

# Identify failure-inducing combinations for multiple faults\*

Xintao Niu  
State Key Laboratory for Novel Software  
Technology  
Nanjing University  
China, 210023  
niuxintao@smail.nju.edu.cn

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

## ABSTRACT

Combinatorial testing(CT) is proven to be effective to reveal the potential failures caused by the interaction of the inputs or options of the system under test(SUT). A key problem in CT is to isolate the failure-inducing interactions of the related failure as it can facilitate the debugging effort by reducing the scope of code that needs to be inspected. Many algorithms has been proposed to identify the failure-inducing interactions, however, most of these studies either just consider the condition of one fault or ignore masking effects among multiple faults which can bias their identified results. In this paper, we analysed how the masking effect of multiple faults affect on the isolation of failure-inducing interactions. We further give a strategy of selecting test cases to alleviate this impact. The key to the strategy is to prune these test cases that may trigger masking effect and generate no-masking-effect ones to test the interactions supposed to be tested in these pruned test cases. The test-case selecting process repeated until we get enough information to isolate the failure-inducing interactions. We conducted some empirical studies on several open-source GNU software. The result of the studies shows that multiple faults do exist in real software and our approach can assist combinatorial-based failure-inducing identifying methods to get a better result when handling multiple faults in SUT.

## Categories and Subject Descriptors

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

\*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.

## General Terms

Reliability, Verification

## Keywords

Software Testing, Combinatorial Testing, failure-inducing combinations, Masking effects

## 1. INTRODUCTION

With the increasing complexity and size of modern software, many factors, such as input parameters and configuration options, can influence the behaviour of the system under test(SUT). The unexpected faults caused by the interaction among these factors can make testing such software a big challenge if the interaction space is too large. One remedy for this problem is combinatorial testing, which systematically sample the interaction space and select a relatively small size of test cases that cover all the valid iterations with the number of factors involved in the interaction no more than a prior fixed integer, i.e., the *strength* of the interaction.

Once failures are detected, it is desired to isolate the failure-inducing interactions in these failing test cases. This task is important in CT as it can facilitate the debugging effort by reducing the code scope that needed to be inspected. Many algorithms has been proposed to identify the failure-inducing interactions in SUT, which include approaches such as building classification tree model [17], generating one test case one time [12], ranking suspicious interactions based on prior rules[8], using graphic-based deduction [10] and so on. These approaches can be partitioned into two categories [5]: *adaptive*—tests cases are chosen based on the outcomes of the executions of prior tests or *nonadaptive*—test cases are chosen independent and can be executed parallel.

While all these approaches can help developers to isolate the failure-inducing factors in failing test cases, in our recently studies on several open-source software, however, we found these approaches suffered from *masking effects* of multiple faults in SUT. A masking effect [6, 18] is an effect that some failures prevents test cases from normally checking combinations that are supposed to be tested. Take the Linux command—*Grep* for example, we noticed that there are two different faults reported in the bug tracker system. The first one <sup>1</sup> claims that Grep incorrectly match unicode patterns with '`<>`', while the second one <sup>2</sup> claims a incompatibility between option '`-c`' and '`-o`'. When we put this two

<sup>1</sup><http://savannah.gnu.org/bugs/?29537>

<sup>2</sup><http://savannah.gnu.org/bugs/?33080>

scenario into one test case only one fault information will be observed, which means another fault is masked by the observed one. This effect was firstly introduced by Dumllu and Yilmaz in [6], in which they found that the masking effects in CT can make traditional covering array failed detecting some combinations and they proposed an approach to work around them. Their recent work [18] further empirically studied the impacts on the failure-inducing combinations identifying approach (FCI approach for short): classification tree approach (CTA for short) [17], of which CTA has two versions, i.e., ternary-class and multiple-class.

As known that masking effects negatively affect the performance of FCI approaches, a natural question is how do this effect bias the results of FCI approaches so that they cannot get the results as accuracy as expected. In this paper, we formalized the process of identifying failure-inducing combinations under the circumstance that masking effects exist in SUT and try to answer this question. One insight from the formalized analysis is that we cannot completely get away from the impact of the masking effect even if we do exhaustive testing. Furthermore, both ignoring the masking effects and regarding multiple faults as one fault is harmful for FCI process.

Based on the insight we proposed a strategy to alleviate this impact. This strategy adopts the divide and conquer framework, i.e., separately handle each fault in SUT. For a particular fault under analysis, we discard the test cases that trigger faults different from the one under analysis and only keep those that either pass or trigger the expected fault. As the test cases discarding manipulation can make FCI approaches lose some information that needed to make them normally work, we will generate additional test cases to compensate for the loss. It is noted that the additional test cases generating criteria vary in different FCI approaches we chose. For example, for the CTA, we will generate more test cases to keep as the same coverage as possible after we deleting some unsatisfied test cases from original covering array. While for the one fact one time approach (OFOT for short), we will repeat generating test case until we find a test case can test the fixed part as well as not trigger unsatisfied fault or until a prior ending criteria is met.

To evaluate the performance of our strategy, we applied our strategy on three FCI approaches, which are CTA [17], OFOT [12], FIC [20] respectively. The subjects we used are several open-source software with the developers' forum in Source-forge net. Through studying their bug reports in the bug tracker system as well as their user's manual guide, we built the testing model which can reproduce the reported bugs with specific test cases. We then applied the traditional FCI approaches and their variation augmented with our strategy to identify the failure-inducing combinations in the subjects respectively. The results of our empirical studies shows that approaches augmented with our strategy identified failure-inducing combinations more accurately than traditional ones, which indicates that our strategy do assist FCI approaches to behave better under the circumstances that masking effects exist in the SUT.

The main contributions of this paper are:

1. We formally studied the impact on the isolation of the failure-inducing interactions when the SUT contain multiple faults which can mask each other.
2. We proposed a divide and conquer strategy of selecting

```
public float foo(int a, int b, int c, int d){
//step 1 will cause a exception when b == c
float x = (float)a / (b - c);

//step 2 will cause a exception when c < d
float y = Math.sqrt(c - d);

return x+y;
}
```

Figure 1: a toy program with four input parameters

test cases to alleviate the impact of masking effect.

