## Path Testing and Test Coverage

Chapter 9

## Structural Testing

- Also known as glass/white/open box testing
- Structural testing is based on using specific knowledge of the program source text to define test cases
- Contrast with functional testing where the program text is not seen but only hypothesized


## Structural Testing

- Structural testing methods are amenable to
- Rigorous definitions
- Control flow, data flow, coverage criteria
- Mathematical analysis
- Graphs, path analysis
- Precise measurement
- Metrics, coverage analysis


## Program Graph Definition

- What is a program graph?


## Program Graph Definition - 2

- Given a program written in an imperative programming language
- Its program graph is a directed graph in which nodes are statements and statement fragments, and edges represent flow of control
- Two nodes are connected if execution can proceed from one to the other

Triangle program text

```
integers'
input ( \(a, b, c\) )
output("Side a b c: ", a, b, c)
if \((a<b)\) and \((b<a+c)\) and \((c<a+b)\)
then isTriangle \(\leftarrow\) true
else isTriangle \(\leftarrow\) false
fi
8 if isTriangle
9 then if \((a=b)\) and \((b=c)\)
10 else output ("equilateral")
11 else if \((a \neq b)\) and \((a \neq c)\) and ( \(b \neq c)\)
12 then output ("scalene")
13 else output("isosceles")
14
                fi
\(15 \quad \mathbf{f i}\)
16 else output ("not a triangle")
17 fi
```


## Triangle Program Program Graph



## DD-Path

- What is a DD-path?


## DD-Path - informal definition

- A decision-to-decision path (DD-Path) is a path chain in a program graph such that
- Initial and terminal nodes are distinct
- Every interior node has indeg =1 and outdeg = 1
- The initial node is 2-connected to every other node in the path
- No instances of 1- or 3-connected nodes occur



## Connectedness definition

- What is the definition of node connectedness?
- Hint: There are 4-types of connectedness


## Connectedness definition - 2

- Two nodes J and $K$ in a directed graph are
- 0-connected iff no path exists between them

- 1-connected iff a semi-path but no path exists between them



## Connectedness definition - 2

- Two nodes J and K in a directed graph are
- 2-connected iff a path exists between between them

- 3-connected iff a path goes from J to K , and a path goes from $K$ to $\mathrm{n}_{1}$



## DD-Path - formal definition

- A decision-to-decision path (DD-Path) is a chain in a program graph such that:
- Case 1: consists of a single node with indeg=0
- Case 2: consists of a single node with outdeg=0
- Case 3: consists of a single node with indeg $\geq 2$ or outdeg $\geq 2$
- Case 4: consists of a single node with indeg $=1$, and outdeg $=1$
- Case 5: it is a maximal chain of length $\geq 1$
- DD-Paths are also known as segments


## Triangle program DD-paths

| Nodes | Path | Case |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | First | 1 |
| 2,3 | A | 5 |
| 4 | B | 3 |
| 5 | C | 4 |
| 6 | D | 4 |
| 7 | E | 3 |
| 8 | F | 3 |
| 9 | G | 3 |


| Nodes | Path | Case |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10 | H | 4 |
| 11 | I | 3 |
| 12 | J | 4 |
| 13 | K | 4 |
| 14 | L | 3 |
| 15 | M | 3 |
| 16 | N | 4 |
| 17 | Last | 2 |

## DD-path Graph

- What is a DD-path graph?


## DD-Path Graph - informal definition

- Given a program written in an imperative language, its DD-Path graph is a directed graph, in which
- Nodes are DD-Paths of its program graph
- Edges represent control flow between successor DD-Paths.
- Also known as Control Flow Graph


## Control Flow Graph Derivation

- Straightforward process
- Some judgment is required
- The last statement in a segment must be
- a predicate
- a loop control
- a break
- a method exit


## Triangle program DD-path graph



## displayLastMsg - Example Java program

```
public int displayLastMsg(int nToPrint) {
    np = 0;
    if ((msgCounter > 0) && (nToPrint > 0)) {
        for (int j = lastMsg; (( j != 0) && (np < nToPrint)); --j) {
            System.out.println(messageBuffer[j]);
            ++np;
        }
        if (np < nToPrint) {
            for (int j = SIZE; ((j != 0) && (np < nToPrint)); --j) {
                    System.out.println(messageBuffer[j]);
            ++np;
        }
        }
    }
    return np;
}
```


## displayLastMsg- Segments part 1

Line
Segment

| 1 | public int displayLastMsg(int nToPrint) \{ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | $\mathrm{np}=0$; | A |
| 3a | if ( (msgCounter > 0) | A |
| 3b | \&\& (nToPrint > 0)) | B |
| 4a | \{ for (int j = lastMsg; | C |
| 4b | ( ( j ! = 0) | D |
| 4c | \&\& ( np < nToPrint)); | E |
| 4d | --j) | F |
| 5 | \{ System.out.println(messageBuffer[j]); | F |
| 6 | ++np; | F |
| 7 | \} | F |

## displayLastMsg- Segments part 2

| Line | Segment |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | if ( np < nToPrint ) | G |
| 9a | \{ for (int $\mathrm{j}=$ SIZE; | H |
| 9b | ( j ! $=0$ ) \& \& | I |
| 9c | (np < nToPrint)) ; | J |
| 9d | --j) | K |
| 10 | \{ System.out.println(messageBuffer[j]); | K |
| 11 | ++np; | K |
| 12 | \} | L |
| 13 | \} | L |
| 14 | \} | L |
| 15 | return np ; | L |
| 16 | \} | L |

displayLastMsg - Control Flow Graph


## Control flow graphs definition - 1

- Depict which program segments may be followed by others
- A segment is a node in the CFG
- A conditional transfer of control is a branch represented by an edge
- An entry node (no inbound edges) represents the entry point to a method
- An exit node (no outbound edges) represents an exit point of a method


