Group number: 5

Group name: Church

Names: Morten Egelund Rasmussen, Ole Ertmann Nielsen, Sten Anderson Rasmus Lohals Larsen

Emails: [stea@itu.dk](mailto:stea@itu.dk), [rlla@itu.dk](mailto:rlla@itu.dk)

# Table of Contents

1 Table of Contents 2

2 Example textual model 3

3 Meta-model 4

3.1 Class diagram 4

3.2 Partonomy 5

4 Static semantics 6

5 Xtext grammar 7

6 Backends 9

6.1 HTML 5 mobile web client 9

6.2 Windows client(Windows store app) 11

6.2.1 Code generator 11

6.2.2 Code generation output 12

6.2.3 Client UI 13

7 Test methods and artefacts 14

7.1 Test strategy 14

7.2 Metamodel test case examples 15

7.3 Grammar test case examples 16

7.4 Code generators test case examples 18

7.4.1 1. Overview of HTML5 mobile web client 18

7.4.2 Test of dynamic html generation 18

7.4.3 Test of static html generation 18

# Example textual model


*Morten.*

*Tjek at vi kommer hele modellen rundt.*

No commentary expected

# Meta-model

## Class diagram



## Partonomy

*Sten*

# Static semantics

# Xtext grammar

**grammar** dk.itu.smdp2015.church.Configurator **with** org.eclipse.xtext.common.Terminals

**import** "http://itu.dk/smdp/configurator"

**import** "http://www.eclipse.org/emf/2002/Ecore" **as** ecore

Configurator:

'configurator' name=ID

(description=STRING)?

'{' parameters+=AbstractParameter ( ','? parameters+=AbstractParameter)\* '}';

AbstractParameter:

ParameterGroup | Parameter;

ParameterGroup:

'group' name=ID

(description=STRING)?

( ('visible-if' visibility=Expression)?

& ('constraints' '{' constraints+=Constraint ( ',' constraints+=Constraint)\* ','? '}' )?

& '{' parameters+=AbstractParameter ( ','? parameters+=AbstractParameter)\* ','? '}' );

Parameter:

'parameter' name=ID

(description=STRING)?

( ((optional?='optional')|'mandatory')?

& ('visible-if' visibility=Expression)?

& ('default-value' default=Expression)?

& ('constraints' '{' constraints+=Constraint ( ',' constraints+=Constraint)\* '}' )?

& 'values' valueRange=ValueRange );

ValueRange:

Enumerated | Bounded;

Enumerated **returns** *Enumerated*:

'(' values+=Expression ( ',' values+=Expression)\* ')';

Bounded **returns** *Bounded*:

'[' lowerBound=Expression ';' upperBound=Expression ']';

Constraint:

('description' description=STRING)?

expression=Expression;

Expression:

LogicalOr;

**enum** LogicalOrOperator **returns** *BinaryOperator*:

logicalOr = 'or' ;

LogicalOr **returns** *Expression*:

LogicalAnd ( {*Binary*.left=**current**} operator=LogicalOrOperator right=LogicalAnd )\*;

**enum** LogicalAndOperator **returns** *BinaryOperator*:

logicalAnd = 'and';

LogicalAnd **returns** *Expression*:

Equality ( {*Binary*.left=**current**} operator=LogicalAndOperator right=Equality )\*;

**enum** EqualityOperator **returns** *BinaryOperator*:

equal = '==' | notEqual = '!=';

Equality **returns** *Expression*:

Comparative ( {*Binary*.left=**current**} operator=EqualityOperator right=Comparative )\*;

**enum** ComparativeOperator **returns** *BinaryOperator*:

lessThan = '<' | greaterThan = '>' ;

Comparative **returns** *Expression*:

Additive ( {*Binary*.left=**current**} operator=ComparativeOperator right=Additive )\*;

**enum** AdditiveOperator **returns** *BinaryOperator*:

addition = '+' | subtraction = '-';

Additive **returns** *Expression*:

Multiplicative ( {*Binary*.left=**current**} operator=AdditiveOperator right=Multiplicative )\*;

**enum** MultiplicativeOperator **returns** *BinaryOperator*:

multiplication = '\*';

Multiplicative **returns** *Expression*:

Primitive ( {*Binary*.left=**current**} operator=MultiplicativeOperator right=Primitive )\*;

Primitive **returns** *Expression*:

Unary | InRange | Integer | Boolean | String0 | Identifier | '(' Expression ')';