3. We empirically studies our strategy and find that our approach can get a better result.

## 2. MOTIVATION EXAMPLE

This section constructed a small program example for convenience to illustrate the motivation of our approach. Assume we have a method *foo* which has four input parameters : *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*. The types of these four parameters are all integers and the values that they can take are:  $v_a = \{7, 11\}$ ,  $v_b = \{2, 4, 5\}$ ,  $v_c = \{4, 6\}$ ,  $v_d = \{3, 5\}$  respectively. The detail code of this method is listed in figure 1.

Inspecting the simple code above, we can find two faults: First, in the step 1 we can get a *ArithmeticException* when *b* is equal to *c*, i.e.,  $b = 4$  &  $c = 4$ , that makes division by zero. Second, another *ArithmeticException* will be triggered in step 2 when  $c < d$ , i.e.,  $c = 4$  &  $d = 5$ , which makes square roots of negative numbers. So the expected MFSs in this example should be  $(-, 4, 4, -)$  and  $(-, -, 4, 5)$ .

Traditional FCI algorithms do not consider the detail of the code. They take black-box testing of this program, i.e., feed inputs to those programs and execute them to observe the result. The basic justification behind those approaches is that the failure-inducing combinations for a particular fault must only appear in those inputs that trigger this fault. As traditional FCI approaches aim at using as small number of inputs as possible to get the same or approximate result as exhaustive testing, so the results derive from a exhaustive testing set must be the best that these FCI approaches can reach. Next we will illustrate how exhaustive testing works on identifying the failure-inducing combinations in the program.

We first generated every possible inputs as listed in the Column "test inputs" of Table 1, and the execution result of are listed in Column "result" of Table 1. In this Column, *PASS* means that the program runs without any exception under the inputs in the same row. *Ex 1* indicates that the program triggered a exception corresponding to the step 1 and *Ex 2* indicates the program triggered a exception corresponding to the step 2. According to data listed in table 1, we can deduce that that  $(-, 4, 4, -)$  must be the failure-inducing combination of Ex 1 as all the inputs triggered Ex 1 contain this schema. Similarly, the combination  $(-, 2, 4, 5)$  and  $(-, 3, 4, 5)$  must be the failure-inducing combinations of the Ex 2. We listed this three combinations and its corresponding exception in Table 2.

Note that we didn't get the expected result with traditional FCI approaches in this case. The failure-inducing

**Table 1: test inputs and their corresponding result**

id	test inputs	result	id	test inputs	result
1	(7, 2, 4, 3)	PASS	13	(11, 2, 4, 3)	PASS
2	(7, 2, 4, 5)	Ex 2	14	(11, 2, 4, 5)	Ex 2
3	(7, 2, 6, 3)	PASS	15	(11, 2, 6, 3)	PASS
4	(7, 2, 6, 5)	PASS	16	(11, 2, 6, 5)	PASS
5	(7, 4, 4, 3)	Ex 1	17	(11, 4, 4, 3)	Ex 1
6	(7, 4, 4, 5)	Ex 1	18	(11, 4, 4, 5)	Ex 1
7	(7, 4, 6, 3)	PASS	19	(11, 4, 6, 3)	PASS
8	(7, 4, 6, 5)	PASS	20	(11, 4, 6, 5)	PASS
9	(7, 5, 4, 3)	PASS	21	(11, 5, 4, 3)	PASS
10	(7, 5, 4, 5)	Ex 2	22	(11, 5, 4, 5)	Ex 2
11	(7, 5, 6, 3)	PASS	23	(11, 5, 6, 3)	PASS
12	(7, 5, 6, 5)	PASS	24	(11, 5, 6, 5)	PASS

**Table 2: Identified failure-inducing combinations and their corresponding Exception**

failure-inducing combinations	Exception
(-, 4, 4, -)	Ex 1
(-, 2, 4, 5)	Ex 2
(-, 3, 4, 5)	Ex 2

combinations we get for Ex 2 are (-,2,4,5) and (-,3,4,5) respectively instead of the expected combination (-, -,4,5). So why we failed getting the (-, -,4,5)? The reason lies in *input 6*: (7,4,4,5) and *input 18*: (11,4,4,5). This two inputs contain the combination (-, -,4,5), but didn't trigger the Ex 2, instead, Ex 1 was triggered.

Now let us get back to the source code of *foo*, we can find that if Ex 1 is triggered, it will stop executing the remaining code and report the exception information. In another word, Ex 1 have a higher faulting level than Ex 2 so that Ex 1 may mask Ex 2. Let us re-exam the combination (-, -,4,5): if we supposed that *input 6* and *input 18* should trigger Ex 2 if they didn't trigger Ex 1, then we can conclude that (-, -,4,5) should be the failure-inducing combination of the Ex 2, which is identical to the expected one.

However, we cannot validate the supposition, i.e., *input 6* and *input 18* should trigger Ex 2 if they didn't trigger Ex 1, unless we have fixed the code that trigger Ex 1 and then re-executed all the test cases. So in practice, when we do not have enough resource to re-execute all the test cases again and again or can only take black-box testing, the more economic and efficient approach to alleviate the masking effect on FCI approaches is desired.

### 3. FORMAL MODEL

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 (software under test) 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 [13].

**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 under 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.

Figuring out the test case as well as the executing result is usually not enough to analyse the source of the bug, especially when there are too many parameters we need to care in this test case. In this circumstance, we need to study some subsets of this test case, so we need the following definition:

**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  $k$  is equal to  $n$ . Furthermore, if a test case contain a *combination*, i.e., every fixed value in this combination is also in this test case, we say this test case *hit* this *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  $(-, 4, 4, 5)$ .

**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 will call the combination  $c$  the *minimal faulty combination* for  $F$ .

In fact, *minimal faulty combinations* is identical to the failure-inducing combinations we discussed previously. Figuring it out can eliminate all details that are irrelevant for producing the failure, which can facilitate the debugging effort.

