



L3 Mention Informatique Parcours Informatique et MIAGE

Génie Logiciel Avancé -Advanced Software Engineering White-Box Tests (Rev)

Burkhart Wolff wolff@lri.fr

 How can we test during development (at coding time, even at design-time ?)

- How can we test during development (at coding time, even at design-time ?)
- How can we test "systematically"?

- How can we test during development (at coding time, even at design-time ?)
- How can we test "systematically"?
 - What could be a test-generation method?

- How can we test during development (at coding time, even at design-time ?)
- How can we test "systematically"?
 - What could be a test-generation method?
 - What could be an algorithm to generate tests?

- How can we test during development (at coding time, even at design-time ?)
- How can we test "systematically"?
 - What could be a test-generation method?
 - What could be an algorithm to generate tests?
 - What could be a coverage criterion?
 (or: adequacy criterion, telling that we "tested enough")

Let's exploit the structure of the program !!!

(and not, as before in specification based tests ("black box"-tests), depend entirely on the spec).

Let's exploit the structure of the program !!!

(and not, as before in specification based tests ("black box"-tests), depend entirely on the spec).

 Assumption: Programmers make most likely errors in branching points of a program (Condition, While-Loop, ...), but get the program "in principle right". (Competent programmer assumption)

Let's exploit the structure of the program !!!

(and not, as before in specification based tests ("black box"-tests), depend entirely on the spec).

- Assumption: Programmers make most likely errors in branching points of a program (Condition, While-Loop, ...), but get the program "in principle right". (Competent programmer assumption)
- Lets develop a test method that exploits this !





we select "critical" paths



- we select "critical" paths
- specification used to verify the obtained resultants





Idea:

a path corresponds to <u>one</u> logical expression over initial values x_0 , y_0 , z_0 . corresponding to one test-case (comprising several test data ...)

 $\neg Cond_1(x_0, y_0, z_0) \land \neg Cond_2(x_0, y_0, z_0)$

We are interested either in edges (control flow), or in nodes (data flow)





Recall: This path-condition can be effectively constructed by a process called "symbolic execution

The notion of a "coverage criterion"

The notion of a "coverage criterion"

A coverage criterion is a function mapping a CFG to a particular subset of its paths ...

- the set of paths covering all basic blocks
- the set of paths covering all conditions
- the set with all loops are traversed
- a particular subset of calls/labels occurring in the CFG has been covered

•

Criterion C = AllInstructions(CFG):

For all nodes N in CFG (basic instructions or decisions) exists a path in C that contains N

Criterion C = AllTransitions(CFG):

For all arcs A in the CFG exists a path in C that uses A

Criterion C = AllPaths(CFG):

All possible paths ...

Criterion C = AllPaths(CFG):

All possible paths ...

⁽³⁾ Whenever there is a loop, C is infinite !

Criterion C = AllPaths(CFG):

All possible paths ...

⁽³⁾ Whenever there is a loop, C is infinite !

- **Criterion** C = AllPaths(CFG):
- All possible paths ...
- ⁽³⁾ Whenever there is a loop, C is infinite !
- $rest weaker variant: AllPaths_{k}(CFG).$

We limit the paths through a loop to maximally k times ...

- **Criterion** C = AllPaths(CFG):
- All possible paths ...
- [©] Whenever there is a loop, C is infinite !
- $rest weaker variant: AllPaths_{k}(CFG).$

We limit the paths through a loop to maximally k times ...

we have again a finite number of paths

- **Criterion** C = AllPaths(CFG):
- All possible paths ...
- [©] Whenever there is a loop, C is infinite !
- $rest weaker variant: AllPaths_{k}(CFG).$

We limit the paths through a loop to maximally k times ...

we have again a finite number of paths

A Hierarchy of Coverage Criteria

■ AllPaths(CFG) \supseteq AllPaths_k(CFG) \supseteq AllTransitions(CFG) \supseteq AllInstructions(CFG)

Each of these implications reflects a proper containment;
 the other way round is never true.

Program:

```
int f (int a) {
 int i = 0;
 int tm = 1;
 int sum = 1;
 while(sum <= a) {</pre>
        i = i+1;
        tm = tm+2;
        sum = tm+sum;
 }
 return i;
```

9/8/20

}

Program:

```
int f (int a) {
 int i = 0;
 int tm = 1;
 int sum = 1;
 while(sum <= a) {</pre>
        i = i+1;
        tm = tm+2;
        sum = tm+sum;
 }
 return i;
```

Specification:

pre : $a \ge 0$ post: $a \le result^2 \land a < (result+1)^2$

Program:

```
int f (int a) {
 int i = 0;
 int tm = 1;
 int sum = 1;
 while(sum <= a) {</pre>
        i = i+1;
        tm = tm+2;
        sum = tm+sum;
 }
 return i;
```

9/8/20

}

Program:

int f (int a) { int i = 0;int tm = 1; int sum = 1; while(sum <= a) {</pre> i = i+1; tm = tm+2;sum = tm+sum; return i;





CFG de f:

CFG de f:



CFG de f:



For example:

AllInstructions(CFG)={[start,2,5,6,5,10,end]} AllTransitions(CFG)={[start,2,5,6,5,10,end]} AllPath₃(CFG)={[start,2,5,10,end], [start,2,5,6,6,5,10,end], [start,2,5,6,6,6,5,10,end], [start,2,5,6,6,6,5,10,end]} AllPath(CFG)={ S I $\exists k \in \mathbb{N}$. S = [start,2,5,(6,5)^k,10,end]} (infinite !)