**enum** UnaryOperator:

inversion = '-' | logicalNot = 'not';

Unary:

operator=UnaryOperator inner=Primitive;

Constant:

Integer | Boolean | String0;

InRange:

parameter=[*Parameter*] 'in' range=ValueRange;

Integer:

value=EInt;

Boolean:

value=EBoolean;

String0 **returns** *String*:

value=STRING;

Identifier:

id=[*Parameter*];

EInt **returns** *ecore::EInt*:

/\* '-'? \*/ INT;

EDouble **returns** *ecore::EDouble*:

/\* '-'? \*/ INT? '.' INT (('E'|'e') '-'? INT)?;

EBoolean **returns** *ecore::EBoolean*:

'true' | 'false';

# Backends

## HTML 5 mobile web client

The HTML client is build using HTML5, javascript and CSS. The code generated is purely html and javascript, so no compilation is taking place as these scripts are interpreted by a browser. We have used two popular javacript frameworks Jquery Mobile (JQM) and Knockout to build a single page web application (SPA), with a clearly defined user interface architecture. Jquery mobile enables mobile oriented user experiences using a simple declarative markup. Depending on the markup the framework applies javascript and CSS to give the application a native mobile look and feel. Knockout is a two data binding javascript framework that uses the Model-View-ViewModel (MVVM) user interface architectual pattern to facilitate a clear separation of concerns between user interface logic and data model manipulation. This separation made it fairly straight forward to generate code from an instance of our Meta Model. Using the Knockout validation plugin, converting our validation expressions into javascript code was also straight forward, as this plugin enable custom validation rules, which is automatically applied by the framework.


|  |
| --- |
| Overview of html client architecture |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Jquery mobile page sample |
| <**div id="main" data-role="page" data-add-back-btn="true"**>  <**div data-role="header"**>  <**h1**>  car  </**h1**>  <**button class="ui-btn-right ui-icon-check ui-btn-icon-right ui-btn" onclick="***submitconfiguration*();**"**>submit</**button**>  </**div**>   <**div role="main"**>  <**section class="description"**>  A configurator for a car  </**section**>  <**section class="validationSection" data-bind="css:{showValidationSummary: !isModelValid()}"**>  <**div class="validationSummary"**>  <**h4**>Validation summary</**h4**>  <**ul data-bind="foreach: currentErrors"**>  <**li**><**span data-bind="text: $data"**> </**span**> </**li**>  </**ul**>  </**div**>  </**section**>  <**ul data-role="listview"**>  <**li**>  <**label for="engine-param"**>engine:</**label**>   <**select id="engine-param" data-bind="options: engine.choices, selectedOptions: engine.value,optionsCaption:'Choose...'"**>      </**select**>  <**p class="validationMessage" data-bind="validationMessage: engine.value"**></**p**>  <**li data-bind="visible: group\_seats().isVisible"**>  <**a href="#seats"**>seats  <**p class="validationMessage" data-bind="validationMessage: group\_seats"**></**p**></**a**>  </**li**>  </**ul**>  </**div**> </**div**> |

|  |
| --- |
| Knockout ViewModel object sample |
| **engine**: {  **choices**: [**'TFSI 1.2'**, **'TFSI 1.4'**, **'TFSI 2.02'**],  **value**: **ko**.observable()  .**extend**({  **validation**: {  validator: **function** (val, param) {  **if**(***App***.**ViewModel**==**null**)*//not initialized* **return true**;  *//Expression here:* **var** result =  (  **$**.inArray(**"TFSI 1.2"**, ***App***.**ViewModel**().**engine**.**value**()) > -1 ||  **$**.inArray(**"TFSI 1.4"**, ***App***.**ViewModel**().**engine**.**value**()) > -1  ) ||  **$**.inArray(**"sport"**, ***App***.**ViewModel**().**variant**.**value**()) > -1  **return** result;   },  **message**: **"Big engines only available for sports model"** }}) } |

## Windows client(Windows store app)

Image of the CS configurator application with the ’VW’ test configuration

[](https://github.com/smdp2015/project/blob/master/Smdp2015DotNetClient/screenshot_04292015_141316.png)


<https://github.com/smdp2015/project/tree/master/Smdp2015DotNetClient>  
  
FileDescription

ChurchConfig / Configuration / Configurator.cs – generated code  
ChurchConfig / Configuration / CommonConfig.cs – BaseClasses to the generated code  
ChurchConfig / ConfigControl.xaml – configurator usercontrol   
ChurchConfig / HubPage.xaml – Application mainpage

### Code generator

https://github.com/smdp2015/project/tree/master/dk.itu.smdp2015.church.configurator.syntax/src/dk/itu/smdp2015/church/generator/CSGenerator.xtend

All in one file.