We have the following proposition based on these basic definitions.

**PROPOSITION 1.** Let  $c_m$  be a  $m$ -value combination, the set  $P_{c_m}(m+l) = \{c_m + l : c_m \prec c_m + l\}$  be all the  $m+l$  value parent combination of  $c_m$ . Moreover, we denote all the test cases can hit the combination  $c_m$  as  $T(c_m)$ , then we have the following formula:

$$T(c_m) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{|P_{c_m}(m+l)|} T(c_{(m+l)_i}).$$

The proof of this propositions is obvious, we just take an example to illustrate this. For SUT(2,2,2), the  $T((1, -, -)) = \{(1, 0, 0), (1, 0, 1), (1, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1)\} = T((1, 0, -)) \cup T((1, 1, -)) \cup T((1, -, 0)) \cup T((1, -, 1))$ . Additional, some test cases of

these parent-combinations may overlapped each other, for example,  $T((1,0,-))$  overlap with  $T((1,-,1))$  at the test case  $(1,0,1)$ .

By definition, if all the test cases in  $T(c_m)$  are failing test cases with the same fault, say,  $F_m$ , then combination  $c_m$  is the failure-inducing combination of  $F_m$ . However, if some test cases in  $T(c_m)$  does not trigger  $F_m$ , then we can get the following proposition.

**PROPOSITION 2.** *For a combination  $c_m$ , if all the test cases triggered fault  $F_m$ , denoted as  $T_{F_m}$ , is the subset of  $T(c_m)$ , i.e.,  $T_{F_m} \subsetneq T(c_m)$ , then the failure-inducing combinations for  $F_m$  must be some parent-combinations of  $c_m$ , i.e.,  $\{c_{m+l_i}\} (l \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-m\}; i \in \{1, 2, \dots, |P_{c_m}(m+l)|\})$ .*

**PROOF.** To proof this proposition, we must proof that there must exist at least one parent combination  $c_{m+l}$ , that satisfy:

$$1. T(c_{m+l}) \subset T_{F_m}$$

$$2. \forall c_{m+l-h} \prec c_{m+l}, \text{ s.t. } T(c_{m+l-h}) \not\subset T_{F_m}$$

We proof this proposition by two steps:

First, we proof that there must exist some parent-combination  $c_{m+l}$  satisfy the first formula. Let me divide the  $T(c_m)$  to pieces of  $T(c_{n_i})$ . Each set of  $T(c_{n_i})$  just have one element, that is  $c_{n_i}$  itself as a test case. Obviously, these set do not overlap with each other. Take an example,  $T((1, -, -)) = \{(1, 0, 0), (1, 0, 1), (1, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1)\} = T((1, 0, 0)) \cup T((1, 0, 1)) \cup T((1, 1, 0)) \cup T((1, 1, 1))$ .

As  $T_{F_m} \subsetneq T(c_m)$ , which means that at least one test case in  $T(c_m)$  trigger the fault  $F_m$ , and it must be one of  $T(c_{n_i})$ . So at least there exist one combination  $c_{n_i}$  which can satisfy the first formula.

Next, we proof that there must be at least one parent-combination  $c_{m+l}$  simultaneity satisfied this two formula. We proof by contradiction.

Assume that all the  $c_{m+l}$  satisfy the first formula, don't satisfy the second formula. For a particular  $c_{m+l}$ , then at least one child combination  $c_{m+l-h}$  must satisfy  $T(c_{m+l-h}) \subset T_{F_m}$ , ( $h > 0$ ). Furthermore, it must have  $c_m \prec c_{m+l-h}$ , for  $T(c_{m+l-h}) \subset T_{F_m} \subset T(c_m)$ , which indicate that all the test cases contain  $c_{m+l-h}$  must contain  $c_m$ .

Then as  $c_m \prec c_{m+l-h}$  and  $T(c_{m+l-h}) \subset T_{F_m}$ , similarly, there must exist  $c_m \prec c_{m+l-h-h_1}$  s.t.  $T(c_{m+l-h-h_1}) \subset T_{F_m}$ ,  $c_m \prec c_{m+l-h-h_1-h_2}$  s.t.  $T(c_{m+l-h-h_1-h_2}) \subset T_{F_m}$ ....

At last we can get  $c_m \prec c_m$  and  $T(c_m) \subset T_{F_m}$ . In this circumstance,  $c_m$  is identical to the original one. As in fact  $T_{F_m} \subsetneq T(c_m)$  which contradict  $T(c_m) \subset T_{F_m}$ , so the assumption is invalid, which indicate there must exist at least one parent combination of  $c_m$  simultaneity satisfied this two formula.

□

However, if  $T_{F_m} \not\subset T(c_m)$ , This proposition will not hold. In this circumstance, there are three possibilities of the failure-inducing combinations:

1. if  $T(c_m) \subset T_{F_m}$ , the the failure-inducing combinations must be the child combinations of  $c_m$  by definition. Or.

2. if  $T(c_m) \not\subset T_{F_m}$ , which can also divide into two possibilities:

2.1 if  $T(c_m) \cap T_{F_m} = \emptyset$ , which means that  $c_m$  is the health combination. We cannot get any information of failure-inducing combinations. In this circumstance, neither its

parent and child combinations is the failure-inducing combinations, we call  $c_m$  is irrelevant to the failure-inducing combinations.

2.2 if  $T(c_m) \cap T_{F_m} \neq \emptyset$ . In this time we can still have the conclusion that, some parent-combination  $c_{m+l}$  satisfy the following formula

$$T(c_{m+l}) \subset T_{F_m}$$

However, it do not hold the next formula, the key is that we can not get the following deduction:  $T(c_{m+l-h}) \subset T_{F_m} \subset T(c_m)$ . So in this time, if this formula holds, 2.2.1 we can learn that some failure-inducing combination must be the parent combinations which proofed in the second proposition.

2.2.2 If not, then the failure-inducing combination must not be the parent combination of  $c_m$ , and obviously, they will not also be the child combinations of  $c_m$ , as  $T(c_m) \not\subset T_{F_m}$ , so in this circumstance, we can also have  $c_m$  is irrelevant to failure-inducing combinations.

Based on this proposition, we can easily get the following lemma:

**LEMMA 1.** *For two set of test cases  $T_l$  and  $T_k$ , assume that  $T_l \subset T_k$ . Suppose SUT has a fault  $F$ . Now first let all the test cases that trigger  $F$  to be the set  $T_k$ , the failure-inducing combinations for  $F$  is the set  $C_k = \{c_k\}$ . Then let all the test cases that trigger  $F$  to be  $T_l$ , which we get another set failure-inducing combinations  $C_l = \{c_l\}$ . Then we can deduce that  $C_l$  and  $C_k$  satisfy at least one of the following properties:*

- 1)  $\exists c_k \in C_k$  and  $\exists c_l \in C_l$  s.t.  $c_l$  subsumes  $c_k$
- 2)  $\exists c_k \in C_k$  s.t.  $c_k$  is irrelevant to  $C_l$

**PROOF.** Easily we can get that  $\bigcup T(c_k) = T_k$  and  $\bigcup T(c_l) = T_l$ . As  $T_l \subset T_k$ . So there exist  $T(c_l) \subset T_k$ . If  $T_k = T(c_k)$ . Then the failure-inducing combinations of  $c_l$  must be the parent-combinations of  $c_k$  which proofed in the previous section.

For multiple,  $T(c_{k_i}) \cap (\bigcup T(c_{k_i})) \neq \emptyset$ . So in this time there are several circumstances: if there exist  $T_l \subset T(c_k)$ , the conclusion holds.

do there exist  $T(c_k) \subset T_l$  ? it is not hold, for that

□

. We illustrate this two scenarios in table 3. There are two parts in this table, in which the left part shows the case that the failure-inducing combinations satisfy the first properties (both  $(0,0,-)$  and  $(0,1,0)$  subsume  $(0,-,-)$ ). While the right part give an example to the second properties, as  $(1,-,-)$  is irrelevant to any one of  $(0,0,-)$  and  $(0,1,0)$ .

Next, let move to formal analysis of the masking effects.

### 3.2 masking effect

**Definition 5.** A *masking effect* is the effect that a test case  $t$  hit a failure-inducing combination for  $F_a$ , say  $c$ , but doesn't trigger fault  $F_a$  as expected because this test case triggered other fault which is different from  $F_a$ , say,  $F_b$ .

based on this definition, we can learn that, to get the accurate result, we should take consider these test cases do not trigger some specific fault because it trigger other faults. We call these test cases  $T_{mask(F_m)}$  for a particular fault  $F_m$  masked by these test cases.

**Table 3: example of two scenarios**

		$T_l$	$T_k$
$T_l$	$T_k$		
(0, 0, 0)	(0, 0, 0)	(0, 0, 0)	(0, 0, 0)
(0, 0, 1)	(0, 0, 1)	(0, 0, 1)	(0, 0, 1)
(0, 1, 0)	(0, 1, 0)	(0, 1, 0)	(0, 1, 0)
	(0, 1, 1)		(1, 0, 0)
			(1, 0, 1)
			(1, 1, 0)
			(1, 1, 1)
$C_l$	$C_k$	$C_l$	$C_k$
(0, 0, -)	(0, -, -)	(0, 0, -)	(0, 0, -)
(0, 1, 0)		(0, 1, 0)	(0, 1, 0)
			(1, -, -)

So in fact, the failure-inducing combination for  $F_m$  should be the combination which have the test cases  $T_{F_m} \cup T_{mask(F_m)}$ . We call the failure-inducing combinations with considering the masking effects the *perfect failure-inducing combinations*. However, this is not possible in practice, unless we fix some bugs in the SUT and re-execute the test cases to figure out  $T_{mask(F_m)}$ .

For traditional FCI approaches, there are two kinds of approaches, let me see what they like:

### 3.2.1 regard as one fault

This is the most common dealing approach, they don't distinguish the faults, i.e., regard all the types of faults as one fault-failure, others as the pass.

So they will find the  $c_m$  for  $T_F = \bigcup_{i=1}^L F_i$ ,  $L$  is the number of all the faults in the SUT. Obviously,  $T_{F_m} \cup T_{mask(F_m)} \subset T_F$ . So in this circumstance, by the proposed lemma, the failure-inducing combinations we get will have some combinations irrelevant to the perfect failure-inducing combinations, or some combinations just be the child-combinations of some of the perfect failure-inducing combinations.

Suppose we take this strategy in the motivation example. then.

### 3.2.2 distinguish fault by buggy information

Distinguish the faults by the exception traces or error code can help make FCI approaches focus on particular fault. Yilmaz in [18] propose a *multiple-class* failure characterize method instead of *ternary-class* approaches to make the charactering approach more accurately. Besides, other approaches can also be easily extended to apply on SUT with multiple faults. We call this approach *distinguish FCI* approaches.

Without no information of the masking effect, distinguish FCI approaches can only identify the  $c_m$  for  $T_{F_m}$ . In this case, we can learn that  $T_{F_m} \cup T_{mask(F_m)} \supset T_{F_m}$ , consequently, the failure-inducing combinations we get in this case will have some combinations be the parent-combination of some perfect combinations or completely miss some failure-inducing combination.

It is noted that, the motivation example list the approach which adopt this strategy, and we can easily see that do make failure-combinations bigger.

## 3.3 summary of formal model

Note that our discuss is based on the SUT is a deterministic software, i.e., the random failing information of test case will be ignored. The non-deterministic problem will com-

plex our test scenario, which will not be discussed in this paper.

## 4. TEST CASE REPLACING STRATEGY

Previous section formally studied the case that under the masking effects, neither regarding as one fault approach nor distinguishing faults approach is not accurate. The main reason is that we cannot figure out the  $T(mask_{F_m})$ . As  $T(mask_{F_m}) \subset \bigcup_{i=1 \& j \neq m}^L T_{F_i}$ . So to reduce the influence of  $T(mask_{F_m})$ , we need to reduce the number of test cases that trigger other faults as much as possible.

