proven to be effective to handle the interaction faults in the system.

A typical CT life-circle is listed as Figure 1, in which there are four main testing stages. At the very beginning of the testing, engineers should extract the specific model of the software under test. In detail, they should identify the factors, such as user inputs, configure options, environment states and the like that could affect the system's behavior. Next, which values each factor can take should also be determined. Further efforts will be needed to figure out the constraints and dependencies between each factor and corresponding values to make the testing work valid. After the modeling stage, a bunch of test cases should be generated and executed to expose the potential faults in the system. In CT, one test case is a set of assignment of all the factors that we modeled before. Thus, when such a test case is executed, all the interactions contained in the test case are deemed to be checked. The main target of this stage is to design a relatively small size of test cases to get some specific coverage, for CT the most common coverage is to check all the possible interactions with the number of factors no more than a prior fixed integer, i.e., strength  $t$ . The third testing

stage in this circle is the fault localization, which is responsible for diagnosing the root cause of the failure we detected before. To characterize such root cause, i.e., failure-inducing interactions of corresponding factors and values is important for future bug fixing, as it will reduce the suspicious code scope that needed to inspect. The last testing stage of CT is evaluation. In this stage, testers will assess the quality of the previously conducted testing tasks, many metrics such as whether the failure-inducing interactions can reflect the failures detected, whether the generated test cases is adequate to expose all the behaviors of the system, will be validated. And if the assessment result shows that the previous testing process does not fulfil the testing requirement, some testing stages should be made some improvement, and sometimes, may even need to be re-conducted.

Although this conventional CT framework is simple and straightforward, however in terms of the test cases generation and fault localization stages, we conjecture that the first-generation-then-localization is not the proper choice for most test engineers. This is because, first, it is not realistic for testers wait for all the needed test cases are generated before they can diagnosis and fix the failures that haven been detected, second, and the most important, utilizing the early determined failure-inducing interactions can guide the following test cases generations, such that many unnecessary and invalid test cases will be avoided. For this we get to the most key idea of this paper:

*Generation and Localization process should be organised in a more tightly way.*

Based on the idea, we propose a new CT framework, which instead of dividing the generation and localization into two independent stages, it integrate this two stages into one. We call this new one the Generation-Localization stage, which allows for both generation and localization better share each other's testing information. To this aim, we remodel the generation and localization modular to make them better adapt to this newly framework. In specific, our generation adopts the one-test-one-time strategy, i.e., generate and execute one test case in one iteration. Rather than generating the overall needed test cases in one time, this strategy is more flexible so that it allows for terminating at any time during generation, no matter whether the coverage is reached or not. With this strategy, we can let the generation stops at the point we detect some failures, and then after localization we can utilize the diagnosing result to change the coverage criteria, e.g., the interactions related to the failure-inducing interactions do not need to be checked any more. Then based on the new coverage criteria, the generation process goes on.

We conducted a series empirical studies on several open-source software to evaluate our newly framework. In short, we take two main comparisons, one is to compare our new framework with the traditional one, which first generate a complete set of test cases and then perform the fault localization. Another one is to compare with the Error locating array, which is a well-designed set of test cases that can be used directly detect and isolate the failure-inducing interactions. The results shows that in terms of test case generation and fault diagnosis, our approach can and significantly reduced the overall needed test cases and can more quickly isolate the root cause of the system under test.

The main contributions of this paper:

1. We propose a newly CT framework which combine the




Figure 1: The life circle of CT

test cases generation and fault localization more closely.

2. We augment the traditional CT test cases generation and fault localization process to make them adapt to the newly framework.
3. A series comparisons with traditional CT is conducted and the result of the empirical studies are discussed.

The reset of the paper is organised as follows: Section 2 presents the preliminary background of some definitions of the CT. Section 3 describes our newly framework and a simple case study is also given. Section 4 presents the empirical studies and the results are discussed. Section 5 shows the related works. Section 6 concludes the paper and propose some further works.

