

```
{() => fs}
```



b Testing the backend

We will now start writing tests for the backend. Since the backend does not contain any complicated logic, it doesn't make sense to write unit tests for it. The only potential thing we could unit test is the `toJSON` method that is used for formatting notes.

In some situations, it can be beneficial to implement some of the backend tests by mocking the database instead of using a real database. One library that could be used for this is mongodb-memory-server.

Since our application's backend is still relatively simple, we will decide to test the entire application through its REST API, so that the database is also included. This kind of testing where multiple components of the system are being tested as a group is called integration testing.

Test environment

In one of the previous chapters of the course material, we mentioned that when your backend server is running in Fly.io or Render, it is in *production* mode.

The convention in Node is to define the execution mode of the application with the `NODE_ENV` environment variable. In our current application, we only load the environment variables defined in the `.env` file if the application is *not* in production mode.

It is common practice to define separate modes for development and testing.

Next, let's change the scripts in our notes application `package.json` file, so that when tests are run, `NODE_ENV` gets the value `test`:

```
{
  // ...
  "scripts": {
    "start": "NODE_ENV=production node index.js",
    "dev": "NODE_ENV=development nodemon index.js",
    "build:ui": "rm -rf build && cd ../frontend/ && npm run build && cp -r build
../backend",
    "deploy": "fly deploy",
    "deploy:full": "npm run build:ui && npm run deploy",
    "logs:prod": "fly logs",
    "lint": "eslint .",
    "test": "NODE_ENV=test jest --verbose --runInBand"
  },
  // ...
}
```

copy

We also added the `runInBand` option to the npm script that executes the tests. This option will prevent Jest from running tests in parallel; we will discuss its significance once our tests start using the database.

We specified the mode of the application to be *development* in the `npm run dev` script that uses nodemon. We also specified that the default `npm start` command will define the mode as *production*.

There is a slight issue in the way that we have specified the mode of the application in our scripts: it will not work on Windows. We can correct this by installing the `cross-env` package as a development dependency with the command:

```
npm install --save-dev cross-env
```

copy

We can then achieve cross-platform compatibility by using the `cross-env` library in our npm scripts defined in `package.json`:

```
{
  // ...
  "scripts": {
    "start": "cross-env NODE_ENV=production node index.js",
    "dev": "cross-env NODE_ENV=development nodemon index.js",
    // ...
    "test": "cross-env NODE_ENV=test jest --verbose --runInBand",
  },
  // ...
}
```

copy

NB: If you are deploying this application to Fly.io/Render, keep in mind that if cross-env is saved as a development dependency, it would cause an application error on your web server. To fix this, change cross-env to a production dependency by running this in the command line:

```
npm install cross-env
```

[copy](#)

Now we can modify the way that our application runs in different modes. As an example of this, we could define the application to use a separate test database when it is running tests.

We can create our separate test database in MongoDB Atlas. This is not an optimal solution in situations where many people are developing the same application. Test execution in particular typically requires a single database instance that is not used by tests that are running concurrently.

It would be better to run our tests using a database that is installed and running on the developer's local machine. The optimal solution would be to have every test execution use a separate database. This is "relatively simple" to achieve by running Mongo in-memory or by using Docker containers. We will not complicate things and will instead continue to use the MongoDB Atlas database.

Let's make some changes to the module that defines the application's configuration:

```
require('dotenv').config()

const PORT = process.env.PORT

const MONGODB_URI = process.env.NODE_ENV === 'test'
  ? process.env.TEST_MONGODB_URI
  : process.env.MONGODB_URI

module.exports = {
  MONGODB_URI,
  PORT
}
```

[copy](#)

The .env file has *separate variables* for the database addresses of the development and test databases:

```
MONGODB_URI=mongodb+srv://fullstack:<password>@cluster0.o1opl.mongodb.net/noteApp?
retryWrites=true&w=majority
PORT=3001

TEST_MONGODB_URI=mongodb+srv://fullstack:
<password>@cluster0.o1opl.mongodb.net/testNoteApp?retryWrites=true&w=majority
```

[copy](#)

The `config` module that we have implemented slightly resembles the node-config package. Writing our implementation is justified since our application is simple, and also because it teaches us valuable

lessons.

These are the only changes we need to make to our application's code.

You can find the code for our current application in its entirety in the *part4-2* branch of [this GitHub repository](#).

supertest

Let's use the [supertest](#) package to help us write our tests for testing the API.

We will install the package as a development dependency:

```
npm install --save-dev supertest
```

[copy](#)

Let's write our first test in the *tests/note_api.test.js* file:

```
const mongoose = require('mongoose')
const supertest = require('supertest')
const app = require('../app')

const api = supertest(app)

test('notes are returned as json', async () => {
  await api
    .get('/api/notes')
    .expect(200)
    .expect('Content-Type', /application\/json/)
})

afterAll(async () => {
  await mongoose.connection.close()
})
```

[copy](#)

The test imports the Express application from the *app.js* module and wraps it with the *supertest* function into a so-called [superagent](#) object. This object is assigned to the *api* variable and tests can use it for making HTTP requests to the backend.