In the exhaustive testing, as all the test cases will be used to identify the failure-inducing combinations, so there is no room left to improve the accurateness. However, when just choose part of the whole test cases, which is practical and sometimes the only solution for large-scale SUT, we can adjust the test cases we need to use by choosing proper ones so that we can limit the number of  $T(mask_{F_m})$  to be as less as possible.

### 4.1 Replace test configuration that trigger unexpected fault

The basic idea is to discard the test configurations that trigger other faults and generate other test configurations to represent them. These regenerate test configurations should either pass the executing or trigger  $F_i$ . The replacement must fulfil some criteria, such as for CTA, the input for this algorithm is a covering array, and if we replace some test configuration in it, we should ensure that the covering rate is not changed.

Commonly, when we replace the test configuration that trigger unexpected fault with a new test configuration, we should keep some part in the original test configuration, we call this part as *fixed part*, and mutant other part with different values from the original one. For example, if a test configuration (1,1,1,1) triggered Err 2, which is not the expected Err 1, and the fixed part is (-,-,1,1), then we may regenerate a test configuration (0,0,1,1) which will pass or trigger Err 1.

The *fixed part* can be the schemas that only appear in the original test configuration which other test configurations in the covering array did not contain (for the algorithm take covering array as the input: CTA), or the factors that should not be changed in the OFOT algorithms, or the part that should not be mutant of the test configuration in the last iteration(FIC\_BS).

The process of replace a test configuration with a new one with keeping some fixed part is depicted in Algorithm 1:

The inputs for this algorithm consists of a test configuration which trigger an unexpected fault -  $t_{original}$ , the fixed part which we want to keep from the original test configuration -  $s_{fixed}$ , the fault type which we current focus -  $F_i$ . And the values sets that each option can take from respectively. The output of this algorithm is a test configuration  $t_{new}$  which either trigger the expected  $F_i$  or passed.

In fact, this algorithm is a big loop(line 1 - 14) which be parted into two parts:

The first part(line 2 - line 7): generate a new test configuration which is different from the original one. This test configuration will keep the fixed part (line 7), and just mutant these factors are not in the fixed part(line 2). The mutant for each factor is just choose one legal value that

**Algorithm 1** replace test configurations that trigger unexpected fault

**Input:**  $t_{original}$   $\triangleright$  original test configurations  
 $F_i$   $\triangleright$  fault type  
 $s_{fixed}$   $\triangleright$  fixed part  
 $Param$   $\triangleright$  values that each option can take  
**Output:**  $t_{new}$   $\triangleright$  the regenerate test configuration

```

1: while not MeetEndCriteria() do
2:    $s_{mutant} \leftarrow t_{original} - s_{fixed}$ 
3:   for each  $opt \in s_{mutant}$  do
4:      $i = \text{getIndex}(Param, opt)$ 
5:      $opt' \leftarrow opt' \text{ s.t. } o \in Param[i] \text{ and } opt' \neq opt$ 
6:   end for
7:    $t_{new} \leftarrow s_{fixed} \cup s_{mutant}$ 
8:    $result \leftarrow \text{execute}(t_{new})$ 
9:   if  $result == PASS$  or  $result == F_i$  then
10:    return  $t_{new}$ 
11:   else
12:     continue
13:   end if
14: end while
15: return null

```

is different from the original one(line 3 - 6). The choosing process is just by random and the generated test configuration must be different each iteration(can be implemented by hashing method).

Second part is to validate whether this newly generated test configuration matches our expect(line 8 - lone 13). First we will execute the SUT under the newly generated test configuration(line 8), and then check the executed result, either passed or trigger the expected fault –  $F_i$  will match our expect.(line 9) If so we will directly return this test configuration(line 10). Otherwise, we will repeat the process(generate newly test configuration and check)(line 11 -12).

It is noted that the loop have another end exit besides we have find a expected test configuration(line 10), which is when function *MeetEndCriteria()* return a true value(line 1). We didn't explicitly show what the function *MeetEndCriteria()* is like, because this is depending the computing resource you own and the how accurate you want to the identifying result to be. In detail, if you want to your identify process be more accurate and you have enough computing resource, you can try much times to get the expected test configuration, otherwise, you may just try a relatively small times to get the expected test configuration.

In this paper, we just set 3 as the biggest repeat times for function. When it ended with *MeetEndCriteria()* is true, we will return null(line 15), which means we cannot find a expected test configuration.

## 4.2 Examples of applying the strategy

Assume we have test a system with four parameters, each has three options. And we take the test configuration (0 0 0 0) we find the system encounter a failure called "Err 1". Next we will take the MFS identifying algorithms – OFOT with the help of our approach to identify the MFS for the "Err 1". The process is listed in table 4. In this table, The test configuration which are labeled with a deleted line represent the original test configuration generated by OFOT, and it will be replaced by the regenerated test configuration which are labeled with a wave line under it.

**Table 4: Identifying MFS using OFOT with our approach**

original test configuration				fault info
0	0	0	0	Err 1
gen test configurations				result
1	0	0	0	Err 1
<del>0</del>	<del>1</del>	<del>0</del>	<del>0</del>	<del>Err 2</del>
<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	Err 1
0	0	1	0	Pass
0	0	0	1	Pass
original identified:		identified with re- placement		
(- 0 0 0)		(- - 0 0)		

From this table, we can find the algorithm mutant one factor to take the different value from the original test configuration on time. Originally if the test configuration encounter the different condition with the Err 1, OFOT will make a judgement that the MFS was broken, in another word, if we change one factor and it does not trigger the same fault, we will label them as one failure-inducing factor, after we changed all the elements, we will get the failure-inducing schemas. For this case, as when we change the second factor, third factor and the fourth factor, it doesn't trigger the Err 1 ( for second factor, it trigger Err 2 and for the third and fourth, it passed). So if we do not regenerate the test configuration (0 2 0 0), we will get the MFS – (- 0 0 0) for the err 1(which are also labeled with a delete line).

However, if we replace the test configuration (0 1 0 0) with (0 2 0 0) which triggered err 1 (in this case, the fixed part of the test configuration is (0, - - -)), we will find that only when we change the third and fourth factor will we broke the MFS for err 1, so with our approach, we will find the MFS for err 1 should be (- - 0 0) (labeled with a wave line under it).

## 5. EMPIRICAL STUDIES

We conducted several case studies to address the following questions:

**Q1:** Do masking effects existed in real software when it contain multiple faults?

**Q2:** How much do traditional approaches suffer from these real masking effects?

**Q3:** Can our approach do better than traditional approaches when facing these masking effects?

Specifically, section 6.1 surveyed several open-source software to gain a insight of the existence of multiple faults and their masking effects. Section 6.2 directly applied three MFS-identifying programs on the surveyed software and analysis their results. Section 6.3 applied our approach on the software and a comparison with traditional approaches will be discussed. Section 6.4 discuss the threats to validity of our empirical studies.

### 5.1 study 1: multiple faults and masking effects in practice

In the first study, we surveyed two open-source software to gain an insight of the existence of multiple faults and their

**Table 5: Software under survey**

software	versions	LOC	classes	bug pairs <sup>3</sup>
HSQLDB	2.0rc8	139425	495	#981 & #1005
	2.2.5	156066	508	#1173 & #1179
	2.2.9	162784	525	#1286 & #1280
JFlex	1.4.1	10040	58	#87 & #80
	1.4.2	10745	61	#98 & #93

effects. The software under study are: HSQLDB and JFlex, in which the former is a database management software written in pure java and the later one is a lexical analyser generator for Java. Each of them contain different versions. All the two subjects are highly configurable so that the options and their combination can influence their behaviour. Additionally, they all have developers' community so that we can easily get the real bugs reported in the bug tracker forum. Table 5 lists the program, the number of versions we surveyed, number of lines of uncommented code, number of classes in the project and the bug's id of each software we studied.

### 5.1.1 study setup

We first looked through the bug tracker forum of each software and scratched some bugs which are caused by the options combination to study later. We then classify these bugs according to the version they belong to. For each bug, we will derive its failure-inducing combinations by analysing the bug description report and its attached test file which can reproduce the bug. For example, through analysing the source code of the test file of bug#981 for HSQLDB, we found the failure-inducing combinations for this bug is: (*preparestatement*, *placeholder*, *Long string*), this three factors together form the condition on which the bug will be triggered. These analysed result will be regarded as the "perfect combinations" later.

We further selected pairs of bugs belong to the same version and merged their test file. This merging manipulation vary with the pair of bugs we selected, and for each pair of bugs, we have posted the source code of the merging file on the web site.

Next we built the input model which consist of the options related to the perfect combinations and additional noise options. The detailed model information is listed in appendix. We then generated the exhaustive test suite consist of all the possible combinations of these options under which we executed the merged test file. We record the output of each test case to observe whether there are test cases contain 'perfect combination' but do not produce the corresponding bug.

### 5.1.2 result and discuss

Table 8 lists the results of our survey. Column "all tests" give the total number of test cases we executed, column "failure" indicate the number of test cases that failed during testing and column "num of masking" indicate the number of test cases which trigger the masking effect.

We observed that for each pair of bugs we listed in the table, we can always find some test cases, although contain fail-

<sup>3</sup><http://sourceforge.net/p/hsqldb/bugs>  
<http://sourceforge.net/p/jflex/bugs>

**Table 6: input model of HSQLDB**

Common options		values
sql.enforce_strict_size		true, false
sql.enforce_names		true, false
sql.enforce_refs		true, false
Server Type		server, webserver, inprocess
existed form		mem, file
resultSetTypes		forwad, insensitive, sensitive
resultSetConcurrencys		read_only, updatable
resultSetHoldabilitys		hold, close
StatementType		statement, prepared
versions	specific options	values
2.0rc8	more	true, false
	placeholder	true, false
	cursorAction	next,previous,first,last
2.2.5	multiple	single, multiple, d
	placeholder	true, false
2.2.9	duplicate	duplicate, single, d
	default_commit	true, false
versions	Config space	
2.0rc8	$2^9 \times 3^2 \times 4^1$	
2.2.5	$2^8 \times 3^3$	
2.2.9	$2^8 \times 3^3$	

**Table 7: input model of JFlex**

Common options		values
public		true, false
apiprivate		true, false
cup		true, false
caseless		true, false
char		true, false
line		true, false
column		true, false
notunix		true, false
yyeof		true, false
generation		switch, table, pack
charset		default, 7bit, 8bit, 16bit
versions	specific options	values
1.4.1	hasReturn	true, false, d
	normal	true, false
1.4.2	lookAhead	single, multiple, d
	type	true, false
	standalone	true, false
versions	Config space	
1.4.1	$2^{10} \times 3^2 \times 4^1$	
1.4.2	$2^{11} \times 3^2 \times 4^1$	

**Table 8: number of faults and their masking effect condition**

software	versions	all tests	failure	masking
HSQLDB	2cr8	18432	4608	768
-	2.2.5	6912	3456	576
-	2.2.9	6912	3456	1728
JFlex	1.4.1	36864	24576	6144
-	1.4.2	73728	36864	6144

ure inducing combinations, did not trigger the corresponding bug, i.e., the expected bug was masked. Specifically, there are 1000 out of 2000 (20%) test cases for HSQLDB triggered the masking effect.

So the answer to Q1 is that in practice, when SUT have multiple faults, there is a good chance that masking effect can be triggered by some test cases.

## 5.2 study 2:performance of traditional algorithms

In the second study, we want to learn to what degree do the masking effect impact on the traditional approaches. To conduct this study, we need to apply the traditional failure-inducing identifying algorithms on identifying the failure-inducing combinations in the prepared software and compare them with the perfect combinations.

