An interleaving approach to combinatorial testing and failure-inducing interaction identification*

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

Hareton Leung
Department of computing
Hong Kong Polytechnic
University
Kowloon, Hong Kong
cshleung@comp.polyu.edu.hk

Jeff Lei
Department of Computer
Science and Engineering
The University of Texas at
Arlington
ylei@cse.uta.edu

JiaXi Xu and Yan Wang
School of Information
Engineering
Nanjing Xiaozhuang University
China, 211171
xujiaxi@njxzc.edu.cn

Xiaoyin Wang
Department of Computer
Science
University of Texas at San
Antonio
Xiaoyin.Wang@utsa.edu

ABSTRACT

Combinatorial testing(CT) seeks to detect 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 set of test cases to cover each possible interaction and then to locate the failure-inducing interaction after a 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 desire to identify 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 invalid test cases can be avoided. For this, we propose a novel CT framework that allows for both generation and identification process to better share each other's information. As a result, both testing stages will be done more effectively and efficiently. 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 requiring fewer test cases.

Categories and Subject Descriptors

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

General Terms

Reliability, Verification

Keywords

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

1. INTRODUCTION

Modern software is developed more sophisticatedly and intelligently than before. To test such software is challenging, as the candidate factors that can influence the system's behaviour, e.g., configuration options, system inputs, message events, are enormous. Even worse, the interactions between these factors can also crash the system, e.g., the incompatibility problems. In consideration of the scale of the real industrial software, to test all the possible interaction of all the factors (we call them the interaction space) is not feasible, and even it is possible, it is not recommended to test all the interactions because most of them do not provide any useful information.

Many empirical studies show 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 to 6 is usually the upper bounds. With this observation, applying CT in practice is appealing, as it is proven to be effective to detect the interaction faults in the system.

A typical CT life-cycle is shown 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, the specific 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 for valid testing. After the modeling stage, a set of test cases should be generated and executed to expose the potential faults in the system. In CT, each 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 set of test cases to achieve 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 cycle is the fault localization, which is responsible for diagnosing the root cause of the failure 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, based on 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. And if the assessment result shows that the previous testing process does not fulfil the testing requirement, some testing stages should be improved, and sometimes, may even need to be re-conducted.

Although this conventional CT framework is simple and straightforward, in terms of the test cases generation and fault localization stages, we conjecture that the first-generation-then-identification is not the proper choice in practice. This is because, first, it is not realistic for testers wait for all the needed test cases are generated before they can diagnose and fix the failures that have been detected [30]; 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 can be avoided. For this we get the key idea of this paper: *Generation and Fault Localization process should be integrated.*

Based on the idea, we propose a new CT framework, which instead of dividing the generation and identification into two independent stages, it integrates this two stages into one. We call this the Generation-Identification stage, which allows for both generation and identification better share each other's testing information. To this aim, we remodel the generation and identification module to make them better adapt to this new framework. Specifically, our generation adopts the one-test-one-time strategy, i.e., generate and execute one test case in one iteration. Rather than generating the all the needed test cases in one time, this strategy is more flexible so that it allows 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 identification 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 of empirical studies on several open-source software to evaluate our new framework. In short,


Figure 1: The life cycle of CT

we take two main comparisons, one is to compare our new framework with the traditional one, which first generates a complete set of test cases and then performs the fault localization. The second one is to compare with the Error Locating Array [20, 21], which is a well-designed set of test cases that can be used directly detect and identify the failure-inducing interactions. The results shows that in terms of test case generation and failure-inducing interactions identification, our approach can significantly reduced the overall needed test cases and as a result it can more quickly identify the root cause of the system under test.

The main contributions of this paper:

1. We propose a new CT framework which combine the test cases generation and fault localization more closely.

2. We augment the traditional CT test cases generation and failure-inducing interactions identification process to make them adapt to the new framework.

3. A series of comparisons with traditional CT and Error Locating Array is conducted and the result of the empirical studies are discussed.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows: Section 2 presents the preliminary background of CT. Section 3 describes our new 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 work.

2. BACKGROUND

This section presents some definitions and propositions to give a formal model for CT.

Assume that the SUT is influenced by n parameters, and each parameter p_i can take the values from the finite set V_i ($i = 1,2,..n$). Some of the definitions below are originally defined in [22].

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

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 SUT.

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

Definition 2. For the SUT, the n-tuple $(-,v_{n_1},...,v_{n_k},...)$ is called a k-degree *schema* $(0 < k \leq n)$ when some k parameters have fixed values and other irrelevant parameters are represented as "-".

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

Note that the schema is a formal description of the interaction between parameter values we discussed before.

Definition 3. Let c_l be a l-degree schema, c_m be an m-degree schema 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-schema* of c_m and c_m is a *super-schema* of c_l, which can be denoted as $c_l \prec c_m$.

For example, the 2-degree schema (-, 4, 4, -) is a sub-schema of the 3-degree schema (-, 4, 4, 5), that is, (-,4,4,-) $\prec$ (-,4,4,5).

Definition 4. If all test cases that contain a schema, say c, trigger a particular fault, say F, then we call this schema c the *faulty schema* for F. Additionally, if none of sub-schema of c is the *faulty schema* for F, we then call the schema c the *minimal failure-causing schema (MFS)* [22] for F.

In fact, MFS are identical to the failure-inducing interactions we discussed previously. In this paper, the terms *failure-inducing interactions* and *MFS* are used interchangeably. Figuring the MFS out helps to identify the root cause of a failure and thus facilitate the debugging efforts.

2.1 CT Test Generation

When applying CT, the most important work is to determine whether the SUT is suffering from the interaction faults or not, i.e., to detect the existence of the MFS. Rather than impractically executing exhaustive test cases, CT commonly design a relatively small set of test cases to cover all the schemas with the degree no more than a prior fixed number, t. Such a set of test cases is called the *covering array*. If some test cases in the covering array failed in execution, then the interaction faults is regard to be detected.