Our test makes an HTTP GET request to the *api/notes* url and verifies that the request is responded to with the status code 200. The test also verifies that the *Content-Type* header is set to *application/json*, indicating that the data is in the desired format.

Checking the value of the header uses a bit strange looking syntax:

```
.expect('Content-Type', /application\/json/)
```

[copy](#)

The desired value is now defined as regular expression or in short regex. The regex starts and ends with a slash /, because the desired string *application/json* also contains the same slash, it is preceded by a \ so that it is not interpreted as a regex termination character.

In principle, the test could also have been defined as a string

```
.expect('Content-Type', 'application/json')
```

[copy](#)

The problem here, however, is that when using a string, the value of the header must be exactly the same. For the regex we defined, it is acceptable that the header *contains* the string in question. The actual value of the header is *application/json; charset=utf-8*, i.e. it also contains information about character encoding. However, our test is not interested in this and therefore it is better to define the test as a regex instead of an exact string.

The test contains some details that we will explore a bit later on. The arrow function that defines the test is preceded by the *async* keyword and the method call for the *api* object is preceded by the *await* keyword. We will write a few tests and then take a closer look at this *async/await* magic. Do not concern yourself with them for now, just be assured that the example tests work correctly. The *async/await* syntax is related to the fact that making a request to the API is an *asynchronous* operation. The async/await syntax can be used for writing asynchronous code with the appearance of synchronous code.

Once all the tests (there is currently only one) have finished running we have to close the database connection used by Mongoose. This can be easily achieved with the afterAll method:

```
afterAll(async () => {  
  await mongoose.connection.close()  
})
```

[copy](#)

When running your tests you may run across the following console warning:

Jest did not exit one second after the test run has completed.

This usually means that there are asynchronous operations that weren't stopped in your tests. Consider running Jest with `--detectOpenHandles` to troubleshoot this issue.

The problem is quite likely caused by the Mongoose version 6.x, the problem does not appear when version 5.x or 7.x is used. Mongoose documentation does not recommend testing Mongoose applications with Jest.

One way to get rid of this is to add to the directory *tests* a file *teardown.js* with the following content

```
module.exports = () => {  
  process.exit(0)  
}
```

[copy](#)

}

and by extending the Jest definitions in the *package.json* as follows

```
{
  //...
  "jest": {
    "testEnvironment": "node",
    "globalTeardown": "./tests/teardown.js"
  }
}
```

copy

Another error you may come across is your test takes longer than the default Jest test timeout of 5000 ms. This can be solved by adding a third parameter to the test function:

```
test('notes are returned as json', async () => {
  await api
    .get('/api/notes')
    .expect(200)
    .expect('Content-Type', /application\/json/)
}, 100000)
```

copy

This third parameter sets the timeout to 100000 ms. A long timeout ensures that our test won't fail due to the time it takes to run. (A long timeout may not be what you want for tests based on performance or speed, but this is fine for our example tests).

If you still encounter issues with mongoose timeouts, set `bufferTimeoutMS` variable to a value significantly higher than 10000 (10 seconds). You could set it like this at the top, right after the `require` statements. `mongoose.set("bufferTimeoutMS", 30000)`

One tiny but important detail: at the beginning of this part we extracted the Express application into the *app.js* file, and the role of the *index.js* file was changed to launch the application at the specified port via `app.listen`:

```
const app = require('./app') // the actual Express app
const config = require('./utils/config')
const logger = require('./utils/logger')

app.listen(config.PORT, () => {
  logger.info(`Server running on port ${config.PORT}`)
})
```

copy

The tests only use the Express application defined in the *app.js* file, which does not listen to any ports:

```
const mongoose = require('mongoose')
const supertest = require('supertest')
const app = require('../app')

const api = supertest(app)

// ...
```

copy

The documentation for supertest says the following:

if the server is not already listening for connections then it is bound to an ephemeral port for you so there is no need to keep track of ports.

In other words, supertest takes care that the application being tested is started at the port that it uses internally.

Let's add two notes to the test database using the `mongo.js` program (here we must remember to switch to the correct database url).

Let's write a few more tests:

```
test('there are two notes', async () => {
  const response = await api.get('/api/notes')

  expect(response.body).toHaveLength(2)
})

test('the first note is about HTTP methods', async () => {
  const response = await api.get('/api/notes')

  expect(response.body[0].content).toBe('HTML is easy')
})
```

copy

Both tests store the response of the request to the `response` variable, and unlike the previous test that used the methods provided by `supertest` for verifying the status code and headers, this time we are inspecting the response data stored in `response.body` property. Our tests verify the format and content of the response data with the expect method of Jest.