The generator collects codes in three linkedLists.

* GroupParameterClasses contains generated Groupparameter classes.
* parameterInstance contains parameter instanciation.
* confBuilder contains code to create the configuration instance.

### Code generation output


The code generator generate a static typed C# file called Configurator.cs.


Parameters and groupParameters is handled differently. Parameters have a predefined class for each instantiated type. Ex. EnumeratedParameter and IntParameter. Parametergroup’s is defined as individual classes. The reason for differensation is there is only a few parameter types and almost all parameterGroups are unique.


The configurator has global scope and it is possible to reference all defined named elements from all Validate and IsVisible functions. That’s the reason all parameters and parametergroups is instantiated with a named reference(ex. var name = new…).


There is no UI related code in the generated code.

Some small snippet from code generated files









All parameters and parametergroups are instantiated so validation and Isvisible methods can reference other parameters. They are all in global scope.

All IsVisible and Validate properties is defined as Func<bool> delegates, because they are defined in the configuration and not in the static parameter class.

The static method ConfigurationBuilder.Build() creates an instance of the configuration model.


### Client UI

The UI is build in xaml(which is a domain specific language ☺)


The configuration UI is created from a ListView Control.




In the view constructor the configurator model is instantiated.   
Next the BuildListView method recursively traverse the model so every parameter and groupparameter is binded to a ListViewItems datacontext and added to the listView.



A DataTemplateSelector decides how each parameter is rendered



DataTemplate for a string parameter



# Test methods and artefacts

## Test strategy

We have written tests covering the following parts of our project:

* Meta model: Tested through dynamic model instances.
* Parser: Testing grammar syntax.
* Constraints: Testing syntax that satisfies/violates the constraint in question.
* Code generators: Testing that different elements returns expected generated code.

We have written unit-tests for each part, which are all based on a known initial state / input (i.e. a test bench with a fixed input), and a confirmation that the tested element returns the expected output.

We have written unit tests which validates valid input, or (correctly) invalidates invalid input. Thus, we have both positive and negative test cases.

We have focused on making each unit test as small as possible, in order to give a detailed overview of the test results. This gives a clear indication for any possible test errors.

We are aware that unit tests cannot stand alone as a full test of the developed feature. An easy way extend the system tests would be to perform a compilation of the generated code (if the generated code needs to be compiled), subsequently performing an exploratory test of the final application which the user sees.

## Metamodel test case examples

**class** TestConstraints {

**def** **static** **dispatch** constraint(Configurator **it**) {

!parameters.empty && !name.empty

}

**def** **static** **dispatch** constraint(Parameter **it**) {

!name.empty

}

**def** **static** **dispatch** constraint(ParameterGroup **it**) {

!parameters.empty && !name.empty

}

**def** **static** **dispatch** constraint(Bounded **it**) {

**var** lBound = (lowerBound **as** dk.itu.smdp2015.church.model.configurator.Integer)

**var** uBound = (upperBound **as** dk.itu.smdp2015.church.model.configurator.Integer)

lBound.value < uBound.value

}

....

// Fallback

**def** **static** **dispatch** constraint(EObject **it**) {

**true**

}

}

## Grammar test case examples

**package** dk.itu.smdp2015.church.configurator.syntax.tests

// Imports removed

@RunWith(XtextRunner)

@InjectWith(ConfiguratorInjectorProvider)

**class** ConfiguratorGrammarTest {

@Inject **extension** ParseHelper<Configurator>

@Inject **extension** ValidationTestHelper

@Before

**def** **void** before() {

ConfiguratorPackage.*eINSTANCE*.eClass

}

@Test

**def** **void** testInvalidModelNoParameters() {

**var** model = '''configurator Empty'''.parse

model.assertError(ConfiguratorPackage.Literals.*CONFIGURATOR*, Diagnostic.*SYNTAX\_DIAGNOSTIC*, "mismatched input")

}

@Test

**def** **void** testValidBoundedRange() {

**var** model = '''configurator Bicycle "Bicycle configuration" { parameter wheel\_size values [16;24] }'''.parse

*assertEquals*("Bicycle configuration", model.description)