Many studies in CT focus on how to generate such a test suite with the aim of making the size of the test suite as small as possible. In general, most of these studies can be classified into three categories according to the construction strategy of the covering array:

1) One test case one time : This strategy repeats generating one test case as one row of the covering array and counting the covered schemas achieved until no more schemas is needed to be covered.

2) A set of test cases one time: This strategy generates a set of test cases at each iteration. Through mutating the values of some parameters of some test cases in this test set, it focuses optimising the coverage. If the coverage is finally satisfied, it will reduce the size of the set to see if fewer test cases can still fulfil the coverage. Otherwise, it will increase the size of test set to cover all the schemas[4].

3) Others : This strategy differentiates from the previous two strategies in that it does not firstly generate completed test cases [18]. Instead, it first focuses on assigning values to some part of the factors or parameters to cover the schemas that related to these factors, and then fill up the remaining part to form completed test cases.

In this paper, we focus on the first strategy: One test case one time as it immediately get a completed test case such that the testers can execute and diagnose in the early stage. And we will see later, with respect to the MFS identification, this strategy is the most flexible and efficient one comparing with the other two strategies.

2.2 Identify the failure-inducing interactions

To detect the existence of MFS in the SUT is still far from figuring out the root cause of the failure. As we do not know exactly which schemas in the failed test cases should be responsible for the failure. In fact, for a failing test case $(v_1, v_2, ..., v_n)$, there can be at most $2^n - 1$ possible schemas for the MFS. Hence, more test cases should be generated to identify the MFS. In CT, the main work in fault localization is to identify the failure-inducing interactions. So in this paper we only focus on the MFS identification. Further works of fault localization such as isolating the defect inside the source code will not be discussed.

A typical MFS identification process is shown in Table 1. This example assumes the SUT has 3 parameters, each can take 2 values. And assume the test case (1, 1, 1) failed. Then in Table 1, as test case t failed, and OFOT mutated one factor of the t one time to generate new test cases: $t_1 - t_3$, It found that the t_1 passed, which indicates that this test case break the MFS in the original test case t. So the (1,-,-) should be one failure-causing factor, and as other mutating process all failed, which means no other failure-inducing factors were broken, therefore, the MFS in t is (1,-,-).

Table 1: OFOT with our strategy

Original test case			Outcome
t	1	1	1	Fail
Additional test cases			
t_1	0	1	1	Pass
t_2	1	0	1	Fail
t_3	1	1	0	Fail

This identification process mutate one factor of the original test case at a time to generate extra test cases. And then according to the outcome of the test cases execution result, it will identify the MFS of the original failing test cases. It is calling the OFOT method, which is a well-known MFS identification method in CT. In this paper, we will focus on this identification method. It is noted that the following proposed CT framework can be easily applied to other MFS identification methods.

3. MOTIVATION EXAMPLE

As discussed previously, the generation and identification are the most important works in CT life-cycle. How best to utilize these two activities in the CT life-cycle is of importance as it is closely impact on the quality and cost of overall software testing. In fact, most studies in CT focus on these two fields. But rather than as a whole, generation and identification are applied independently. The justification for not discussing how to cooperate these two activities is that they think the first-generation-then-identification is so natural and straightforward. As we will show below, however, that the generation and identification is so tightly correlated

that they have a significant impact on the effectiveness and efficiencies of testing.

A typical traditional generation-identification life-cycle is to first generate a t-way covering array. If there exists some failures that triggered by some particular schemas, then we detect some failures and should identify the MFS in the SUT for further bug fixing.

As an example, Table 2 illustrates the process of testing a System with 4 parameters and each parameter has three values. It first generated and executed the 2-way covering array ($t_1 - t_9$). Note that this covering array covered all the 2-way schemas for the SUT. And after finding that t_1, t_2, and t_7 failed during testing, it then respectively identified the MFS in t_1, t_2, and t_7. For t_1, it uses OFOT method to generate four additional test cases ($t_{10} - t_{13}$), and identified the MFS of t_1 is (-, 0, - , -) as only when changing the second factor of t_1 it will pass. Then it will do the same thing to t_2 and t_7, and found that (-,0, -, -) is also the MFS of t_2 and t_7. After all, for detecting and identifying the MFS in this example SUT, we have generated 12 additional test cases(marked with star).

Table 2: Traditional generation-identification life-cycle

	test case				Outcome
	Generation				
t_1	0	0	0	0	Fail
t_2	0	1	1	1	Pass
t_3	0	2	2	2	Pass
t_4	1	0	1	2	Fail
t_5	1	1	2	0	Pass
t_6	1	2	0	1	Pass
t_7	2	0	2	1	Fail
t_8	2	1	0	2	Pass
t_9	2	2	1	0	Pass
	Identification				
	for $t1$— **0 0 0 0**				
t_{10}*	1	0	0	0	Fail
t_{11}*	0	1	0	0	Pass
t_{12}*	0	0	1	0	Fail
t_{13}*	0	0	0	1	Fail
	result – **(-, 0, -, -)**				
	for $t4$— **1 0 1 2**				
t_{14}*	2	0	1	2	Fail
t_{15}*	1	1	1	2	Pass
t_{16}*	1	0	2	2	Fail
t_{17}*	1	0	1	0	Fail
	result – **(-, 0, -, -)**				
	for $t7$— **2 0 2 1**				
t_{18}*	0	0	2	1	Fail
t_{19}*	2	1	2	1	Pass
t_{20}*	2	0	0	1	Fail
t_{21}*	2	0	2	2	Fail
	result – **(-, 0, -, -)**				

We refer to such traditional life-cycle as *sequential CT*. However, we think this is not the best choice in practice. The first reason is that the engineers normally do not want to wait for fault localization after all the test cases are executed. The early bug fixing is appealing and can give the engineers confidence to keep on improving the quality of the software.

The second reason, which is also the most important, is such life-cycle can generate many redundant and unnecessary test cases. This can be reflected in the following two aspects:

1) The test cases generated in the identification stage can also contribute some coverage, i.e., the schemas appear in the passing test cases in the identification stage may have already been covered in the test cases generation stage. For example, when we identify the MFS of t_1 in Table 2, the schema (0, 1, -, -) contained in the extra passing test case $t_{11} - $ (0, 1, 0, 0) has already been appeared in the passing test case $t_2 - $ (0, 1, 1, 1). In other word, if we firstly identify the MFS of t_1, then t_2 is not a good choice as it doesn't covered as many 2-degree schemas as possible. For example, (1, 1, 1, 1) is better than this test case at contributing more coverage.

2) The identified MFS should not appeared in the following generated test cases. This is because according to the definition of MFS, each test case containing this schema will trigger a failure, i.e., to generate and execute more than one test case contained the MFS makes no sense for the failure detecting. Worse more, such test case may suffer from the *masking effects* [29], as failures caused by the already identified MFS can prevent the test case from normally checking (e.g., failures that can trigger an unexpected halt of the execution), as a result some schemas in these test cases that are supposed to be examined will actually skip the testing. Take the example in Table 2, after identifying the MFS – (-, 0, -, -) of t_1, we should not generate the test case t_4 and t_7. This because they also contain the identified MFS (-, 0, -, -), which will result in them failing as expected. Surely the expected failure caused by MFS (-, 0, -, -) makes t_4 and t_7 are superfluous for error-detection, and worse more some other schemas in t_4 or t_7 may be masked, as those schemas can potentially trigger other failures but will not be observed. And since we should not generate t_4 and t_7, then the additional test cases (t_{14} to t_{21})generated for identified the MFS in t_4 and t_7 are also not necessary.

For all of this, a more effective and efficient framework is desired.

4. INTERLEAVING APPROACH

To overcome such deficiencies in traditional CT, we propose a new CT generation-identification framework – *Interleaving CT*. Our new framework aims at enhancing the interaction of generation and identification to reduce the unnecessary and invalid test cases discussed previously.

4.1 Overall framework

The basic outline of our framework is illustrated in Figure 2. In specific, this new framework works as follows: First, it will check whether all the needed schemas is covered or not. Commonly the target of CT is to cover all the t-degree schemas, with t normally be assigned as 2 or 3. Then if the current coverage is not satisfied, it will generate a new test case to cover as many uncovered schemas as possible. After that, it will execute this test case with the outcome of the execution either be pass (executed normally, i.e., doesn't triggered an exception, violate the expected oracle or the like) or fail (on the contrary). When the test case passes the execution, we will recompute the coverage state, as all the schemas in the passing test case are regarded as error-irrelevant. As a result, the schemas that wasn't covered before will be determined to be covered if it is contained in

Figure 2: Interleaving CT

this newly generated test case. Otherwise if the test case fails, then we will start the MFS identification module to identify the MFS in this failing test case. One point that needs to be noted is that if the test case fails, we will not directly change the coverage state, as we can not figure out which schemas are responsible to this failure among all the schemas in this test case until we identify them.

The identification module works almost the same way as traditional independent MFS identify process, i.e., repeats generating and executing additional test cases until it can get enough information to diagnose the MFS in the original failing test case. The only difference from traditional MFS identifying process is that we augment it by counting the coverage this module have contributed to the overall coverage. In detail, when the additional test case passes, we will label the schemas in these test cases as covered if it had not been covered before. And when the MFS is found at the end of this module, we will first set them as forbidden schemas that latter generated test cases should not contain (Otherwise the test case must fail and it cannot contribute to more coverage), second all the t-degree schemas that are *related* to these MFS will be set as covered. Here the *related* schemas indicate the following three types of t-degree schemas:

First, the MFS **themselves**. Note that we haven't change the coverage state after the generated test case fails (both for the generation and identify module), so these MFS will never be covered as they always appear in these failing test cases.

Second, the schemas that are the **super-schemas** of these MFS. By definition of the super-schemas (Definition 3), we can find if the test case contains the super-schemas, it must

also contain all its sub-schemas. So every test case contain the super-schemas of the MFS must fail after execution. As a result, they will never be covered as we don't change the coverage state for failing test cases.

Third, those **implicit forbidden** schemas, which was first introduced in [6]. This type of schemas are caused by the conjunction of multiple MFS. For example, for a SUT with three parameters, and each parameter has two values, i.e., SUT(2, 2, 2). If there are two MFS for this SUT, which are (1, -, 1) and (0, 1, -). Then the schema (-, 1, 1) is the implicit forbidden schema. This is because for any test case that contain this schema, it must contain either (1, -, 1) or (0, 1, -). As a result, (-, 1, 1) will never be covered as all the test cases containing this schema will fail and so that we will not change the coverage state. In fact, by Definition 4, they can be deemed as faulty schemas.

As we all know, the terminating condition of the CT framework is to cover all the t-degree schemas. Then since the three types of schemas will never be covered in our new CT framework, we can set them as covered after the execution of the identify module, so that the overall process can stop.

4.2 The augmentation of the two CT activities

(1) *Generation* : We adopt the *one test case one time* method as the basic skeleton of the generation process. O-riginally, the generation of one test case can be formulated in the EQ1.

$$t \leftarrow select(\mathcal{T}_{all}, \Omega, \xi) \qquad (EQ1)$$

There are three factors determine the selection of test case t. $\mathcal{T}_{all}$ represents all the valid test cases that can be selected to be executed. Usually the test cases that have been tested will not be included as they have no more contribution for the coverage. Ω indicates the set of schemas that have not been covered yet. ξ is a random factor. Commonly the CT generation approaches prefer to select a test case that can cover as many uncovered schemas as possible. This greedy selection process does not guarantee an optimal solution, i.e., the final size of the set of test cases is not guaranteed to be minimal, so the random factor ξ is used to help to escape from localization trap.