The benefit of using the `async/await` syntax is starting to become evident. Normally we would have to use callback functions to access the data returned by promises, but with the new syntax things are a lot more comfortable:

```
const response = await api.get('/api/notes')

// execution gets here only after the HTTP request is complete
```

copy

```
// the result of HTTP request is saved in variable response
expect(response.body).toHaveLength(2)
```

The middleware that outputs information about the HTTP requests is obstructing the test execution output. Let us modify the logger so that it does not print to the console in test mode:

```
const info = (...params) => {
  if (process.env.NODE_ENV !== 'test') {
    console.log(...params)
  }
}

const error = (...params) => {
  if (process.env.NODE_ENV !== 'test') {
    console.error(...params)
  }
}

module.exports = {
  info, error
}
```

[copy](#)

Initializing the database before tests

Testing appears to be easy and our tests are currently passing. However, our tests are bad as they are dependent on the state of the database, that now happens to have two notes. To make our tests more robust, we have to reset the database and generate the needed test data in a controlled manner before we run the tests.

Our tests are already using the afterAll function of Jest to close the connection to the database after the tests are finished executing. Jest offers many other functions that can be used for executing operations once before any test is run or every time before a test is run.

Let's initialize the database *before every test* with the beforeEach function:

```
const mongoose = require('mongoose')
const supertest = require('supertest')
const app = require('../app')
const api = supertest(app)
const Note = require('../models/note')

const initialNotes = [
  {
    content: 'HTML is easy',
    important: false,
  },
  {
    content: 'Browser can execute only JavaScript',
    important: true,
  },
]
```

[copy](#)


```

    },
  ]

  beforeEach(async () => {
    await Note.deleteMany({})
    let noteObject = new Note(initialNotes[0])
    await noteObject.save()
    noteObject = new Note(initialNotes[1])
    await noteObject.save()
  })
  // ...

```

The database is cleared out at the beginning, and after that, we save the two notes stored in the `initialNotes` array to the database. By doing this, we ensure that the database is in the same state before every test is run.

Let's also make the following changes to the last two tests:

```

test('all notes are returned', async () => {
  const response = await api.get('/api/notes')

  expect(response.body).toHaveLength(initialNotes.length)
})

test('a specific note is within the returned notes', async () => {
  const response = await api.get('/api/notes')

  const contents = response.body.map(r => r.content)
  expect(contents).toContain(
    'Browser can execute only JavaScript'
  )
})

```

[copy](#)

Pay special attention to the expect in the latter test. The `response.body.map(r => r.content)` command is used to create an array containing the content of every note returned by the API. The `toContain` method is used for checking that the note given to it as a parameter is in the list of notes returned by the API.

Running tests one by one

The `npm test` command executes all of the tests for the application. When we are writing tests, it is usually wise to only execute one or two tests. Jest offers a few different ways of accomplishing this, one of which is the `only` method. If tests are written across many files, this method is not great.

A better option is to specify the tests that need to be run as parameters of the `npm test` command.

The following command only runs the tests found in the `tests/note_api.test.js` file:

```
npm test -- tests/note_api.test.js
```

[copy](#)

The `-t` option can be used for running tests with a specific name:

```
npm test -- -t "a specific note is within the returned notes"
```

[copy](#)

The provided parameter can refer to the name of the test or the describe block. The parameter can also contain just a part of the name. The following command will run all of the tests that contain *notes* in their name:

```
npm test -- -t 'notes'
```

[copy](#)

NB: When running a single test, the mongoose connection might stay open if no tests using the connection are run. The problem might be because supertest primes the connection, but Jest does not run the `afterAll` portion of the code.

async/await

Before we write more tests let's take a look at the `async` and `await` keywords.

The `async/await` syntax that was introduced in ES7 makes it possible to use *asynchronous functions that return a promise* in a way that makes the code look synchronous.

As an example, the fetching of notes from the database with promises looks like this:

```
Note.find({}).then(notes => {  
  console.log('operation returned the following notes', notes)  
})
```

[copy](#)

The `Note.find()` method returns a promise and we can access the result of the operation by registering a callback function with the `then` method.

All of the code we want to execute once the operation finishes is written in the callback function. If we wanted to make several asynchronous function calls in sequence, the situation would soon become painful. The asynchronous calls would have to be made in the callback. This would likely lead to complicated code and could potentially give birth to a so-called callback hell.

By chaining promises we could keep the situation somewhat under control, and avoid callback hell by creating a fairly clean chain of `then` method calls. We have seen a few of these during the course. To

illustrate this, you can view an artificial example of a function that fetches all notes and then deletes the first one:

```
Note.find({})
  .then(notes => {
    return notes[0].deleteOne()
  })
  .then(response => {
    console.log('the first note is removed')
    // more code here
  })
```

[copy](#)

The then-chain is alright, but we can do better. The generator functions introduced in ES6 provided a clever way of writing asynchronous code in a way that "looks synchronous". The syntax is a bit clunky and not widely used.

The `async` and `await` keywords introduced in ES7 bring the same functionality as the generators, but in an understandable and syntactically cleaner way to the hands of all citizens of the JavaScript world.

We could fetch all of the notes in the database by utilizing the await operator like this:

```
const notes = await Note.find({})

console.log('operation returned the following notes', notes)
```

[copy](#)

The code looks exactly like synchronous code. The execution of code pauses at `const notes = await Note.find({})` and waits until the related promise is *fulfilled*, and then continues its execution to the next line. When the execution continues, the result of the operation that returned a promise is assigned to the `notes` variable.

