# CS 6015: Software Engineering

Spring 2024

Lecture 13: Test automation

## Last Week

- Parsing cont. (Project related)
- MSDScript project overview
- Power of variables
- Libraries (Lab 5)

## This Week

- Test automation
- Design patterns

## Recall Testing

Unit tests cover what you thought might go wrong

- Drawback?
  - Are we aware of different test combinations?
  - How to generate different strings from a pool of characters?
- We still need that kind of testing- but we need to think of generating many different combinations of the input

- Test generation/automation
  - Generating random inputs.
  - Results of the output are compared against expected output to verify that the test output passed or failed
- Generated tests can find what you didn't think about

## Test generation needs:

- a way to generate inputs
- a driver to send the inputs and receive outputs
- a way to decide whether the output was good

Test oracle

## Test generation needs:

- a way to generate inputs
- a driver to send the inputs and receive outputs
- a way to decide whether the output was good

Use another implementation differential testing

- Saves time
- Quick to find bug candidates: couple of minutes to perform a testing session.
- Ensures consistency and reduces human error
- Reduces variance in test quality from different individuals
- Run tests more frequently and anytime

### Which tests should be automated

- Test cases which are executed repeatedly
- Tests which are difficult to perform manually
- Time consuming tests

### Tests not suitable for automation

 Test cases which are faster to test manually rather than develop automated tests for them

## Testing: Example

## https://www.sqlite.org/testing.html

- Four independently developed test harnesses
- 100% branch test coverage in an as-deployed configuration
- Millions and millions of test cases
- Out-of-memory tests
- I/O error tests
- Crash and power loss tests
- Fuzz tests
- Boundary value tests
- Disabled optimization tests
- Regression tests
- Malformed database tests
- Extensive use of assert() and run-time checks
- Valgrind analysis
- Undefined behavior checks
- Checklists

The project has 590 times as much test code and test scripts

## **Fuzz testing**



**Program did not crash** 

- or fuzz testing
- Type of test generation
- Provides random generated input to a program

```
// Makes a string of up to 31 random bytes
static std::string random_bytes() {
  std::string word = "";
  for (int i = rand() % 32; i-- > 0; )
     word += rand() % 256;
  return word;
}
```

- or fuzz testing
- Type of test generation
- Provides random generated input to a program

```
// Makes a string of up to 31 random bytes
static std::string random_bytes() {
  std::string word = "";
  for (int i = rand() % 32; i-- > 0; )
      word +: Returns a "random" int
  return word;
}
```

- or fuzz testing
- Type of test generation
- Provides random generated input to a program

```
// Makes a string of up to 31 random bytes
static std::string random_bytes() {
  std::string word = "";
  for (int i = rand() % 32; i-- > 0; )
     word +: Use srand(clock()) to generate varying values
  return word;
}
```

- or fuzz testing
- Type of test generation
- Provides random generated input to a program

```
// Makes a string of up to 31 random bytes
static std::string random_bytes() {
  std::string word = "";
  for (int i = rand() % 32; i-- > 0; )
     word += ran
     A number between 0 and 31
  return word;
}
```

- or fuzz testing
- Type of test generation
- Provides random generated input to a program

```
// Makes a string of up to 31 random bytes
static std::string random_bytes() {
  std::string word = "";
  for (int i = rand() % 32; i-- > 0; )
     word += rand() % 256;
  return word;
}
```

 Fuzzing is a good idea for testing parsers, but just generating random strings is unlikely to generate many interesting MSDscript expressions

# **Project related**

# Generating Expressions

```
(expr)
       = (number)
          ( <expr>)
         ⟨expr⟩ + ⟨expr⟩
         ⟨expr⟩ * ⟨expr⟩
         (variable)
         _let (variable) = (expr)_in (expr)
    Possible strategy:
    randomly pick a case
    •for (number), randomly pick one
    •for (variable), randomly generate one
    •for others, recur for nested (expr)
```

## **Generating Expressions**

Generate **Expr** values or strings?

By generating strings, we can make the test generator more separate from the code it's trying to test

First try — just generate numbers

```
std::string random_expr_string() {
  return std::to_string(rand());
}
```

#### Could check:

- --interp mode prints the same number
- --print mode prints the same number
- --pretty-print mode prints the same number
- •exit code is always 0

```
std::string random_expr_string() {
  if ((rand() % 10) < 6)
     return std::to_string(rand());
  else
     return random_expr_string() + "+" + random_expr_string();
}</pre>
```

```
std::string random_expr_string() {
   if ((rand() % 10) < 6)
        return std::to_string(rand()); 60% of the time
   else
        return random_expr_string() + "+" + random_expr_string();
}</pre>
```

```
std::string random_expr_string() {
   if ((rand() % 10) < 6)
       return std::to_string(rand()); 60% of the time
   else
      return random_expr_string() + "+" + random_expr_string(); 40% of the time
}</pre>
```

Even without tracking the expected sum, but could check:

- --interp mode prints some number
- --print mode prints some expression that interps to the same number
- --pretty-print mode prints some expression that interps to the same number and pretty-prints exactly the same
- exit code is always 0

## Trying Generated Expressions

### **Overall:**

- Generate an expression string
- Send string as input to msdscript
- Check msdscript output and exit code

### Inside the **msdscript** implementation:

We take control of input and output using std::istream& and std::ostream& arguments

### From the **outside**:

- We need a way to run a program
- Send it input to std::cin,
- and capture its output to std::count

**}**;

```
Provided by exec.cpp:

ExecResult exec_program(int argc, char **argv, std::string in);

class ExecResult {
  public:
    int exit_code;
    std::string out;
    std::string err;
}
```

```
Provided by exec.cpp:

argv[0] is the program to run

ExecResult exec_program(int argc, char **argv, std::string in);

one string as input

class ExecResult {

public:
    int exit_code;
    std::string out;
    std::string err;
};
```

## Another Simple Test Driver

```
int main(int argc, char **argv) {
 const char * const interp argv[] = { "msdscript", "--interp" };
 const char * const print argv[] = { "msdscript", "--print" };
 for (int i = 0; i < 100; i++) {
  std::string in = random expr string();
  std::cout << "Trying"<< in << "\n";</pre>
  ExecResult interp_result = exec_program(2, interp_argv, in);
  ExecResult print result = exec program(2, print argv, in);
  ExecResult interp again result = exec program(2, interp argv, print result.out);
   if (interp_again_result.out != interp result.out)
    throw std::runtime error("different result for printed");
 return 0;
```

## Simple Test Driver

```
int main(int argc, char **argv) {
 const char * const interp1 argv[] = { "msdscript", "--interp" };
 const char * const interp2 argv[] = { "msdscript2", "--interp" };
 for (int i = 0; i < 100; i++) {
   std::string in = random expr string();
   std::cout << "Trying " << in << "\n";</pre>
  ExecResult interp1 result = exec program(2, interp1 argv, in);
  ExecResult interp2 result = exec program(2, interp2 argv, in);
  if (interp1 result.out != interp2 result.out)
      throw std::runtime error("different results");
 return 0;
```

## Project

Test generation for the msdscript project does not use any of the msdscript implementation