As discussed in section 3.1, we should account for the MFS to let them not appear in the latter generated test cases, which should be handled as the constraints–forbidden schemas. In other words, the candidate test cases that can be selected are reduced, because those test cases that contain should not be appeared next. Formally, let $\mathcal{T}_{MFS}$ indicates the set of test cases that contain the currently identified MFS, then the test case selection are augmented as EQ2.

$$t \leftarrow select(\mathcal{T}_{all} - \mathcal{T}_{MFS}, \Omega, \xi) \qquad (EQ2)$$

In this formula, the only difference from EQ1 is that the candidate test cases that can be selected are changed to be $\mathcal{T}_{all} - \mathcal{T}_{MFS}$, which excludes $\mathcal{T}_{MFS}$ from candidate test cases.

In practice, it is impossible to thoroughly search the exhaustive candidate test cases $\mathcal{T}_{all}$ to get one test case t. Hence, some heuristic methods are used to simplify the s-election. For example, AETG [3] successively assigns the value to each parameter to form a test case (The order of assignment are by random). The value to be assigned is the one that appears in the greatest number of uncovered schemas. Correspondingly, when considering not generating

the test cases in $\mathcal{T}_{MFS}$, it is common to utilize a constraint solver to avoid the forbidden schemas [6, 7].

(2) *MFS identification* : Traditional MFS identification aims at finding the MFS in a failing test case. As discussed before, test cases in the covering array are not enough to identify the MFS. Hence, additional test cases are should be generated and executed in this CT activity. Generally, an additional test case is generated based on the original failing test case, so that the failure-inducing parts can be determined by comparing the difference between the additional test cases and the original failing test cases. Take the OFOT approach as an example. In Table 2, the additional test case $t_{11}*$ is constructed by mutating the second parameter value of the original failing test case t_1. Then we can determined that the second parameter value (-, 0, -, -) must be a failure-inducing element. Formally, let $t_{failing}$ be the original failing test case, Δ be the mutation parts, $\mathcal{P}$ be the parameters and their values, then the traditional additional test case generation can be formulated as EQ3.

$$t \leftarrow mutate(\mathcal{P}, t_{failing}, \Delta) \qquad (EQ3)$$

EQ3 indicates that the test case t are generated by mutating the part Δ of the original failing test case $t_{failing}$. Note that the mutated values may have many choices, as long as they are within the scope of $\mathcal{P}$ and different from those in $t_{failing}$. Traditional MFS identification process just select one by random. However, when considering to adjust the MFS identification process to adapt to the new CT framework, this selection should be refined.

First it should not contain the previously identified MFS. To achieve this goal, the constraints checking process is also needed like Algorithm 1. Another point that needs to be noted is that the additional test cases generated in the identification process can also contribute the coverage. As the overall testing process aims to cover all the t-degree schemas, so if those additional test cases can cover more uncovered t-degree schemas, the overall testing process can stop earlier. As a result, the overall test cases generated can be reduced.

it should the coverage and forbidden schemas, the we. should take care. To this aim, we need to select proper test cases from. Formally, let $\mathcal{T}_{candidate}$ be the all the candidate as EQ4. We later

Normally,

$$\mathcal{T}_{candidate} = \{ \ t \mid t \leftarrow mutate(\mathcal{P}, t_{failing}, \Delta) \ \} \qquad (EQ4)$$

Then we just need to do the same thing as that in generation, i.e., . Formally as EQ5.

$$t \leftarrow select(\mathcal{T}_{candidate} - \mathcal{T}_{MFS}, \Omega, \xi) \qquad (EQ5)$$

In this formula, we .

After the MFS are identified, some related t-degree schemas, i.e., *MFS themselves*, *super-schemas* and *implicit forbidden schemas*, should be set as covered to make the overall C-T process stoppable. The algorithm that seeks to handling these three types of schemas is listed in Algorithm 1.

In this algorithm, we firstly append the newly identified MFS into the global MFS set (line 1 - 3), so that we can use them in the following generation and identification processes. Then for each newly identified MFS, we will set them as covered, i.e., remove them from the uncovered set, if they are t-degree schemas (line 4 - 7). This is the first type of schemas –*themselves*. For each t-degree super-schema of these newly identified MFS, we will also remove them from

---

Algorithm 1 Changing coverage after identification of MFS

Input: $S_{identified}$ ▷ currently identified MFS
$\quad\quad\quad S_{MFS}$ ▷ previously identified MFS
$\quad\quad\quad T_{uncovered}$ ▷ the schemas that are still uncovered
Output: *void* ▷ do not need any output
1: **for each** $s \in S_{identified}$ **do**
2: $\quad S_{MFS}.append(s)$
3: **end for**
4: **for each** $s \in S_{identified}$ **do**
5: $\quad$ **if** s is t-degree schema **then**
6: $\quad\quad T_{uncovered}.remove(s)$
7: $\quad$ **end if**
8: $\quad$ **for each** s_p is super-schema of s **do**
9: $\quad\quad$ **if** s_p is t-degree schema **then**
10: $\quad\quad\quad T_{uncovered}.remove(s_p)$
11: $\quad\quad$ **end if**
12: $\quad$ **end for**
13: **end for**
14: **for each** $t \in T_{uncovered}$ **do**
15: $\quad$ **if** not $isSatisfied(t, S_{MFS})$ **then**
16: $\quad\quad T_{uncovered}.remove(t)$
17: $\quad$ **end if**
18: **end for**

---

the uncovered set (line 8 - 12), as they are the second type of schemas – *super-schemas*. The last type, i.e., *implicit forbidden schemas*, is the toughest one. To remove them, we need to search through each potential schema in the uncovered schemas set (line 14), and judge if it is the implicit forbidden schema (line 16) by constraints checking.

4.3 A case study

With this new framework, when we re-consider the example in Table 2 in section 3.1, we can get the following result listed in Table 3.

Table 3: newly generation-identification life-cycle

Generation					Identification					
t_1	0	0	0	0	Fail						
						t_2*	1	0	0	0	Fail
						t_3*	0	1	0	0	Pass
						t_4*	0	0	1	0	Fail
						t_5*	0	0	0	1	Fail
						MFS: $(-, 0, -, -)$					
t_6	0	1	1	1	Pass						
t_7	0	2	2	2	Pass						
t_8	1	1	1	2	Pass						
t_9	1	1	2	0	Pass						
t_{10}	1	2	0	1	Pass						
t_{11}	2	1	2	1	Pass						
t_{12}	2	1	0	2	Pass						
t_{13}	2	2	1	0	Pass						

This table consists of two main columns, where the left indicates the generation part while the right column indicates the identification process. We can find that after identifying the MFS (-, 0, -, -) for t_1. The following test cases (t_6 to t_{13}) will not contain this schema. Correspondingly, all the 2-degree schemas that are related to this schema, e.g. (0, 0, -, -), (-, 0, 1, -), etc, will also not appear in the following test cases. Additionally, the passing test case t_3 generated in the

identification process cover 6 *2-degree* schemas, i.e., (0, 1, -, -), (0, -, 0, -), (0, -, -, 0), (-, 1, 0, -), (-, 1, -, 0), and (-, -, 0, 0) respectively, so that it is not necessary to generate more test cases to cover them. Above all, when using the interleaving CT approach, the overall generated test case are 8 less than that of the traditional sequential CT approach in Table 2.

Note that this example only lists the condition of a single MFS, under which some *super-schemas* or *themselves* will do not need to be covered. When there are multiple MFS, additional *implicit forbidden* schemas will be computed and set to be covered.

5. EMPIRICAL STUDIES

To evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the interleaving CT approach, we conducted a series of empirical experiments on several open-source software.

5.1 Subject programs

The subject programs used in our experiments are five open-source software as listed in Table 4. Column "Subjects" indicates the specific software. Column "Version" indicates the specific version that are used in the following experiments. Column "LOC" shows the number of source code lines for each software. Column "Faults" presents the fault ID, which is used as the index to fetch the original fault description at each bug tracker for that software. Column "Lan" shows the programming language for each software (Only the main programming language are shown).

Table 4: Subject programs

Subjects	Version	LOC	Faults	Lan
Tomcat	7.0.40	296138	#55905	java
Hsqldb	2.0rc8	139425	#981	Java
Gcc	4.7.2	2231564	#55459	c
Jflex	1.4.1	10040	#87	Java
Tcas	v1	173	#Seed	c

In these software, Tomcat is a web server for java servlet, Hsqldb is a pure-java relational database engine, Gcc is the programming language compiler, Jflex is a lexical analyzer generator, and Tcas is a module of an aircraft collision avoidance system. We select these software as subjects because their behaviours are influenced by various combinations of configuration options or inputs. For example, one component *connector* of Tomcat is influenced by more than 151 attributes [14]. For program Tcas, although with a relatively small size (only 173 lines), it also has 12 parameters with their values ranged from 2 to 10. As a result, the overall input space for Tcas can reach 1036800 [27, 16].

As the target of our empirical studies is to compare the ability of fault defecting between our approach with traditional ones. We firstly must know these faults and their corresponding MFS in prior, such that we can determine whether the schemas identified by those approaches are accurate or not. For this, We looked through the bug tracker forum of each software and focused on the bugs which are caused by the options combination. Then for each such bug, we derive its MFS by analysing the bug description report and the associated test file which can reproduce the bug. For Tcas, as it does not contain any fault for the original source file, we took an mutation version for that file with injected

fault. The mutation was the same as that in [16], which is used as a experimental object for the fault detection studies.

5.1.1 Specific inputs models

To apply CT on the selected software, we need to firstly model their input parameters. As we discussed before, the whole configuration options is extremely large so that we cannot include all of them in our model in consideration of the experimental time and computing resource. Instead, a moderate small set of these configuration options will be selected. It is noted that the options that caused the specific fault in Table 4 will be included as so the test cases generated by CT will detect that fault. Additional options are selected to include some noise for the MFS identification approach. These options are selected by random. The inputs model as well as the corresponding MFS (degree) are listed as Table 5.

Table 5: inputs model

Subjects	Inputs	MFS
Tomcat	$2^8 \times 3^1 \times 4^1$	1(1) 2(2)
Hsqldb	$2^9 \times 3^2 \times 4^1$	3(2)
Gcc	$2^9 \times 6^1$	3(4)
Jflex	$2^{10} \times 3^2 \times 4^1$	2(1)
Tcas	$2^7 \times 3^2 \times 4^1 \times 10^2$	9(16) 10(8) 11(16) 12(8)

In this table, Column "inputs" depicts the input model for each version of the software, presented in the abbreviated form $\#values^{\#number\ of\ parameters} \times ...$, e.g., $2^9 \times 3^2 \times 4^1$ indicates the software has 9 parameters that can take 2 values, 2 parameters can take 3 values, and only one parameter that can take 4 values. Column "MFS" shows the degrees of each MFS and the corresponding number which are listed in the parentheses. The details of the specific options and fault information are posted in .

5.2 Compare with sequential CT

After preparing the subjects software, next we will construct the experiment that can evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of our approach. To this aim, we need to compare our framework with the traditional sequential CT approach to see if interleaving CT approach has any advantage.

The covering array generating algorithm used in the experiment are AETG [3], as it is the most common one-test-case-one-time generation algorithm. And the MFS identifying algorithm is the OFOT [22] as discussed before. The constraints handling solver is a java SAT solver – SAT4j [17].

5.2.1 Study setup

In this experiment, we focus on three coverage criteria, i.e., 2-way , 3-way and 4-way, respectively. It is known that the generated test cases vary for different runs of AETG algorithm. So to avoid the biases of randomness, we conduct each experiment 30 times and then evaluate the results. In other word, for each subject software, we will repeatedly execute traditional approach and our approach 30 times to detect and identify the MFS.