[S,	2,	5,	6,	5,	10,	E]
$\Phi \mapsto a_0^{\geq 0}$	a₀≥0					
a ⊨ a ₀	a ₀					
i ⊢ i ₀	0					
tm ⊨ tm ₀	1					
sum ⊢ sum	·0 1					

[S,	2,	5,	6,	5,	10,	E]
$\Phi \mapsto a_0^{\geq 0}$	a₀≥0	(sum≤a) σ_2				
a → a ₀	a ₀					
i ⊢ i ₀	0					
tm ⊨ tm ₀	1					
sum ⊢ sum	[.] 0 1					

[S,	2,	5,	6,	5,	10,	E]
$\Phi \mapsto a_0^{\geq 0}$	a₀≥0	(sum≤a) $\sigma_{\!\!\!\!2}$ ∧ a ₀ ≥0				
a ⊨ a ₀	a ₀					
i ➡ i ₀	0					
tm ⊨ tm ₀	1					
sum ⊢ sum	·o 1					

[S,	2,	5,	6,	5,	10,	E]
$\Phi \mapsto a_0^{\geq 0}$	a₀≥0	(sum≤a) $\sigma_{\!\!\!\!\!2}$ ∧ a ₀ ≥0				
a ⊨ a ₀	a ₀	a ₀				
i ⊢ i ₀	0	0				
tm ⊨ tm ₀	1	1				
sum ⊢ sum	·o 1	1				

[S,	2,	5,	6,	5,	10,	E]
$\Phi \mapsto a_0^{\geq 0}$	a₀≥0	(sum≤a) $\sigma_{\!\!\!\!2}$ ∧ a ₀ ≥0	1≤a ₀ ∧			
a ⊨ a ₀	a ₀	a ₀				
i ⊢ i ₀	0	0				
tm ⊨ tm ₀	1	1				
sum ⊢ sum	·o <u>1</u>	1				

[S,	2,	5,	6,	5,	10,	E]
$\Phi \mapsto a_0^{\geq 0}$	a₀≥0	(sum≤a) $\sigma_{\!\!\!\!\!2}$ ∧ a ₀ ≥0	1≤a ₀ ∧ a ₀ ≥0			
a ⊨ a ₀	a ₀	a ₀				
i ⊢ i ₀	0	0				
tm ⊨ tm ₀	1	1				
sum ⊢ sum	·o <u>1</u>	1				

[S,	2,	5,	6,	5,	10,	E]
$\Phi \mapsto a_0^{\geq 0}$	a₀≥0	(sum≤a) $\sigma_{\!\!\!\!2}$ ∧ a ₀ ≥0	1≤a ₀ ∧ a ₀ ≥0			
a ⊨ a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	a ₀			
i ⊢ i ₀	0	0	1			
tm ⊨ tm ₀	1	1	3			
sum ⊢ sum	·0 <u>1</u>	1	4			

[S,	2,	5,	6,	5,	10,	E]
$\Phi \mapsto a_0^{\geq 0}$	a₀≥0	(sum≤a) $\sigma_{\!\!\!\!\!2}$ ∧ a ₀ ≥0	1≤a ₀ ∧ a ₀ ≥0	1≤a ₀ ∧ ¬(sum≤a)ơ ₆		
a ⊨ a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	a ₀			
i ⊢ i ₀	0	0	1			
tm ⊨ tm ₀	1	1	3			
sum ⊢ sum	·o <u>1</u>	1	4			

[S,	2,	5,	6,	5,	10,	E]
$\Phi \mapsto a_0^{\geq 0}$	a₀≥0	(sum≤a) $\sigma_{\!\!\!\!\!2}$ ∧ a ₀ ≥0	1≤a ₀ ∧ a ₀ ≥0	1≤a ₀ ∧ ¬(sum≤a)ơ ₆		
a → a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	a ₀		
i ⊢ i ₀	0	0	1	1		
tm ⊨ tm ₀	1	1	3	3		
sum ⊢ sum	·o <u>1</u>	1	4	4		

