

Advanced Programming

Testing and Assessment

Ken Friis Larsen
kflarsen@diku.dk

Department of Computer Science
University of Copenhagen

September 14, 2017

Today's Program

- ▶ Quick monad recap
- ▶ What is an assessment?
- ▶ Testing
- ▶ Property based testing

Our Two Favorite Type Classes

```
class Functor f where
```

```
  fmap :: (a -> b) -> f a -> f b
```

```
class Functor f => Applicative f where
```

```
  pure :: a -> f a
```

```
  (<*>) :: f (a -> b) -> f a -> f b
```

```
class Applicative m => Monad m where
```

```
  return :: a -> m a
```

```
  (>=)    :: m a -> (a -> m b) -> m b
```

```
  (>>)    :: m a -> m b -> m b
```

```
  fail    :: String -> m a
```

Make Functors (and Applicatives) For Your Monads

Whenever you make your type a monad, you should also make it a functor (and an applicative functor).

Here are implementations of Functor and Applicative for free (you can sometimes/often do better):

```
instance Monad T where
```

```
...
```

```
instance Functor T where
```

```
  fmap f xs = xs >>= return . f
```

```
instance Applicative T where
```

```
  pure = return
```

```
  af <*> ax = do f <- af
```

```
                x <- ax
```

```
                return (f x)
```

What Is An Assessment?

From the frontpage of the exam:

*For each question your report should give an overview of your solution, including **an assessment** of how good you think your solution is and on which grounds you base your assessment (testing, gut feeling, proof of correctness, ...).*

You should document:

- ▶ Your assumptions (if any).
- ▶ How suitable is your choice of algorithms and data structures, often based on your assumptions
- ▶ The correctness/robustness of your code.
- ▶ An overall summary of the quality of your code.

And present evidence for your conclusions.

Morse Code

- ▶ One of the exercises from exercise set 0 is about decoding morse code.
- ▶ That is, write the functions

```
encode :: String -> String
```

```
decode :: String -> [String]
```

For instance, ". . . - - - . . - -" could be the encoding for both Sofia and Eugenia.

Morse Code, Implementation

```
import qualified Data.List as L

charMap = [( 'A', ".-"), ( 'B', "-..."), ... ]

findChar c = fromMaybe "" $ lookup c charMap

encode :: String -> String
encode = concatMap findChar

decode :: String -> [String]
decode "" = [""]
decode input = [ c : rest | (c, code) <- charMap
                          , code `L.isPrefixOf` input
                          , let clen = length code
                          , rest <- decode $ drop clen input ]
```


You should document:

- ▶ Your assumptions (if any).
- ▶ How suitable is your choice of algorithms and data structures, often based on your assumptions
- ▶ The correctness/robustness of your code.
- ▶ An overall summary of the quality of your code.

And present evidence for your conclusions.

(Bad) Assessment of Morse Code Implementation

I believe that my solution for working with Morse code is quite good. The only weakness is that I use a list as my data structure for mapping chars to the corresponding Morse code. Instead I should probably have used an array or a map (tree or hash based). That would make 'findChar' a constant time operation, which would make 'encode' much faster. Alas, it also make my implementation of 'decode' much uglier, and since the list is short i decided to stay with list.

I tested my functions in the REPL for many examples, and they always gave the correct results.

Correctness Claim by Testing

To claim that your code is correct, you must **as a minimum** do some kind of testing:

- ▶ Black-box testing
- ▶ White-box testing
- ▶ Functional testing
- ▶ Unit testing
- ▶ ...

Bare minimum, for each test:

- ▶ write down what you (think) you test,
- ▶ what is the expected outcome of the test,
- ▶ what was the outcome of the test.

All in a test schema/table (or as unit test). Summarise if needed.

Unit Testing In Haskell

The standard Unit testing framework for Haskell is HUnit, in the module `Test.HUnit`.

Unit tests for the Morse module

```
import Test.HUnit
import qualified Morse

test1 = TestCase $ assertBool "Decode Sofia" $
    "SOFIA" 'elem' Morse.decode "...-----"
test2 = TestCase $ assertBool "Decode Eugenia" $
    "EUGENIA" 'elem' Morse.decode "...-----"

tests = TestList [TestLabel "Decode" $ TestList [test1, test2],
                  TestLabel "Encode" $
                      "...-." ~=? Morse.encode "KEN"]

main = runTestTT tests
```

Property Based Testing

To say something about the correctness of our code, we should be able to prove what *properties* holds for the code, or at least test that the properties hold for a few instances.

For instance, for the Morse module we would expect to be able to decode an encoded string:

$$s = \text{decode}(\text{encode}(s))$$

Alas, that's too strong a property. Several strings can have the same encoding. Thus the property we are after is

$$s \in \text{decode}(\text{encode}(s))$$

Using QuickCheck For Property Testing

The standard testing framework for property based testing in Haskell is QuickCheck, in the module `Test.QuickCheck`.

Again, for the we code up our property as a function, which we can then test with the function `quickCheck`

```
import Test.QuickCheck
import qualified Morse
```

```
prop_encode_decode s = s `elem` Morse.decode (Morse.encode s)
```

```
main = quickCheck prop_encode_decode
```

QuickCheck Building Blocks

- ▶ QuickCheck generates random values by clever use of the Arbitrary type-class:

```
class Arbitrary a where  
    arbitrary :: Gen a
```

- ▶ That uses the type:

```
newtype Gen a = MkGen { unGen :: QCGen -> Int -> a }  
to generate values of type a.
```

- ▶ Gen is a monad.

QuickCheck for Morse, Take 2

```
import qualified Test.QuickCheck as QC
import qualified Data.Char as C
import qualified Morse

upper = map C.toUpper

prop_encode_decode (LO s) = upper s `elem`
                             Morse.decode (Morse.encode s)

asciiLetter = QC.elements (['a'..'z'] ++ ['A'..'Z'])

newtype LettersOnly = LO String
    deriving (Eq, Show)

instance QC.Arbitrary LettersOnly where
    arbitrary = fmap LO (QC.listOf asciiLetter)
```


QuickCheck for Morse, Take 3

```
import Test.QuickCheck
import qualified Data.Char as C
import qualified Morse

upper = map C.toUpper
prop_encode_decode (L0 s) = upper s `elem`
                                Morse.decode (Morse.encode s)

weightedLetters = frequency [(2 ^ (max - length code), return c)
                              | (c,code) <- Morse.charMap]
  where max = 1 + (maximum $ map (length . snd) Morse.charMap)

newtype LettersOnly = L0 String deriving (Eq, Show)

instance Arbitrary LettersOnly where
  arbitrary = fmap L0 $ do n <- choose (0, 5)
                           vectorOf n weightedLetters
```

Testing Algebraic Data Types

How can we generate random expressions for checking that Add is commutative:

```
data Expr = Con Int
          | Add Expr Expr
          deriving (Eq, Show, Read, Ord)
```

```
value :: Expr -> Int
```

```
value (Con n) = n
```

```
value (Add x y) = value x + value y
```

```
prop_com_add x y = value (Add x y) == value (Add y x)
```

Generating Exprs

- Our first attempt

```
expr = oneof [ fmap Con arbitrary  
              , do x <- expr  
                y <- expr  
                return $ Add x y]
```

instance Arbitrary Expr where

arbitrary = expr

is correct,

- ... but may generate humongous expressions.
- Instead we should generate a sized expression

```
expr = sized exprN
```

```
exprN 0 = fmap Con arbitrary
```

```
exprN n = oneof [fmap Con arbitrary,  
                 liftM2 Add subexpr subexpr]
```

```
where subexpr = exprN (n 'div' 2)
```

Test your understanding: Check that minus is commutative

- ▶ Add constructor and extend eval.

- ▶ Extend data generator:

```
expr = sized exprN
exprN 0 = liftM Con arbitrary
exprN n = oneof [liftM Con arbitrary,
                  liftM2 Add subexpr subexpr,
                  liftM2 Minus subexpr subexpr
                  ]
    where subexpr = exprN (n 'div' 2)
```

- ▶ Write a property

```
prop_com_minus x y =
  eval (Minus x y) == eval (Minus y x)
```

Shrinking in Haskell

- ▶ The Arbitrary type class also specify the function shrink

shrink :: a -> [a]

Which should produces a (possibly) empty list of all the possible immediate shrinks of the given value.

- ▶ For Exprs

instance Arbitrary Expr where

arbitrary = sized exprN

where expr N 0 = ...

shrink (**Add** e1 e2) = [e1, e2]

shrink (**Minus** e1 e2) = [e1, e2]

shrink _ = []

Summary

- ▶ Practise making an assessments (it will be on the exam)
- ▶ To claim correctness you should have some kind of evidence, as a minimum some testing.
- ▶ Use HUnit for unit testing
- ▶ Use QuickCheck for better testing
- ▶ Write better generators by using the Gen monad