## Control flow graphs definition - 2

- An entry-exit path is a path from the entry node to the exit node
- Path expressions represent paths as sequences of nodes
- Loops are represented as segments within parentheses followed by an asterisk
- There are 22 different entry-exit path expressions in displayLastMsg


## Entry-exit path expressions - part 1

Entry-Exit paths

| 1 | A L |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | A B L |
| 3 | A B C D G L |
| 4 | A B C D E G L |
| 5 | A B C (D E F)* D G L |
| 6 | A B C (D E F)* D E G L |
| 7 | A B C D G H I L |
| 8 | A B CD G H I J L |
| 9 | A B CD G H (I J K) I L |
| 10 | A B C (D E F)* D E G H (I J K)* I J L |
| 11 | A B CD E G H I L |

## Entry-exit path expressions - part 2

Entry-Exit paths

| 12 | A B C D E G H I J L |
| :--- | :--- |
| 13 | A B C D E G H (I J K)* I L |
| 14 | A B C D E G H (I J K)* I J L |
| 15 | A B C (D E F)* D G H I L |
| 16 | A B C (D E F)* D G H I J L |
| 17 | A B C (D E F)* D G H (I J K)* I L |
| 18 | A B C (D E F)* D G H (I J K)* I J L |
| 19 | A B C (D E F)* D E G H I L |
| 20 | A B C (D E F)* D E G H I J L |
| 21 | A B C (D E F)* D E G H (I J K)* I L |
| 22 | A B C (D E F)* D E G H (I J K)* I J L |

## Paths displayLastMsg - decision table - part 1

Path condition by Segment Name

|  | Entry/Exit Path | A | B | D | E | G | I | J |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A L | F | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2 | A B L | T | F | - | - | - | - | - |
| 3 | A B C D G L | T | T | F | - | F | - | - |
| 4 | A B C D E G L | T | T | T | F | - | - | - |
| 5 | A B C (D E F)* D G L | T | T | T/F | T/- | F | - | - |
| 6 | A B C (D E F)* D E G L | T | T | T/T | T/F | F | - | - |
| 7 | A B C D G H I L | T | T | F | - | T | F | - |
| 8 | A B CD G H I J L | T | T | F | - | T | T | F |
| 9 | A B CD G H (I J K)* I L | T | T | F | - | T/F | T/- | T |
| 10 | A B CD G H (I J K)* I J L | T | T | F | - | T/T | T/F | T |
| 11 | A B CDE G H I L | T | T | T | F | T | F | - |

$\mathrm{x} / \mathrm{x}$ Conditions at loop-entry / loop-exit - is don't care

## Paths displayLastMsg - decision table - part 2

Path condition by Segment Name

|  | Entry/Exit Path | A | B | D | E | G | I | J |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | A B C D E G H I J L | T | T | T | F | T | T | F |
| 13 | A B C D E G H (I J K)* I L | T | T | T | F | T | $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{F}$ | $\mathrm{T} /-$ |
| 14 | A B C D E G H (I J K)* I J L | T | T | T | F | T | $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{T}$ | $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{F}$ |
| 15 | A B C (D E F)* D G H I L | T | T | $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{F}$ | $\mathrm{T} /-$ | T | F | - |
| 16 | A B C (D E F)* D G H I J L | T | T | $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{T}$ | $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{F}$ | T | T | F |
| 17 | A B C (D E F)* D G H (I J K)* I L | T | T | $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{F}$ | $\mathrm{T} /-$ | T | $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{F}$ | $\mathrm{T} /-$ |
| 18 | A B C (D E F)* D G H (I J K)* I J L | T | T | $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{F}$ | $\mathrm{T} /-$ | T | $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{T}$ | $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{F}$ |
| 19 | A B C (D E F)* D E G H I L | T | T | $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{T}$ | $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{F}$ | T | F | - |
| 20 | A B C (D E F)* D E G H I J L | T | T | $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{T}$ | $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{F}$ | T | T | F |
| 21 | A B C (D E F)* D E G H (I J K)* I L | T | T | $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{T}$ | $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{F}$ | T | T | T |
| 22 | A B C (D E F)* D E G H (I J K)* I J L | T | T | $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{T}$ | $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{F}$ | T | T | T |

$\mathrm{x} / \mathrm{x}$ Conditions at loop-entry / loop-exit - is don't care

Program text coverage Metrics

- List the program text coverage metrics.


## Program text coverage Metrics - 2

- $C_{0}$ Every Statement
- $C_{1}$ Every DD-path
- $\mathrm{C}_{1 \mathrm{p}}$ Every predicate to each outcome
- $\mathrm{C}_{2} \quad \mathrm{C}_{1}$ coverage + loop coverage
- $C_{d} \quad C_{1}$ coverage + every dependent pair of DD-paths
- $\mathrm{C}_{\text {MCC }}$ Multiple condition coverage
- $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{ik}}$ Every program path that contains k loop repetitions
- $\mathrm{C}_{\text {stat }}$ Statistically significant fraction of the paths
- $\mathrm{C}_{\infty}$ Every executable path


## Program text coverage models

- What are the common program text coverage models?


## Program text coverage models - 2

- Statement Coverage
- Segment Coverage
- Branch Coverage
- