Parallel Test Case Prioritization for Distributed System Using Search Algorithms

Team 6
Seyoung Song, Subeom Park, Yoonho Nam, Azret Kenzhaliev

Abstract

TODO

Contents

1 Introduction

TODO: Seyoung

References: [1]–[4]

- Regression Test Case Prioritization
- Parallel Test Prioritization
- Parallel Test Prioritization, but different CPU

2 Parallel Test Prioritization

TODO: Subeom

- Problem Description
- Problem Definition
- Effectiveness Measure

3 Algorithms

3.1 Greedy Algorithms

TODO: Azret

3.2 Simulated Annealing

TODO: Subeom

3.3 Genetic Algorithms

TODO: Yoonho

4 Empirical Study

4.1 Research Questions

- RQ1: Which algorithm is most effective in solving the parallel test prioritization problem?
- RQ2: How do the number of computing resources and the relative performance between them influence the performance of the parallel test prioritization techniques?

4.2 Experimental Design

1. Sequential Test Prioritization
   - $c = \{1\}$
2. Parallel Test Prioritization
   - $c = \{2, 4, 8, 16\}$
3. Asymmetric Test Prioritization
   - $1:2$
   - $1:3$
   - $1:4$
   - $1:1:1:1:4:4:4:4$

Table 1: An example of computing scenarios

Computing Scenario	Relative Performances
Sequential Test Prioritization	[1]
Parallel Test Prioritization ($c = 2$)	[1, 1]
Parallel Test Prioritization ($c = 4$)	[1, 1, 1, 1]
Parallel Test Prioritization ($c = 8$)	[1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1]
Parallel Test Prioritization ($c = 16$)	[1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1]
Asymmetric Test Prioritization ($1:2$)	[1, 2]
Asymmetric Test Prioritization ($1:3$)	[1, 3]
Asymmetric Test Prioritization ($1:4$)	[1, 4]

Computing Scenario	Relative Performances
Asymmetric Test Prioritization ($1:1:1:1:4:4:4:4$)	[1, 1, 1, 1, 4, 4, 4, 4]

Table 2: Settings for additional experiments

Performance of Computing Resources p
Sequential ($c = 1$)
Parallel ($c = 2$)
Parallel ($c = 4$)
Asymmetric ($1:3$)
Asymmetric ($1:1:2$)
Asymmetric ($2:2$)
Parallel ($c = 8$)
Asymmetric ($1:7$)
Asymmetric ($2:6$)
Asymmetric ($3:5$)
Asymmetric ($4:4$)
Asymmetric ($2:2:2:2$)
Asymmetric ($1:1:3:3$)
Parallel ($c = 12$)
Parallel ($c = 25$)
Parallel ($c = 50$)
Parallel ($c = 100$)
Parallel ($c = 200$)

Table 3: Settings for additional experiments

Time Constraint TC
1.25
1.5
1.75
2.0

4.3 Subjects

TODO: Seyoung

Table 4: Open-source subjects from GitHub

ID	Subjects	SLOC	#Test	Time (s)
1	commons-cli	9053	192	3.064
2	dictomaton	4318	53	14.067
3	disklrucache	1921	61	2.364
4	efflux	5633	40	0.581
5	exp4j	5699	311	11.350
6	gdx-artemis	3607	35	0.483
7	geojson-jackson	1569	60	1.284
8	gson-fire	3566	91	3.249
9	jactor	6984	60	11.628
10	jadventure	5276	74	2.311
11	jarchivelib	2256	33	0.217
12	java-faker	8541	571	34.154
13	java-uuid-generator	4321	46	0.937
14	javapoet	9874	346	15.323
15	jsonassert	3476	150	1.641
16	jumblr	2970	103	0.905
17	lastcalc	7271	34	13.672
18	low-gc-membuffers	13099	51	1.784
19	metrics	6493	76	43.964
20	mp3agic	10037	495	4.815
21	nv-websocket-client	8617	73	1.014
22	protoparser	5545	171	4.752
23	restfixture	8243	290	6.716
24	skype-java-api	9749	24	15.720
25	stateless4j	2728	88	2.146
26	stream-lib	8756	142	443.206
27	xembly	3030	63	6.834

4.4 Results and Analysis

TODO

Setting	**GA**	**SA**	**AGA**
Sequential	**0.932**	0.868	0.876
Parallel ($c = 2$)	**0.964**	0.936	0.937
Parallel ($c = 4$)	**0.980**	0.966	0.966
Parallel ($c = 8$)	**0.987**	0.981	0.981
Parallel ($c = 16$)	**0.990**	0.988	0.988
Asymmetric ($1 : 2$)	**0.976**	0.955	0.958
Asymmetric ($1 : 3$)	**0.982**	0.963	0.968
Asymmetric ($1 : 4$)	**0.985**	0.968	0.975
Asymmetric ($1 : 1 : 1 : 1 : 4 : 4 : 4 : 4$)	**0.995**	0.992	0.993

5 Conclusion

- Discussion
  - Comparison With Sequential Test Prioritization
  - Practical Concerns
  - Generalizability
- Comments from Professor
  - How long should the entire test take for there to be real gains in prioritization?
  - The time gain from prioritization becomes smaller as the number of compute resources increases, so it may not be meaningful if you already have a lot of compute resources.

References

[1] Z. Li, M. Harman, and R. M. Hierons, "Search algorithms for regression test case prioritization," *IIEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 225–237, Apr. 2007, doi: 10.1109/TSE.2007.38.

[2] J. Chen *et al.*, "Optimizing test prioritization via test distribution analysis," in *Proceedings of the 2018 26th ACM joint meeting on european software engineering conference and symposium on the foundations of software engineering*, Oct. 2018, pp. 656–667. doi: 10.1145/3236024.3236053.

[3] Q. Luo, K. Moran, L. Zhang, and D. Poshyvanyk, "How do static and dynamic test case prioritization techniques perform on modern software systems? An extensive study on GitHub projects," *IIEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, vol. 45, no. 11, pp. 1054–1080, Nov. 2019, doi: 10.1109/TSE.2018.2822270.

[4] J. Zhou, J. Chen, and D. Hao, "Parallel test prioritization," *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.*, vol. 31, no. 1, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.1145/3471906.