To evaluate the results of the two approaches, one metric is the cost, i.e., the number of test cases that each approach needs. Apart from this, another important metric is the quality of their identified MFS. For this, we used standard metrics: *precise* and *recall*, which are defined as follows:

$$precise = \frac{\#the\ num\ of\ correctly\ identified\ MFS}{\#the\ num\ of\ all\ the\ identified\ schemas}$$

and

$$recall = \frac{\#the\ num\ of\ correctly\ identified\ MFS}{\#the\ num\ of\ all\ the\ real\ MFS}$$

Precise shows the degree of accuracy of the identified schemas when comparing to the real MFS. *Recall* measures how well the real MFS are detected and identified. The combination of them is F-measure, which is

$$F - measure = \frac{2 \times precise \times recall}{precise + recall}$$

5.2.2 Result and discussion

The result is listed in Table 6. In Column 'Method', *ncf* indicates the interleaving CT approach and *fgti* indicates the sequential CT approach. The results of three covering criteria, i.e., 2-way, 3-way, and 4-way are shown in three main columns. In each of them, the overall test cases (size), precise, recall, and f-measure are listed.

One observation from this table is that the overall test cases generated by our approach are far less than that of the traditional approach. In fact, except for subject *tcas*, our approach reduced about dozens of test cases for 2-way coverage, and hundreds of test cases for 3-way and 4-way coverage. For *tcas*, however, as the MFS are hard to detect (all of them have degrees greater than 9), so both approaches nearly do not trigger errors (see the metric *recall*). Under this condition, both the approaches will be transferred to a normal covering array.

As for the quality of the identified MFS, we find that there is no apparent gap between them. For example, there are 9 cases under which our approach performed better than traditional one (marked in bold). But among these cases, the maximal gap are 0.27 (2-way for Tomcat), and the average gap are around 0.1, which is trivial.

The reason of the similarity between the quality of these two approaches is that both of them have advantages and disadvantages. Specifically, our approach can reduce the impacts when a test case contain multiple MFS. Our previous study showed that multiple MFS in a test case can reduce the accurateness of the MFS identifying algorithms [25]. As a result, our approach can improve the quality of the identified schemas. But as a side-effect, if the schemas identified at the early iteration of our approach are not correct, it will significantly impact the following iteration. This is because we will compute the coverage and constraints based on previous identified MFS. It was the other way around for traditional approach. Traditional one suffers from impacts when a test case contain multiple MFS, but correspondingly, previous identified MFS has little influence on the traditional approach.

In summary, our approach needs much less test cases than traditional sequential CT approach, and there is no decline in the quality of the identified MFS when comparing with traditional approach.

5.3 Comparing with Error locating Array

Error locating array[9, 21] is a well-designed set of test cases that can support not only failure detection, but also the identification of the MFS of the failure. It is known that only with a covering array sometimes is not sufficient to identify the MFS, thus additional test cases are needed. Martínez et al.[20] has proved that a $(t + d)$-way covering array can identify all the MFS with the number of them no more than d, and degrees no more than t. After executing all the test cases in the $t + d$-way covering array, the MFS can be obtained by keeping those t-degree or less than t-degree schemas that only appear in the failing test cases in the covering array. So with the number d and degrees t known in prior, a $(t + d)$-way covering array is a *Error Locating Array (ELA)*.

To compare our approach with this CT-based array is meaningful, as both approaches have the same target. The relationship between our approach with the Error locating array can be deemed as the dynamic and static. In detail, our approach dynamically detect and identify the MFS in the SUT, i.e., the test cases generated by our approach are changed according to the specific MFS. On the contrary, ELA just generates a static covering array, and it can support MFS identification if the number and degrees of these schemas are known in prior.

5.3.1 Study setup

As the results of our approach have been already collected in the Section 4.2, this section will just apply ELA to identify the MFS of the 5 subjects in Table 4. It is noted that the conclusion that a $t+d$-way covering array is an ELA is based on that there must exist *safe* values for each parameter of the SUT. A *safe* value is the parameter value that is not any part of these MFS. In our experiment, all the five subject programs satisfies this condition. Based on this, we then applied the ELA to generate appropriate covering arrays for each subject program and recorded the MFS identified as well as the overall test cases generated. The covering array generation algorithm we adopted in this experiment is also AETG [3], and similar as the previous experiment, this experiment is repeated 30 times.

5.3.2 Result and discussion

The overall test cases and the quality of the identified MFS are listed in Table 7. We can firstly observe that this approach needs more test cases than the two approaches discussed before. This is as expected, as this approach needs to generate a higher-way covering array than the previous two approaches. Apart from the high cost, this approach correctly identified all the real MFS. The accuracy has been proved in [20, 21]. Note that this perfect MFS identification result is based on the fact that it knows the number and degree of the MFS, which is usually not available in practice.

Table 7: Results from Error Locating Array

Subject	Size	Precise	Recall	F-measure
Tomcat	210.8	1	1	1
Hsqldb	333.8	1	1	1
Gcc	860.4	1	1	1
Jflex	49.1	1	1	1
Tcas	460800	1	1	1

As both the cost (number of test cases) and the quality of the identified schemas are important in practice. We combine the two metrics (*size* and *f-measure*) into a single one, by dividing *f-measure* by *size*. The normalized result of

Table 6: Compare with traditional approach

Subject	Method	2-way				3-way				4-way			
		Size	Precise	Recall	F-measure	Size	Precise	Recall	F-measure	Size	Precise	Recall	F-measure
Tomcat	ncf	42.53	1	1	**1**	64.67	0.97	0.96	**0.96**	114.23	0.93	0.91	**0.92**
	fglt	114.33	0.73	0.74	0.73	289.97	0.75	1	0.86	676.83	0.75	1	0.86
Hsqldb	ncf	27.3	0.67	0.4	**0.49**	63.07	0.37	0.37	0.37	144.93	0.37	0.37	0.37
	fglt	26.43	0.55	0.3	0.38	80.77	0.5	0.5	0.5	233.13	0.5	0.5	0.5
Gcc	ncf	32.73	0.47	0.28	**0.34**	72.5	0.46	0.37	**0.40**	130.67	0.58	0.48	**0.52**
	fglt	34.17	0.33	0.18	0.23	114.5	0.36	0.43	0.39	243.37	0.33	0.5	0.40
Jflex	ncf	29.97	1	1	1	63.3	1	1	1	159.77	1	1	1
	fglt	48.27	1	1	1	187.93	1	1	1	580.23	1	1	1
Tcas	ncf	108.63	0	0	0	426.77	0.03	0.0007	**0.001**	1638.23	0.07	0.001	**0.0027**
	fglt	109	0	0	0	426.83	0	0	0	1638.57	0.03	0.001	0.0026

this combination metric is shown in Fig.3. In this figure, *ncf* and *fglt* represent interleaving CT approach and traditional sequential CT approach. *Ela* indicates the error locating array approach.