[S,	2,	5,	6,	5,	10,	E]
$\Phi \mapsto a_0^{\geq 0}$	a₀≥0	(sum≤a) $\sigma_{\!\!\!\!\!2}$ ∧ a ₀ ≥0	1≤a ₀ ∧ a ₀ ≥0	1≤a ₀ ∧ ¬(sum≤a)σ ₆	1≤a ₀ ∧ 4>a ₀	
a → a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	a ₀		
i ➡ i ₀	0	0	1	1		
tm ⊨ tm ₀	1	1	3	3		
sum ⊢ sum	·o <u>1</u>	1	4	4		

[S,	2,	5,	6,	5,	10,	E]
$\Phi \mapsto a_0^{\geq 0}$	a₀≥0	(sum≤a) $\sigma_{\!\!\!\!\!2}$ ∧ a ₀ ≥0	1≤a ₀ ∧ a ₀ ≥0	1≤a ₀ ∧ ¬(sum≤a)σ ₆	1≤a ₀ ∧ 4>a ₀	
a → a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	
i ⊨ i ₀	0	0	1	1	1	
tm ⊨ tm ₀	1	1	3	3	3	
sum ⊢ sum	·o 1	1	4	4	4	

[S,	2,	5,	6,	5,	10,	E]
$\Phi \mapsto a_0^{\geq 0}$	a₀≥0	(sum≤a) $\sigma_{\!\!\!\!\!2}$ ∧ a ₀ ≥0	1≤a ₀ ∧ a ₀ ≥0	1≤a ₀ ∧ ¬(sum≤a)σ ₆	1≤a ₀ ∧ 4>a ₀	1≤a ₀ ∧ 4>a ₀ ∧ res = 1
a ⊨ a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	
i ➡ i ₀	0	0	1	1	1	
tm ⊨ tm ₀	1	1	3	3	3	
sum ⊢ sum	·o 1	1	4	4	4	

[S,	2,	5,	6,	5,	10,	E]
$\Phi \mapsto a_0^{\geq 0}$	a₀≥0	(sum≤a) $\sigma_{\!\!\!\!\!2}$ ∧ a ₀ ≥0	1≤a ₀ ∧ a ₀ ≥0	1≤a ₀ ∧ ¬(sum≤a)σ ₆	1≤a ₀ ∧ 4>a ₀	1≤a ₀ ∧ 4>a ₀ ∧ res = 1
a → a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	a ₀
i ⊨ i ₀	0	0	1	1	1	1
tm ⊨ tm ₀	1	1	3	3	3	3
sum ⊢ sum	·o 1	1	4	4	4	4

[S,	2,	5,	6,	5,	10,	E]
$\Phi \mapsto a_0^{\geq 0}$	a₀≥0	(sum≤a) $\sigma_{\!\!\!\!\!2}$ ∧ a ₀ ≥0	1≤a ₀ ∧ a ₀ ≥0	1≤a ₀ ∧ ¬(sum≤a)ơ ₆	1≤a ₀ ∧ 4>a ₀	1≤a ₀ ∧ 4>a ₀ ∧ res = 1
a → a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	a ₀	a ₀
i ➡ i ₀	0	0	1	1	1	1
tm ⊨ tm ₀	1	1	3	3	3	3
sum ⊢ sum	·o 1	1	4	4	4	4

Result:

Test-Case:

For the path M=[start,2,5,6,5,10,end] we have the path condition $\Phi \mapsto 1 \le a_0 \land 4 > a_0$

Result:

9/8/20

Test-Case:

For the path M=[start,2,5,6,5,10,end] we have the path condition $\Phi \mapsto 1 \le a_0 \land 4 > a_0$

A concrete Test, satisfying Φ :

Result:

Test-Case:

For the path M=[start,2,5,6,5,10,end] we have the path condition $\Phi \mapsto 1 \le a_0 \land 4 > a_0$

A concrete Test, satisfying Φ :

Result:

Test-Case:

For the path M=[start,2,5,6,5,10,end] we have the path condition $\Phi \mapsto 1 \le a_0 \land 4 > a_0$

A concrete Test, satisfying Φ :

Execution of program with this test vector 3:

Result:

Test-Case:

For the path M=[start,2,5,6,5,10,end] we have the path condition $\Phi \mapsto 1 \le a_0 \land 4 > a_0$

A concrete Test, satisfying Φ :

Execution of program with this test vector 3: f(3) = 1

Result:

Test-Case:

For the path M=[start,2,5,6,5,10,end] we have the path condition $\Phi \mapsto 1 \le a_0 \land 4 > a_0$

A concrete Test, satisfying Φ :

Execution of program with this test vector 3: f(3) = 1

Verification of the post-condition: post(3, 1)

Result:

Test-Case:

For the path M=[start,2,5,6,5,10,end] we have the path condition $\Phi \mapsto 1 \le a_0 \land 4 > a_0$

A concrete Test, satisfying Φ :

Execution of program with this test vector 3: f(3) = 1

Verification of the post-condition: post(3, 1) = true

B. Wolff - GLA - White-Box Tests