## 2. MOTIVATING EXAMPLE

Combinatorial testing can effectively detect the failures caused by the interactions between various options or inputs of the SUT. Covering arrays, the test suite generated by this technique can cover each combination of the options at least once. We conjecture, however, although covering array can effectively, in practice, covering array was too much for detecting and locating the error in particular software.

As an motivating example, we looked through the following scenarios for detecting and locating the errors in the SUT.

Too much redundant fault test cases:

Too much redundant right test cases:

## 3. BACKGROUND

This section presents some definitions and propositions to give a formal model for the FCI problem.

### 3.1 Failure-inducing combinations in CT

Assume that the SUT is influenced by  $n$  parameters, and each parameter  $p_i$  has  $a_i$  discrete values from the finite set  $V_i$ , i.e.,  $a_i = |V_i|$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ). Some of the definitions below are originally defined in .

*Definition 1.* A test case of the SUT is an array of  $n$  values, one for each parameter of the SUT, which is denoted as a  $n$ -tuple  $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$ , where  $v_1 \in V_1, v_2 \in V_2 \dots v_n \in V_n$ .

In practice, these parameters in the test case can represent many factors, such as input variables, run-time options, building options or various combination of them. We need to execute the SUT with these test cases to ensure the correctness of the behaviour of the software.

We consider the fact that the abnormally executing test cases as a *fault*. It can be a thrown exception, compilation error, assertion failure or constraint violation. When faults are triggered by some test cases, what is desired is to figure out the cause of these faults, and hence some subsets of this test case should be analysed.

*Definition 2.* For the SUT, the  $n$ -tuple  $(-, v_{n_1}, \dots, v_{n_k}, \dots)$  is called a  $k$ -value *combination* ( $0 < k \leq n$ ) when some  $k$  parameters have fixed values and the others can take on their respective allowable values, represented as “-”.

In effect a test case itself is a  $k$ -value *combination*, when  $k = n$ . Furthermore, if a test case contain a *combination*, i.e., every fixed value in the combination is in this test case, we say this test case *hits* the *combination*.

*Definition 3.* let  $c_l$  be a  $l$ -value combination,  $c_m$  be an  $m$ -value combination in SUT and  $l < m$ . If all the fixed parameter values in  $c_l$  are also in  $c_m$ , then  $c_m$  *subsumes*  $c_l$ . In this case we can also say that  $c_l$  is a *sub-combination* of  $c_m$  and  $c_m$  is a *parent-combination* of  $c_l$ , which can be denoted as  $c_l \prec c_m$ .

For example, in the motivation example section, the 2-value combination  $(-, 4, 4, -)$  is a sub-combination of the 3-value combination  $(-, 4, 4, 5)$ , that is,  $(-, 4, 4, -) \prec (-, 4, 4, 5)$ .

*Definition 4.* If all test cases contain a combination, say  $c$ , trigger a particular fault, say  $F$ , then we call this combination  $c$  the *faulty combination* for  $F$ . Additionally, if none sub-combination of  $c$  is the *faulty combination* for  $F$ , we then call the combination  $c$  the *minimal faulty combination* for  $F$  (It is also called Minimal failure-causing schema(MFS) in ).

In fact, MFS and *minimal faulty combinations* are identical to the failure-inducing combinations we discussed previously. Figuring it out can eliminate all details that are irrelevant for causing the failure and hence facilitate the debugging efforts.

## 4. ALGORITHMS

### 4.1 Description

### 4.2 A case study

## 5. EMPIRICAL STUDIES

### 5.1 The existence of

#### 5.1.1 Study setup

#### 5.1.2 Result and discussion

### 5.2 Performance of the traditional algorithms

#### 5.2.1 Study setup

#### 5.2.2 Result and discussion

### 5.3 Performance of our approach

#### 5.3.1 Study setup

#### 5.3.2 Result and discussion

## 5.4 Threats to validity

## 6. RELATED WORKS

## 7. CONCLUSIONS