Figure 3: performance comparison

We can learn that *ncf* performs better than *fglt* for all the five subjects. For *ela*, our approach performs better than it for three subjects *Tomcat*, *Hsqldb*, and *Gcc*. The reason that our approach does not perform as well as *ela* at subject *JFlex* is that the MFS for that object is a single 2-degree schema (see Table 5), under which ela just needs a 3-way covering array. For subject *Tcas*, with high-degree MFS as discussed before, our approach is hard to trigger an errors with only *2-way*, *3-way*, and *4-way* covering array. As a result, our approach can hardly identify the MFS. Apart from these two special cases, our approach have a significant advantage over the ELA approach.

To summarize, ELA get the best at the quality of the MFS, but needs much more test cases than our approach. It also needs to know the number and degrees of the MFS in prior, which limits the application of ELA in practice.

5.4 Threats to validity

There are several threats to validity in our empirical studies. First, our experiments are based on only 5 open-source software. More subject programs are desired to make the results more general. In fact, we should conduct comprehensive experiments on the programs with parameters and MFS under control, such that the conclusion of our experiment can reduce the impact caused by specific input space and specific degree or location of the MFS.

Second, many more generation algorithms and MFS identification algorithms are needed. In our empirical studies, we just used the AETG [3] as the test case generation strategy, and OFOT [22] as the MFS identification strategy. As different generation and identification algorithms will significantly affect the performance our proposed CT framework, especially for the number of test cases. More studies for different test cases and MFS identification algorithms are desired to study this impact.

6. RELATED WORKS

Combinatorial testing has been an widely applied in practice [15], especially on domains like configuration testing [28, 8, 26, 11] and software inputs testing [3, 1, 13, 12]. A recent survey [23] comprehensively studied existing works in CT and classified those works into eight categories according to the testing procedure. Based on which, we can learn that test cases generation and MFS identification are two most important key part in CT studies.

Although CT has been proven to be effective at detecting and identifying the interaction failures in SUT, however, to directly applied them in practice can be inefficient and some times even not work at all. Some problems, e.g., constraints of parameters values in SUT [5, 7], masking effects of multiple failures[10, 29], dynamic requirement for the strength of covering array [11], will bring many troubles to CT process. To overcome these problems, some works made efforts to make CT more adaptive and flexible.

JieLi [19] augmented the MFS identifying algorithm by selecting one previous passing test cases for comparison, such that it can reduce some extra test cases when compared to another efficient MFS identifying algorithm [31]. S.Fouché et al., [11] introduced the notion of incremental covering. Different from traditional covering array, it did not need a fixed strength to guide the generation, instead, it can dynamically generate high-degree covering array based on existing low-degree covering array, which can support a flexible tradeoff between covering array strength and testing resources. Cohen [5, 7] studied the impacts of constraints for CT, and proposed an SAT-based approach that can handle those constraints. Bryce and Colbourn [2] proposed an

one-test-case-one-time greedy technique to not only generate test cases to cover all the t-way interactions, but also prioritize them according their importance. E. Dumlu et al., [10] developed a feedback driven combinatorial testing approach that can assist traditional covering in avoiding these masking effects between multiple failures. Yilmaz [29] extended that work by refining the MFS diagnosing method in it. Additionally, Nie [24] constructed an adaptive combinatorial testing framework, which can dynamically adjusted the inputs model, strength t of covering array, and generation strategy during CT process.

Our work differs from them mainly at our work focus on combining two important techniques in CT, i.e., test cases generation and MFS identification, such that the overall cost of CT will be reduced and the identified MFS will be of higher quality.

7. CONCLUSIONS

Combinatorial testing is an effective testing technique at detecting and diagnosis the failure-inducing interactions in the SUT. Traditional CT works separately at test cases generation and MFS identification. In this paper, we proposed a new CT framework, i.e., *interleaving CT*, that integrates these two important testing stages, which allows for both generation and identification better share each other's information. As a result, interleaving CT approach can provide a more efficient testing than traditional sequential CT.

Empirical studies were conducted on five open-source software. The results showed that with our new CT framework, there is a significant reducing on the number of generated test cases when compared to the traditional sequential CT approach, while there is no decline in the quality of the identified MFS. Further, when comparing with the ELA [21, 20], our approach also performed better, especially with fewer test cases.

As a future work, we need to extend our interleaving CT approach with more test case generation and MFS identification algorithms, to see the extent on which our new CT framework can enhance those different CT-based algorithms. Another interesting work is to combine interleaving CT approach with white-box testing techniques, so that it can provide more useful information for developers to debug the system.

8. REFERENCES

[1] M. N. Borazjany, L. Yu, Y. Lei, R. Kacker, and R. Kuhn. Combinatorial testing of acts: A case study. In *Software Testing, Verification and Validation (ICST), 2012 IEEE Fifth International Conference on*, pages 591–600. IEEE, 2012.

[2] R. C. Bryce and C. J. Colbourn. Prioritized interaction testing for pair-wise coverage with seeding and constraints. *Information and Software Technology*, 48(10):960–970, 2006.

[3] D. M. Cohen, S. R. Dalal, M. L. Fredman, and G. C. Patton. The aetg system: An approach to testing based on combinatorial design. *Software Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*, 23(7):437–444, 1997.

[4] M. B. Cohen, C. J. Colbourn, and A. C. Ling. Augmenting simulated annealing to build interaction test suites. In *Software Reliability Engineering, 2003.*

[5] M. B. Cohen, M. B. Dwyer, and J. Shi. Exploiting constraint solving history to construct interaction test suites. In *Testing: Academic and Industrial Conference Practice and Research Techniques-MUTATION, 2007.*, pages 121–132. IEEE, 2007.

[6] M. B. Cohen, M. B. Dwyer, and J. Shi. Interaction testing of highly-configurable systems in the presence of constraints. In *Proceedings of the 2007 international symposium on Software testing and analysis*, pages 129–139. ACM, 2007.

[7] M. B. Cohen, M. B. Dwyer, and J. Shi. Constructing interaction test suites for highly-configurable systems in the presence of constraints: A greedy approach. *Software Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*, 34(5):633–650, 2008.

[8] M. B. Cohen, J. Snyder, and G. Rothermel. Testing across configurations: implications for combinatorial testing. *ACM SIGSOFT Software Engineering Notes*, 31(6):1–9, 2006.

[9] C. J. Colbourn and D. W. McClary. Locating and detecting arrays for interaction faults. *Journal of combinatorial optimization*, 15(1):17–48, 2008.

[10] E. Dumlu, C. Yilmaz, M. B. Cohen, and A. Porter. Feedback driven adaptive combinatorial testing. In *Proceedings of the 2011 International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*, pages 243–253. ACM, 2011.

[11] S. Fouché, M. B. Cohen, and A. Porter. Incremental covering array failure characterization in large configuration spaces. In *Proceedings of the eighteenth international symposium on Software testing and analysis*, pages 177–188. ACM, 2009.

[12] B. Garn and D. E. Simos. Eris: A tool for combinatorial testing of the linux system call interface. In *Software Testing, Verification and Validation Workshops (ICSTW), 2014 IEEE Seventh International Conference on*, pages 58–67. IEEE, 2014.

[13] L. S. G. Ghandehari, M. N. Bourazjany, Y. Lei, R. N. Kacker, and D. R. Kuhn. Applying combinatorial testing to the siemens suite. In *Software Testing, Verification and Validation Workshops (ICSTW), 2013 IEEE Sixth International Conference on*, pages 362–371. IEEE, 2013.

[14] K. Kolinko. The HTTP Connector. `http://tomcat.apache.org/tomcat-7.0-doc/config/http.html`, 2014. [Online; accessed 3-Nov-2014].

[15] D. R. Kuhn, R. N. Kacker, and Y. Lei. Practical combinatorial testing. *NIST Special Publication*, 800:142, 2010.

[16] D. R. Kuhn and V. Okun. Pseudo-exhaustive testing for software. In *Software Engineering Workshop, 2006. SEW'06. 30th Annual IEEE/NASA*, pages 153–158. IEEE, 2006.

[17] D. Le Berre, A. Parrain, et al. The sat4j library, release 2.2, system description. *Journal on Satisfiability, Boolean Modeling and Computation*, 7:59–64, 2010.

[18] Y. Lei, R. Kacker, D. R. Kuhn, V. Okun, and J. Lawrence. Ipog/ipog-d: efficient test generation for multi-way combinatorial testing. *Software Testing,*

Verification and Reliability, 18(3):125–148, 2008.

[19] J. Li, C. Nie, and Y. Lei. Improved delta debugging based on combinatorial testing. In *Quality Software (QSIC), 2012 12th International Conference on*, pages 102–105. IEEE, 2012.

[20] C. Martínez, L. Moura, D. Panario, and B. Stevens. Algorithms to locate errors using covering arrays. In *LATIN 2008: Theoretical Informatics*, pages 504–519. Springer, 2008.

[21] C. Martínez, L. Moura, D. Panario, and B. Stevens. Locating errors using elas, covering arrays, and adaptive testing algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 23(4):1776–1799, 2009.

[22] C. Nie and H. Leung. The minimal failure-causing schema of combinatorial testing. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM)*, 20(4):15, 2011.

[23] C. Nie and H. Leung. A survey of combinatorial testing. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 43(2):11, 2011.

[24] C. Nie, H. Leung, and K.-Y. Cai. Adaptive combinatorial testing. In *Quality Software (QSIC), 2013 13th International Conference on*, pages 284–287. IEEE, 2013.

[25] X. Niu, C. Nie, Y. Lei, and A. T. Chan. Identifying failure-inducing combinations using tuple relationship. In *Software Testing, Verification and Validation Workshops (ICSTW), 2013 IEEE Sixth International Conference on*, pages 271–280. IEEE, 2013.

[26] X. Qu, M. B. Cohen, and G. Rothermel. Configuration-aware regression testing: an empirical study of sampling and prioritization. In *Proceedings of the 2008 international symposium on Software testing and analysis*, pages 75–86. ACM, 2008.

[27] K. Shakya, T. Xie, N. Li, Y. Lei, R. Kacker, and R. Kuhn. Isolating failure-inducing combinations in combinatorial testing using test augmentation and classification. In *Software Testing, Verification and Validation (ICST), 2012 IEEE Fifth International Conference on*, pages 620–623. IEEE, 2012.

[28] C. Yilmaz, M. B. Cohen, and A. A. Porter. Covering arrays for efficient fault characterization in complex configuration spaces. *Software Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*, 32(1):20–34, 2006.

[29] C. Yilmaz, E. Dumlu, M. Cohen, and A. Porter. Reducing masking effects in combinatorialinteraction testing: A feedback drivenadaptive approach. *Software Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*, 40(1):43–66, Jan 2014.

[30] S. Yoo, M. Harman, and D. Clark. Fault localization prioritization: Comparing information-theoretic and coverage-based approaches. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM)*, 22(3):19, 2013.

[31] Z. Zhang and J. Zhang. Characterizing failure-causing parameter interactions by adaptive testing. In *Proceedings of the 2011 International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*, pages 331–341. ACM, 2011.