The slightly complicated example presented above could be implemented by using `await` like this:

```
const notes = await Note.find({})
const response = await notes[0].deleteOne()

console.log('the first note is removed')
```

[copy](#)

Thanks to the new syntax, the code is a lot simpler than the previous then-chain.

There are a few important details to pay attention to when using `async/await` syntax. To use the `await` operator with asynchronous operations, they have to return a promise. This is not a problem as such, as regular asynchronous functions using callbacks are easy to wrap around promises.

The `await` keyword can't be used just anywhere in JavaScript code. Using `await` is possible only inside of an async function.

This means that in order for the previous examples to work, they have to be using async functions. Notice the first line in the arrow function definition:

```
const main = async () => {  
  const notes = await Note.find({})  
  console.log('operation returned the following notes', notes)  
  
  const response = await notes[0].deleteOne()  
  console.log('the first note is removed')  
}  
  
main()
```

[copy](#)

The code declares that the function assigned to `main` is asynchronous. After this, the code calls the function with `main()`.

async/await in the backend

Let's start to change the backend to `async` and `await`. As all of the asynchronous operations are currently done inside of a function, it is enough to change the route handler functions into `async` functions.

The route for fetching all notes gets changed to the following:

```
notesRouter.get('/', async (request, response) => {  
  const notes = await Note.find({})  
  response.json(notes)  
})
```

[copy](#)

We can verify that our refactoring was successful by testing the endpoint through the browser and by running the tests that we wrote earlier.

You can find the code for our current application in its entirety in the *part4-3* branch of this GitHub repository.

More tests and refactoring the backend

When code gets refactored, there is always the risk of regression, meaning that existing functionality may break. Let's refactor the remaining operations by first writing a test for each route of the API.

Let's start with the operation for adding a new note. Let's write a test that adds a new note and verifies that the number of notes returned by the API increases and that the newly added note is in the list.

```
test('a valid note can be added', async () => {
  const newNote = {
    content: 'async/await simplifies making async calls',
    important: true,
  }

  await api
    .post('/api/notes')
    .send(newNote)
    .expect(201)
    .expect('Content-Type', /application\/json/)

  const response = await api.get('/api/notes')

  const contents = response.body.map(r => r.content)

  expect(response.body).toHaveLength(initialNotes.length + 1)
  expect(contents).toContain(
    'async/await simplifies making async calls'
  )
})
```

copy

Test fails since we are by accident returning the status code *200 OK* when a new note is created. Let us change that to *201 CREATED*:

```
notesRouter.post('/', (request, response, next) => {
  const body = request.body

  const note = new Note({
    content: body.content,
    important: body.important || false,
  })

  note.save()
    .then(savedNote => {
      response.status(201).json(savedNote)
    })
    .catch(error => next(error))
})
```

copy

Let's also write a test that verifies that a note without content will not be saved into the database.

```
test('note without content is not added', async () => {
  const newNote = {
    important: true
  }

  await api
```

copy

```

    .post('/api/notes')
    .send(newNote)
    .expect(400)

    const response = await api.get('/api/notes')

    expect(response.body).toHaveLength(initialNotes.length)
  })

```

Both tests check the state stored in the database after the saving operation, by fetching all the notes of the application.

```
const response = await api.get('/api/notes')
```

copy

The same verification steps will repeat in other tests later on, and it is a good idea to extract these steps into helper functions. Let's add the function into a new file called *tests/test_helper.js* which is in the same directory as the test file.

```

const Note = require('../models/note')

const initialNotes = [
  {
    content: 'HTML is easy',
    important: false
  },
  {
    content: 'Browser can execute only JavaScript',
    important: true
  }
]

const nonExistingId = async () => {
  const note = new Note({ content: 'willremovethissoon' })
  await note.save()
  await note.deleteOne()

  return note._id.toString()
}

const notesInDb = async () => {
  const notes = await Note.find({})
  return notes.map(note => note.toJSON())
}

module.exports = {
  initialNotes, nonExistingId, notesInDb
}

```

copy

The module defines the `notesInDb` function that can be used for checking the notes stored in the database. The `initialNotes` array containing the initial database state is also in the module. We also define the `nonExistingId` function ahead of time, which can be used for creating a database object ID that does not belong to any note object in the database.

Our tests can now use the helper module and be changed like this:

```
const supertest = require('supertest')
const mongoose = require('mongoose')
const helper = require('../test_helper')
const app = require('../app')
const api = supertest(app)

const Note = require('../models/note')

beforeEach(async () => {
  await Note.deleteMany({})

  let noteObject = new Note(helper.initialNotes[0])
  await noteObject.save()

  noteObject = new Note(helper.initialNotes[1])
  await noteObject.save()
})

test('notes are returned as json', async () => {
  await api
    .get('/api/notes')
    .expect(200)
    .expect('Content-Type', /application\/json/)
})

test('all notes are returned', async () => {
  const response = await api.get('/api/notes')

  expect(response.body).toHaveLength(helper.initialNotes.length)
})

test('a specific note is within the returned notes', async () => {
  const response = await api.get('/api/notes')

  const contents = response.body.map(r => r.content)

  expect(contents).toContain(
    'Browser can execute only JavaScript'
  )
})

test('a valid note can be added ', async () => {
  const newNote = {
    content: 'async/await simplifies making async calls',
    important: true,
```

