



Data Flow Coverage 2

Conrad Hughes
School of Informatics

Slides thanks to Stuart Anderson



10 February 2009

Software Testing: Lecture 8

1



Coverage: the point, revisited

- We're attempting to decide what makes a good test.
 - i.e judge the **adequacy** of our test suite.
- Surely an **adequate** test suite will show our software is correct?
 - Impossible. Same as proving the software is correct.
- So can we say some test suites are better than others?
 - Yes, if we can define effective, testable **adequacy criteria**.
- Such as?
 - Statement coverage = 1
 - But if our test doesn't exercise all statements, surely it's no good?
 - Branch coverage = 1
 - But if our test doesn't exercise all branches, surely it's no good?
 - Path coverage = 1
 - But if our test doesn't exercise all paths, surely it's no good? (!)
- So they're actually really **inadequacy criteria** :(



Subsumption

- So really, no tests are as good as we'd want.
- But some are provably worse than others:
 - Branch coverage necessarily includes statement coverage.
- Definition: test coverage criterion **A subsumes** test coverage criterion B if and only if, for every program P, every test set satisfying A with respect to P also satisfies B with respect to P.
- If you have branch coverage, you also always have statement coverage. Branch coverage **subsumes** statement coverage.
- If criterion A subsumes criterion B, and a test suite satisfying B is guaranteed to find a fault, then a suite satisfying A will also find that fault.
 - But these criteria provide no guarantees.
 - And with no guarantee that B will find a fault, we have no guarantee for A either.




Adequacy review 1

- Statement adequacy: all statements have been executed by at least one test case.
- Branch adequacy: all branches have been executed by at least one test case.
- Basic condition adequacy: each basic condition evaluates to true in at least one test case, and to false in at least one test case.
- Compound condition adequacy (simplistic definition): each combination of truth values of basic conditions must be visited by at least one test case:

X	Y	Z	(X&Y) Z
F	F	F	F
F	F	T	T
F	T	F	F
F	T	T	T
T	F	F	F
T	F	T	T
T	T	F	T
T	T	T	T

Good definitions are important: basic condition




X	Y	Z	(X&Y) Z
F	F	F	F
F	F	T	T
F	T	F	F
F	T	T	T
T	F	F	F
T	F	T	T
T	T	F	T
T	T	T	T

- $\{(X=Y=Z=F); (X=Y=Z=T)\}$ appears to achieve B.C.A., but condition Y is never evaluated in the first case, nor Z in the second.
- Need, e.g. $\{(X=F, Y=?, Z=T); (X=T, Y=Z=F); (X=Y=T, Z=?)\}$ (?=don't care, because it's never evaluated).

Exercise: test suite adequacy 1

- $T_0 = \{ "", "test", "test+case\%1Dadequacy" \}$
- $T_1 = \{ "adequate+test\%0Dexecution\%7U" \}$
- $T_2 = \{ "\%3D", "\%A", "a+b", "test" \}$
- $T_3 = \{ " ", "+\%0D+\%4J" \}$
- $T_4 = \{ "first+test\%9Ktest\%K9" \}$

Coverage Criterion	T0	T1	T2	T3	T4
Statement					
Branch					
Basic Condition					
Compound Condition					



P&Y p.213-214, Figures 12.1 & 12.2



Comments

- T2 uncovers a bug in the program. What bug?
- Branch coverage appears the same as statement coverage here. Suggest a code construct which would show branch coverage to be superior to statement coverage.
- Basic condition coverage clearly doesn't subsume branch coverage.
- While T4 technically satisfies basic condition coverage, you can argue that it doesn't. How?
- You can also argue that compound condition coverage is impossible for this code fragment, for a similar reason. This might lead us to modify our definitions of basic and compound condition coverage, to make them more practical. How?
- Can you suggest enhancements to each test in order to achieve compound condition coverage?




Adequacy review 2

- Test suite T satisfies the path adequacy criterion for program P iff for each path p of P there exists at least one test case in T that causes the execution of p .
- Loop boundary adequacy criterion: test cases exist such that each loop is executed zero times, exactly once, and many times.
 - Some common sense necessary in application:
 - Some loops have a fixed number of iterations.
 - How many is "many"?

Exercise: test suite adequacy 2

- This routine loops through elements 0 to $n-1$ of array A , replacing any negative entries in A with their absolute (positive) value.
- Generate a test suite (in the form of some suggested values for array A , e.g. $[1, 2], [3, 4]$) which satisfies the path adequacy criterion for this program. Assume $n=|A|$.
- Generate a test suite which satisfies the loop boundary adequacy criterion.





Comments

- Path adequacy is impossible, even for this trivial example!
- Consider the below code fragment. On the surface there are four paths through it, but a little attention makes it clear that no test suite could ever exercise one of those paths:

```
if(a < 0)
    a = 0;
if(a > 10)
    a = 10;
```

- So, realistically, we must settle for less than 100% coverage.



Adequacy review 3: data flow basics

- Data flow criteria are concerned with **definition-clear paths** from definition to use of individual variables.
- Context is a graph representation of the program, with vertices being basic blocks.
- A definition-use pair (**DU pair**) is a pairing of definition and use of a variable, with at least one def-clear path between them (there could be many).
- $dcu(x, v)$ is the set of vertices v' which use variable x in **computations**, and could be directly affected by a definition of x at v (i.e. there is a def-clear path from v to v').
- $dpu(x, v)$ is the set of edges (v', v'') which use variable x in their **predicates** (conditions/branches), and could be directly affected by a definition of x at v (i.e. there is a def-clear path from v to v').



Exercise: data flow basics

- Identify DU pairs for `c` (your answer will be a list of pairs of line numbers).
- Identify DU pairs for `digit_high`.
- Identify the def-predicate uses in your answers.
- Identify the def-computation uses in your answers.
- What is `dcu(ok, 34)`?
- What is `dpu(ok, 20)`?
- What is `dpu(digit_high, 30)`?

```
-17: int cgi_decode(char *encoded, char *decoded) {
-18:     char *eptr = encoded;
-19:     char *dptr = decoded;
-20:     int ok=0;
-21:     while (*eptr) {
-22:         char c;
-23:         c = *eptr;
-24:         /* Case 1: '+' maps to blank */
-25:         if (c == '+') {
-26:             *dptr = ' ';
-27:         } else if (c == '%') {
-28:             /* Case 2: '%xx' is hex for character xx */
-29:
-30:             int digit_high = Hex_Values[*(++eptr)];
-31:             int digit_low = Hex_Values[*(++eptr)];
-32:             if ( digit_high == -1 || digit_low == -1 ) {
-33:                 /* *dptr='?'; */
-34:                 ok=1; /* Bad return code */
-35:             } else {
-36:                 *dptr = 16* digit_high + digit_low;
-37:             }
-38:
-39:             /* Case 3: All other chars map to themselves */
-40:         } else {
-41:             *dptr = *eptr;
-42:         }
-43:         ++dptr;
-44:         ++eptr;
-45:     }
-46:     *dptr = '\0'; /* Null terminator for string */
-47:     return ok;
-48: }
```




Adequacy review 4: data flow criteria

- **All-defs** requires that test T exercises each definition in program P at least once. This means not just executing the definition, but using its result in at least one computation or predicate.
- **All-p-uses** requires exercise of all DU pairs culminating in predicates. Note pairs, not paths: only one def-clear path needed per DU pair.
- **All-c-uses** requires exercise of all DU pairs culminating in computations. Note pairs, not paths.
- **All-p-uses/some-c-uses** and **all-c-uses/some-p-uses** expand the above two by requiring that all-defs hold as well.
- **All-uses** requires that both all-p-uses and all-c-uses hold.
- **All-du-paths** expands on all-uses by requiring that all def-clear paths between each DU pair are exercised, modulo loops.


Exercise: data flow criteria

- Suggest a set of path(s) which satisfy **all-defs**.
- Suggest a set of path(s) which satisfy **all-c-uses**.
- Suggest a set of path(s) which satisfy **all-du-paths**.




All-Defs Coverage Criterion

- We require to use all definitions.
- Here we assume we only use the variable x .
- We require to use each def.
- So the path A, B, D, F is OK.
- Suppose we defined a variable y in C and used it in E what would be a suitable test set?




All-Uses Coverage Criterion

- We need to ensure we exercise every use.
- So we need the set of test paths to include:
 - A to B
 - A to C
 - A to E
- So a satisfactory test set is:
 - A,B,D,F
 - A,C,D,E,F



All DU-paths Coverage Criterion

- Here we need to consider all loop-free paths between A and vertices that use x .
- So we need to include:
 - A,B
 - A,C
 - A,B,D,E
 - A,C,D,E
- So the following test set satisfies the coverage criterion:
 - A,B,D,E,F
 - A,C,D,E,F






More Complex Data Flow Criteria

- Ntafos proposed a generalisation of the original data-flow criteria to allow iteration of definition/use chains
- Foundation:
 - Chains of alternating definitions and uses linked by definition-clear subpaths (k -dr interactions)
 - i^{th} definition reaches i^{th} use,
 - which defines $i^{\text{th}+1}$ definition
 - k is number of iterations

k-dr Interactions





Wrapping up

- So we can argue that certain criteria are less bad than others. Where does this get us?
- Not terribly far unfortunately: most of the theoretical research seems to indicate you can't conclude much about test effectiveness from your adequacy criteria.
- But there is empirical evidence that at very high levels of coverage, stronger criteria are worth pursuing.
- It doesn't seem surprising though that writing ten times as many tests in order to satisfy a stronger criterion gives you better results. The question then is whether these extra criterion-driven tests are better than extra random ones.
- Research now seems to be heading in this more empirical direction, rather than focusing on theoretical adequacy comparisons.