**var** param = model.parameters.get(0) **as** Parameter

*assertEquals*("wheel\_size", param.name)

**var** valueRange = param.valueRange **as** Bounded

*assertEquals*(16, (valueRange.lowerBound **as** IntegerImpl).value)

*assertEquals*(24, (valueRange.upperBound **as** IntegerImpl).value)

model.assertNoErrors

}

@Test

**def** **void** testInvalidBoundedRangeReverse() {

**var** model = '''configurator Bicycle { parameter wheel\_size values [24;16] }'''.parse

model.assertError(ConfiguratorPackage.Literals.*BOUNDED*, ConfiguratorValidator.*INVALID\_BOUND*, "Lower bound should be less than upper bound")

}

@Test

**def** **void** testInvalidBoundedRangeWrongTypes() {

**var** model = '''configurator Bicycle { parameter wheel\_size values [b;16] }'''.parse

model.assertError(ConfiguratorPackage.Literals.*BOUNDED*, ConfiguratorValidator.*WRONG\_TYPE*, "expected the same type")

}

@Test

**def** **void** testValidEnum() {

**var** model = '''configurator Car { parameter Variant values ("Standard", "Sport", "Luxury") }'''.parse

*assertNull*(model.description)

**var** param = model.parameters.get(0) **as** Parameter

*assertEquals*("Variant", param.name)

*assertFalse*(param.optional)

**var** enumerated = param.valueRange **as** Enumerated

*assertEquals*(3, enumerated.values.*length*)

*assertEquals*("Standard", (enumerated.values.get(0) **as** StringImpl).value)

*assertEquals*("Sport", (enumerated.values.get(1) **as** StringImpl).value)

*assertEquals*("Luxury", (enumerated.values.get(2) **as** StringImpl).value)

model.assertNoErrors

}

@Test

**def** **void** testInvalidEnumWrongElement() {

**var** model = '''configurator Car { parameter Variant values ("Standard", "Sport", Luxury) }'''.parse

model.assertError(ConfiguratorPackage.Literals.*ENUMERATED*, ConfiguratorValidator.*INVALID\_ENUMERATION*, "Enumerated item should be a constant")

}

// .....

}


## Code generators test case examples

### 1. Overview of HTML5 mobile web client


Here we only show the jUnit tests for the html generator part. The test case are divided into a dymanic html generator and a static html generator.

First we show an overview of the passing tests as the present themselves in the Eclipse IDE.

### Test of dynamic html generation



### Test of static html generation



Then an explanation of how the testcode is built up.

|  |
| --- |
| Sample code showing some sample dynamic html test case. We make heavily use of Xtends ability to do chained method calls, increasing readability of the code.  All tests are build using the same pattern:  1. Arrange part  An input DSL string, just containing the essential part for test case at hand.  This test input are processed by adding boilerplate prefix (‘configuration someConfiguratorName’), and then parsed into an instance of our metamodel.  Then we select the part of the metamodel instance that are relevant for the test case (the parameter object in this case)  2. Act part  Here we call the .compileParameterLink which is the method being tested here.  3. Assert part  We test the returned string with an expected, string. Since it is html we cant compile it. The test case asserts not only that the semantics of the html is correct, but also that the generated is human readable and indented correctly. |
| @Test  **def** **void** testParameterLink\_RendersAsListItem(){    '{parameter test values (0;10)}'.addPrefix.parse.firstParam  .compileParameterLink  .assertHtmlWithExpectedOutput(  '''<li>  <label for="test-param" >test:</label>  <select id="test-param" data-bind="options: test.choices, selectedOptions: test.value,optionsCaption:'Choose...'"></select>  <p class="validationMessage" data-bind="validationMessage: test.value"></p>  </li>  ''')    } |

|  |
| --- |
| All boiler plate code are put in an abstract base class, and the the actual test class contains only a reference to class under test, and the test cases. |
| **class** TestDynamicJqmHtmlGenerator **extends** BaseTestJqmGenerator{  @Inject **extension** JqmHtmlGenerator //Sut    @Test  **def** **void** testConfigDescription\_rendersAsMainSection(){    'configurator app "main app description"{}'.parse  .renderAppDescription  .assertHtmlWithExpectedOutput(  '''<section class="main-description">  main app description  </section>  ''')    } |