### 5.2.1 study setup

The traditional approaches we selected are: OFOT[12], FIC\_BS [20] and CTA[17], in which CTA(short for classified tree approach) is a integrated failure characterization part of FDA-CIT[18]. As CTA is a post-analysis technique applied on given test cases, different test cases will influence the result of characterization process. So to avoid randomness and be fair, we fed the CTA with the same test cases generated by OFOT to get deterministic results. Additionally, the classified tree algorithms for CTA we chose is J48 implemented in Weka, the configuration options for J48, we choose .

We first selected failing test cases from the exhaustive test suite for a particular software, and for each test case, we applied OFOT, FIC\_BS and CTA respectively to isolate the failure-inducing combinations in this test case. As the subject under test has multiple faults, there are two strategies we will adopted in this case study, i.e., *regard as one fault* and *distinguish faults* described in section 3.2. We then collected all the failure-inducing combinations of each algorithm for each strategy respectively.

We next compared the result with the perfect combinations to quantify the degree to what do traditional approaches suffers from masking effect. There are five metrics we need to care in this study, which are listed as follows:

1. The number of correctly identified failure-inducing combinations. We measure this metric by counting the same combinations between these identified by traditional FCI approaches with these perfect ones, and refer it as *accurate combinations* later.
2. The number of combinations identified by FCI approaches that is the parent combinations of some per-

fect combinations, which is refer to *identified parent combinations*.

3. The number of combinations identified by FCI approaches that is the child combinations of some perfect combinations, which is refer to *identified child combinations*.
4. The number of ignored failure-inducing combinations. This metric counts these combinations in perfect ones, which satisfy that neither these combinations nor their parent and child combinations are in those identified by FCI approaches. We label them as *ignored combinations*.
5. The number of wrongly identified combinations. This metric counts these combinations in these identified by FCI approaches, of which neither themselves nor their child and parent combinations is in these perfect ones. It is referred to the *irrelevant combinations*.

Among these five metrics, the more the "accurate combinations" the better the FCI approaches performed. In the reverse, "ignored combinations" and "irrelevant combinations" indicate the FCI approaches performs badly if this two metrics is too big. For "parent combination" and "child combinations" this two metrics, they can help us determine some useful information, but with some noisy.

Besides, as we discussed in the formal model, *regards as one fault* will, while *distinguish* will. So the four metric will to some extent validate this formal analysis.

For these five software : hsqldb 2cr8, hsqldb 2.2.5 and hsqldb 2.2.9, Jflex 1.4.1 and JFlex 1.4.2 we will collet them together.

### 5.2.2 result and discuss

Figure 2 depicts the result of the second case study. There are three sub-figures in it, correspond, respectively, to the result of three approaches: FIC\_BS, OFOT and CTA. In each sub-figure, the five columns "accurate", "parent", "child", "ignore" and "irrelevant" presents the number of "accurate combinations", "parent identified combinations", "children identified combinations", "ignored combinations" and "irrelevant combinations". Two bars in each column respectively illustrate the result of strategy for *regard as one fault* and *distinguish faults*.

We first observed that, traditional approaches do suffer from the masking effect to some extent. Specifically, in the figure 2(a), FIC\_BS approach only correctly identified 12 and 10 accurate combinations for the two traditional strategies respectively, while wrongly identified 14 and 69 combinations, in which for the identified parent combinations, identified child combinations, identified irreverent combinations are 9,3,2 and 0,8,61 respectively. This is similar to the result illustrated in figure 2(b) and figure 2(c) for approach OFOT and CTA .

Another interesting observations is that for the *regard as one fault* and *distinguish faults* strategy, the former get more *child combinations* than later, while *distinguish faults* strategy get more *parent combinations* than *regard as one*. This result accorded with our formal analysis in section 3.2. What's more, we also learned that for metrics *ignore combinations* and *irrelevant combinations*, this two strategy almost presents the same as expected, i.e., *regard as one fault* would get more except the following case, An exception is






Figure 2: results of two strategies for traditional approaches: FIC\_BS, OFOT and CTA

for the FIC\_BS, which we think when consider the regard as one fault faults strategy, it increase the possibility that import newly bugs so that bais the result. it always that . fahter and parent. which are accordant with the analysis in the formal model.

We further observed that, for different algorithms, the extent to what suffered varied. For example.

Above all, the answer for Q2 is: traditional algorithm do suffer from the multiple faults and their masking effect although the extent vary in different algorithms.

### 5.3 study 3:performance of our approach

The last case study aims to observe the performance of our approach and compare it with the result got by the traditional approaches. Specifically, we augmented the three traditional approaches using the method described in section 5, and then we applied these augmented approaches on identifying the failure-inducing combinations in the prepared subjects.

#### 5.3.1 study setup

The setup of this case study is almost the same as the second case study. The difference is that the algorithms we choose are three augment ones. Additionally, comparisons between augment approaches with three traditional ones will be quantified.

#### 5.3.2 result and analysis

Table presents the result of the last case study. The form of this table is similar to the second study. We just added some information in the parentheses attached the value in each cell. This information display the discrepancy between traditional ones. Notation '+' means promotions against traditional ones, while '-' indicates decrease. The value in parentheses has been normalized.

We observe that, for most cases, augment approaches got promotions against traditional ones. In fact, there are 10 out of 14 cases that augment ones outperform traditional ones at the metric of "similarity", and 9 out of 14 cases that augment ones are better than traditional ones at the metric of "num diff". Additional, this promotion is distinct. As we can see, the best promotion for similarity is 0.9 and the best promotion for num diff is 0.7. Furthermore, the average performance promotion for similarity reached '+ 0.6' and this value reached '+ 0.5' for the num diff metric.

So the answer for Q3 is: our approach do get better performance at identifying failure-inducing combinations when facing masking effect between multiple faults, to which the extent is distinct.