[copy](#)

```

    }

    await api
      .post('/api/notes')
      .send(newNote)
      .expect(201)
      .expect('Content-Type', /application\/json/)

    const notesAtEnd = await helper.notesInDb()
    expect(notesAtEnd).toHaveLength(helper.initialNotes.length + 1)

    const contents = notesAtEnd.map(n => n.content)
    expect(contents).toContain(
      'async/await simplifies making async calls'
    )
  })

test('note without content is not added', async () => {
  const newNote = {
    important: true
  }

  await api
    .post('/api/notes')
    .send(newNote)
    .expect(400)

  const notesAtEnd = await helper.notesInDb()

  expect(notesAtEnd).toHaveLength(helper.initialNotes.length)
})

afterAll(async () => {
  await mongoose.connection.close()
})

```

The code using promises works and the tests pass. We are ready to refactor our code to use the `async/await` syntax.

We make the following changes to the code that takes care of adding a new note (notice that the route handler definition is preceded by the `async` keyword):

```

notesRouter.post('/', async (request, response, next) => {
  const body = request.body

  const note = new Note({
    content: body.content,
    important: body.important || false,
  })

  const savedNote = await note.save()

```

[copy](#)


```
response.status(201).json(savedNote)
})
```

There's a slight problem with our code: we don't handle error situations. How should we deal with them?

Error handling and async/await

If there's an exception while handling the POST request we end up in a familiar situation:

```
Method: POST
Path: /api/notes
Body: { important: true }
---
(node:89372) UnhandledPromiseRejectionWarning: ValidationError: Note validation failed: content: Path `content` is
required.
    at new ValidationError (/Users/mluukkai/opetus/_2019fullstack-koodit/osa3/notes-backend/node_modules/mongoose/
lib/error/validation.js:30:11)
    at model.Document.invalidate (/Users/mluukkai/opetus/_2019fullstack-koodit/osa3/notes-backend/node_modules/mon
goose/lib/document.js:2071:32)
    at p.doValidate.skipSchemaValidators (/Users/mluukkai/opetus/_2019fullstack-koodit/osa3/notes-backend/node_mod
ules/mongoose/lib/document.js:1934:17)
    at /Users/mluukkai/opetus/_2019fullstack-koodit/osa3/notes-backend/node_modules/mongoose/lib/schematype.js:929
:9
    at process._tickCallback (internal/process/next_tick.js:172:11)
(node:89372) UnhandledPromiseRejectionWarning: Unhandled promise rejection. This error originated either by throwi
```

In other words, we end up with an unhandled promise rejection, and the request never receives a response.

With async/await the recommended way of dealing with exceptions is the old and familiar `try/catch` mechanism:

```
notesRouter.post('/', async (request, response, next) => {
  const body = request.body

  const note = new Note({
    content: body.content,
    important: body.important || false,
  })
  try {
    const savedNote = await note.save()
    response.status(201).json(savedNote)
  } catch(exception) {
    next(exception)
  }
})
```

copy

The catch block simply calls the `next` function, which passes the request handling to the error handling middleware.

After making the change, all of our tests will pass once again.

Next, let's write tests for fetching and removing an individual note:

```
test('a specific note can be viewed', async () => {
  const notesAtStart = await helper.notesInDb()

  const noteToView = notesAtStart[0]

  const resultNote = await api
    .get(`/api/notes/${noteToView.id}`)
    .expect(200)
    .expect('Content-Type', /application\/json/)

  expect(resultNote.body).toEqual(noteToView)
})

test('a note can be deleted', async () => {
  const notesAtStart = await helper.notesInDb()
  const noteToDelete = notesAtStart[0]

  await api
    .delete(`/api/notes/${noteToDelete.id}`)
    .expect(204)

  const notesAtEnd = await helper.notesInDb()

  expect(notesAtEnd).toHaveLength(
    helper.initialNotes.length - 1
  )

  const contents = notesAtEnd.map(r => r.content)

  expect(contents).not.toContain(noteToDelete.content)
})
```

[copy](#)

Both tests share a similar structure. In the initialization phase, they fetch a note from the database. After this, the tests call the actual operation being tested, which is highlighted in the code block. Lastly, the tests verify that the outcome of the operation is as expected.

The tests pass and we can safely refactor the tested routes to use `async/await`:

```
notesRouter.get('/:id', async (request, response, next) => {
  try {
    const note = await Note.findById(request.params.id)
    if (note) {
      response.json(note)
    } else {
      response.status(404).end()
    }
  } catch(exception) {
    next(exception)
  }
})
```

[copy](#)

```
}  
})  
  
notesRouter.delete('/:id', async (request, response, next) => {  
  try {  
    await Note.findByIdAndDelete(request.params.id)  
    response.status(204).end()  
  } catch(exception) {  
    next(exception)  
  }  
})
```

You can find the code for our current application in its entirety in the *part4-4* branch of [this GitHub repository](#).

Eliminating the try-catch

Async/await unclutters the code a bit, but the 'price' is the *try/catch* structure required for catching exceptions. All of the route handlers follow the same structure

```
try {  
  // do the async operations here  
} catch(exception) {  
  next(exception)  
}
```

[copy](#)

One starts to wonder if it would be possible to refactor the code to eliminate the *catch* from the methods?

The [express-async-errors](#) library has a solution for this.

Let's install the library

```
npm install express-async-errors
```

[copy](#)

Using the library is *very* easy. You introduce the library in *app.js*, before you import your routes:

```
const config = require('./utils/config')  
const express = require('express')  
require('express-async-errors')  
const app = express()  
const cors = require('cors')  
const notesRouter = require('./controllers/notes')  
const middleware = require('./utils/middleware')  
const logger = require('./utils/logger')  
const mongoose = require('mongoose')
```

[copy](#)

```
// ...
```

```
module.exports = app
```

The 'magic' of the library allows us to eliminate the try-catch blocks completely. For example the route for deleting a note

```
notesRouter.delete('/:id', async (request, response, next) => {  
  try {  
    await Note.findByIdAndDelete(request.params.id)  
    response.status(204).end()  
  } catch (exception) {  
    next(exception)  
  }  
})
```

[copy](#)

becomes

```
notesRouter.delete('/:id', async (request, response) => {  
  await Note.findByIdAndDelete(request.params.id)  
  response.status(204).end()  
})
```

[copy](#)

Because of the library, we do not need the `next(exception)` call anymore. The library handles everything under the hood. If an exception occurs in an *async* route, the execution is automatically passed to the error handling middleware.

The other routes become:

```
notesRouter.post('/', async (request, response) => {  
  const body = request.body  
  
  const note = new Note({  
    content: body.content,  
    important: body.important || false,  
  })  
  
  const savedNote = await note.save()  
  response.status(201).json(savedNote)  
})  
  
notesRouter.get('/:id', async (request, response) => {  
  const note = await Note.findById(request.params.id)  
  if (note) {  
    response.json(note)  
  } else {
```

[copy](#)

```
    response.status(404).end()  
  }  
})
```

Optimizing the beforeEach function

Let's return to writing our tests and take a closer look at the `beforeEach` function that sets up the tests:

```
beforeEach(async () => {  
  await Note.deleteMany({})  
  
  let noteObject = new Note(helper.initialNotes[0])  
  await noteObject.save()  
  
  noteObject = new Note(helper.initialNotes[1])  
  await noteObject.save()  
})
```

[copy](#)

The function saves the first two notes from the `helper.initialNotes` array into the database with two separate operations. The solution is alright, but there's a better way of saving multiple objects to the database:

```
beforeEach(async () => {  
  await Note.deleteMany({})  
  console.log('cleared')  
  
  helper.initialNotes.forEach(async (note) => {  
    let noteObject = new Note(note)  
    await noteObject.save()  
    console.log('saved')  
  })  
  console.log('done')  
})  
  
test('notes are returned as json', async () => {  
  console.log('entered test')  
  // ...  
})
```

[copy](#)

We save the notes stored in the array into the database inside of a `forEach` loop. The tests don't quite seem to work however, so we have added some console logs to help us find the problem.

The console displays the following output:

```
cleared
done
entered test
saved
saved
```

[copy](#)

Despite our use of the `async/await` syntax, our solution does not work as we expected it to. The test execution begins before the database is initialized!

The problem is that every iteration of the `forEach` loop generates an asynchronous operation, and `beforeEach` won't wait for them to finish executing. In other words, the `await` commands defined inside of the `forEach` loop are not in the `beforeEach` function, but in separate functions that `beforeEach` will not wait for.

Since the execution of tests begins immediately after `beforeEach` has finished executing, the execution of tests begins before the database state is initialized.

One way of fixing this is to wait for all of the asynchronous operations to finish executing with the `Promise.all` method:

```
beforeEach(async () => {
  await Note.deleteMany({})

  const noteObjects = helper.initialNotes
    .map(note => new Note(note))
  const promiseArray = noteObjects.map(note => note.save())
  await Promise.all(promiseArray)
})
```

[copy](#)

The solution is quite advanced despite its compact appearance. The `noteObjects` variable is assigned to an array of Mongoose objects that are created with the `Note` constructor for each of the notes in the `helper.initialNotes` array. The next line of code creates a new array that *consists of promises*, that are created by calling the `save` method of each item in the `noteObjects` array. In other words, it is an array of promises for saving each of the items to the database.

The `Promise.all` method can be used for transforming an array of promises into a single promise, that will be *fulfilled* once every promise in the array passed to it as a parameter is resolved. The last line of code `await Promise.all(promiseArray)` waits until every promise for saving a note is finished, meaning that the database has been initialized.

The returned values of each promise in the array can still be accessed when using the `Promise.all` method. If we wait for the promises to be resolved with the `await` syntax `const results = await Promise.all(promiseArray)`, the operation will return an array that contains the resolved values for each promise in the `promiseArray`, and they appear in the same order as the promises in the array.

Promise.all executes the promises it receives in parallel. If the promises need to be executed in a particular order, this will be problematic. In situations like this, the operations can be executed inside of a for...of block, that guarantees a specific execution order.

```
beforeEach(async () => {  
  await Note.deleteMany({})  
  
  for (let note of helper.initialNotes) {  
    let noteObject = new Note(note)  
    await noteObject.save()  
  }  
})
```

[copy](#)

The asynchronous nature of JavaScript can lead to surprising behavior, and for this reason, it is important to pay careful attention when using the async/await syntax. Even though the syntax makes it easier to deal with promises, it is still necessary to understand how promises work!

The code for our application can be found on GitHub, branch *part4-5*.

A true full stack developer's oath

Making tests brings yet another layer of challenge to programming. We have to update our full stack developer oath to remind you that systematicity is also key when developing tests.

So we should once more extend our oath:

Full stack development is *extremely hard*, that is why I will use all the possible means to make it easier

- I will have my browser developer console open all the time
- I will use the network tab of the browser dev tools to ensure that frontend and backend are communicating as I expect
- I will constantly keep an eye on the state of the server to make sure that the data sent there by the frontend is saved there as I expect
- I will keep an eye on the database: does the backend save data there in the right format
- I will progress in small steps
- *I will write lots of console.log statements to make sure I understand how the code and the tests behave and to help pinpoint problems*
- If my code does not work, I will not write more code. Instead, I start deleting the code until it works or just return to a state when everything was still working
- *If a test does not pass, I make sure that the tested functionality for sure works in the application*
- When I ask for help in the course Discord or Telegram channel or elsewhere I formulate my questions properly, see here how to ask for help

Exercises 4.8.-4.12.

NB: the material uses the `toContain` matcher in several places to verify that an array contains a specific element. It's worth noting that the method uses the `===` operator for comparing and matching elements, which means that it is often not well-suited for matching objects. In most cases, the appropriate method for verifying objects in arrays is the `toContainEqual` matcher. However, the model solutions don't check for objects in arrays with matchers, so using the method is not required for solving the exercises.

Warning: If you find yourself using `async/await` and `then` methods in the same code, it is almost guaranteed that you are doing something wrong. Use one or the other and don't mix the two.

4.8: Blog list tests, step1

Use the `supertest` package for writing a test that makes an HTTP GET request to the `/api/blogs` URL. Verify that the blog list application returns the correct amount of blog posts in the JSON format.

Once the test is finished, refactor the route handler to use the `async/await` syntax instead of promises.

Notice that you will have to make similar changes to the code that were made in the material, like defining the test environment so that you can write tests that use separate databases.

NB: When running the tests, you may run into the following warning:

```
console.warn node_modules/mongoose/lib/helpers/printJestWarning.js:4
Mongoose: looks like you're trying to test a Mongoose app with Jest's default jsdom test environment. Please make sure you read Mongoose's docs on configuring Jest to test Node.js apps: http://mongoosejs.com/docs/jest.html
```

One way to get rid of this is to add to the `tests` directory a file `teardown.js` with the following content

```
module.exports = () => {
  process.exit(0)
}
```

[copy](#)

and by extending the Jest definitions in the `package.json` as follows

```
{
  //...
  "jest": {
    "testEnvironment": "node",
    "globalTeardown": "./tests/teardown.js"
  }
}
```

[copy](#)


```
}  
}
```

NB: when you are writing your tests *it is better to not execute all of your tests*, only execute the ones you are working on. Read more about this [here](#).

4.9: Blog list tests, step2

Write a test that verifies that the unique identifier property of the blog posts is named *id*, by default the database names the property *_id*. Verifying the existence of a property is easily done with Jest's `toBeDefined` matcher.

Make the required changes to the code so that it passes the test. The `toJSON` method discussed in part 3 is an appropriate place for defining the *id* parameter.

4.10: Blog list tests, step3

Write a test that verifies that making an HTTP POST request to the `/api/blogs` URL successfully creates a new blog post. At the very least, verify that the total number of blogs in the system is increased by one. You can also verify that the content of the blog post is saved correctly to the database.

Once the test is finished, refactor the operation to use `async/await` instead of promises.

4.11*: Blog list tests, step4

Write a test that verifies that if the *likes* property is missing from the request, it will default to the value 0. Do not test the other properties of the created blogs yet.

Make the required changes to the code so that it passes the test.

4.12*: Blog list tests, step5

Write tests related to creating new blogs via the `/api/blogs` endpoint, that verify that if the *title* or *url* properties are missing from the request data, the backend responds to the request with the status code *400 Bad Request*.

Make the required changes to the code so that it passes the test.

Refactoring tests

Our test coverage is currently lacking. Some requests like `GET /api/notes/:id` and `DELETE /api/notes/:id` aren't tested when the request is sent with an invalid id. The grouping and organization of tests could also use some improvement, as all tests exist on the same "top level" in the test file. The readability of the test would improve if we group related tests with *describe* blocks.