### 5.4 threats to validity

There are several threats to validity for these empirical studies. First, we have only surveyed five open-source software, four of which are medium-sized and one is large-sized. This may impact the generality of our observations. Although we believe it is quite possible a common phenomenon in most software that contain multiple faults which can mask each other, we need to investigate more software to support our conjecture. The second threat comes from the input model we built. As we focused on the options related to the perfect combinations and only augmented it with some noise options, there is a chance we will get different result if we choose other noise options. More different options needed to be opted to see whether our result is common or just appeared in some particular input model. The third threats is that we just observed three MFS identifying algorithms, further works needed to exam more MFS identifying algorithms to get a more general result.

## 6. RELATED WORKS

Nie's approach in [12] first separates the faulty possible tuples and healthy-possible tuples into two sets. Subsequently, by changing a parameter value at a time of the original test configuration, this approach generates extra test configurations. After executing the configurations, the approach converges by reducing the number of tuples in the faulty-possible sets.

Delta debugging [19] proposed by Zeller is an adaptive divide-and-conquer approach to locate interaction fault. It is very efficient and has been applied to real software environment. Zhang et al. [20] also proposed a similar approach that can identify the failure-inducing combinations that has no overlapped part efficiently.

Colbourn and McClary [5] proposed a non-adaptive method. Their approach extends the covering array to the locating array to detect and locate interaction faults. C. Martinez [10, 11] proposed two adaptive algorithms. The first one needs safe value as their assumption and the second one remove the assumption when the number of values of each param-




Figure 3: Caption of subfigures (a), (b) and (c)

ter is equal to 2. Their algorithms focus on identifying the faulty tuples that have no more than 2 parameters.

Ghandehari.etc [8] defines the suspiciousness of tuple and suspiciousness of the environment of a tuple. Based on this, they rank the possible tuples and generate the test configurations. Although their approach imposes minimal assumption, it does not ensure that the tuples ranked in the top are the faulty tuples.

Yilmaz [17] proposed a machine learning method to identify inducing combinations from a combinatorial testing set. They construct a classified tree to analyze the covering arrays and detect potential faulty combinations. Beside this, Fouch  l [7] and Shakya [15] made some improvements in identifying failure-inducing combinations based on Yilmaz's work.

Our previous work [14] have proposed an approach that utilize the tuple relationship tree to isolate the failure-inducing combinations in a failing test case. One novelty of this approach is that it can identify the overlapped faulty combinations. This work also alleviates the problem of introducing newly failure-inducing combinations in additional test cases.

Besides works that aims at identifying the failure-inducing combinations in test cases, there are some work focus on working around the masking effects:

With having known masking effects in prior, Cohen [4] use a SAT solver to avoid these masking effects in test cases generating process. Additional constraints impacts in CT were studied in works like [1, 3, 2, 9, 16]. These approaches use some rules or to avoid these invalidated test cases to improve the efficiency when examine the test cases.

Dumlu and Yilmaz in [6] proposed a feedback-driven approach to work around the masking effects. In specific, it first use CTA classify the possible failure-inducing combinations and then eliminate them and generate new test cases to detect possible masked interaction in the next iteration. They further extended their work in [18], in which they proposed a multiple-class CTA approach to distinguish faults in SUT. In addition, they empirically studied the impacts on both ternary-class and multiple-class CTA approaches.

Our work differs from these ones mainly in the fact that we formally studied the masking effects on FCI approaches and further proposed a divide-and-conquer strategy to alleviate

this impact.

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

Masking effects of multiple faults in SUT can bias the result of traditional failure-inducing combinations identifying approaches. In this paper, we formalized the process of identifying failure-inducing combinations under the circumstance that masking effects exist in SUT and try to understand how do this impacts brought by masking effect. Furthermore, we have presented a divide and conquer strategy to assist traditional FCI approaches to alleviate this impact.

In the empirically studies, we extended three FCI approaches with our strategy. The comparison between this three traditional approaches with their variation is conducted on on several open-source software. The results shows that our strategy do assist traditional FCI approaches get a better performance when facing masking effects in SUT.

As a future work, we need to do more empirical studies to make our conclusion more general. Our current experimental subjects are several middle-sized software, we would like to extend our approach into more complicated and large-scaled testing scenarios. Another promising work in the future is to combine white-box testing technique to make the FCI approaches get more accurate results when handling masking effects. We believe that figuring out the faulting levels of different bugs through white-box testing technique is helpful to reduce misjudgements in the failure-inducing combinations identifying process.

## 8. REFERENCES

- [1] 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.
- [2] A. Calvagna and A. Gargantini. A logic-based approach to combinatorial testing with constraints. In *Tests and proofs*, pages 66–83. Springer, 2008.
- [3] B. Chen, J. Yan, and J. Zhang. Combinatorial testing with shielding parameters. In *Software Engineering Conference (APSEC), 2010 17th Asia Pacific*, pages 280–289. IEEE, 2010.

- [4] 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.
- [5] C. J. Colbourn and D. W. McClary. Locating and detecting arrays for interaction faults. *Journal of combinatorial optimization*, 15(1):17–48, 2008.
- [6] 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.
- [7] 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.
- [8] L. S. G. Ghandehari, Y. Lei, T. Xie, R. Kuhn, and R. Kacker. Identifying failure-inducing combinations in a combinatorial test set. In *Software Testing, Verification and Validation (ICST), 2012 IEEE Fifth International Conference on*, pages 370–379. IEEE, 2012.
- [9] M. Grindal, J. Offutt, and J. Mellin. Handling constraints in the input space when using combination strategies for software testing. 2006.
- [10] 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.
- [11] 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.
- [12] 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.
- [13] C. Nie and H. Leung. A survey of combinatorial testing. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 43(2):11, 2011.
- [14] 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.
- [15] 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.
- [16] C. Yilmaz. Test case-aware combinatorial interaction testing. *Software Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*, 39(5):684–706, 2013.
- [17] 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.
- [18] C. Yilmaz, E. Dumlu, M. Cohen, and A. Porter. Reducing masking effects in combinatorial interaction testing: A feedback driven adaptive approach. 2013.
- [19] A. Zeller and R. Hildebrandt. Simplifying and isolating failure-inducing input. *Software Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*, 28(2):183–200, 2002.
- [20] 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.