Below is an example of the test file after making some minor improvements:

```

const supertest = require('supertest')
const mongoose = require('mongoose')
const helper = require('./test_helper')
const app = require('../app')
const api = supertest(app)

const Note = require('../models/note')

beforeEach(async () => {
  await Note.deleteMany({})
  await Note.insertMany(helper.initialNotes)
})

describe('when there is initially some notes saved', () => {
  test('notes are returned as json', async () => {
    await api
      .get('/api/notes')
      .expect(200)
      .expect('Content-Type', /application\/json/)
  })

  test('all notes are returned', async () => {
    const response = await api.get('/api/notes')

    expect(response.body).toHaveLength(helper.initialNotes.length)
  })

  test('a specific note is within the returned notes', async () => {
    const response = await api.get('/api/notes')

    const contents = response.body.map(r => r.content)

    expect(contents).toContain(
      'Browser can execute only JavaScript'
    )
  })
})

describe('viewing a specific note', () => {
  test('succeeds with a valid id', async () => {
    const notesAtStart = await helper.notesInDb()

    const noteToView = notesAtStart[0]

    const resultNote = await api
      .get(`/api/notes/${noteToView.id}`)
      .expect(200)
      .expect('Content-Type', /application\/json/)

    expect(resultNote.body).toEqual(noteToView)
  })

  test('fails with statusCode 404 if note does not exist', async () => {
    const validNonexistingId = await helper.nonExistingId()
  })
})

```

```

    await api
      .get(`/api/notes/${validNonexistingId}`)
      .expect(404)
  })

  test('fails with statuscode 400 if id is invalid', async () => {
    const invalidId = '5a3d5da59070081a82a3445'

    await api
      .get(`/api/notes/${invalidId}`)
      .expect(400)
  })
})

describe('addition of a new note', () => {
  test('succeeds with valid data', async () => {
    const newNote = {
      content: 'async/await simplifies making async calls',
      important: true,
    }

    await api
      .post('/api/notes')
      .send(newNote)
      .expect(201)
      .expect('Content-Type', /application\/json/)

    const notesAtEnd = await helper.notesInDb()
    expect(notesAtEnd).toHaveLength(helper.initialNotes.length + 1)

    const contents = notesAtEnd.map(n => n.content)
    expect(contents).toContain(
      'async/await simplifies making async calls'
    )
  })

  test('fails with status code 400 if data invalid', async () => {
    const newNote = {
      important: true
    }

    await api
      .post('/api/notes')
      .send(newNote)
      .expect(400)

    const notesAtEnd = await helper.notesInDb()

    expect(notesAtEnd).toHaveLength(helper.initialNotes.length)
  })
})

describe('deletion of a note', () => {

```

```

test('succeeds with status code 204 if id is valid', async () => {
  const notesAtStart = await helper.notesInDb()
  const noteToDelete = notesAtStart[0]

  await api
    .delete(`/api/notes/${noteToDelete.id}`)
    .expect(204)

  const notesAtEnd = await helper.notesInDb()

  expect(notesAtEnd).toHaveLength(
    helper.initialNotes.length - 1
  )

  const contents = notesAtEnd.map(r => r.content)

  expect(contents).not.toContain(noteToDelete.content)
})

afterAll(async () => {
  await mongoose.connection.close()
})

```

The test output is grouped according to the *describe* blocks:

```

PASS tests/note_api.test.js (5.473s)
  when there is initially some notes saved
    ✓ notes are returned as json (1737ms)
    ✓ all notes are returned (180ms)
    ✓ a specific note is within the returned notes (208ms)
  viewing a specifin note
    ✓ succeeds with a valid id (226ms)
    ✓ fails with statuscode 404 if note does not exist (297ms)
    ✓ fails with statuscode 400 id is invalid invalid (114ms)
  addition of a new note
    ✓ succeeds with valid data (243ms)
    ✓ fails with status code 400 if data invaild (168ms)
  deletion of a note
    ✓ succeeds with status code 200 if id is valid (272ms)

```

There is still room for improvement, but it is time to move forward.

This way of testing the API, by making HTTP requests and inspecting the database with Mongoose, is by no means the only nor the best way of conducting API-level integration tests for server applications. There is no universal best way of writing tests, as it all depends on the application being tested and available resources.

You can find the code for our current application in its entirety in the *part4-6* branch of [this GitHub repository](https://github.com/fullstackopen/part4-6).

Exercises 4.13.-4.14.

4.13 Blog list expansions, step1

Implement functionality for deleting a single blog post resource.

Use the async/await syntax. Follow RESTful conventions when defining the HTTP API.

Implement tests for the functionality.

4.14 Blog list expansions, step2

Implement functionality for updating the information of an individual blog post.

Use async/await.

The application mostly needs to update the number of *likes* for a blog post. You can implement this functionality the same way that we implemented updating notes in part 3 .

Implement tests for the functionality.

Propose changes to material

Part 4a
Previous part

Part 4c
Next part

About course

Course contents

FAQ

Partners

Challenge



UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

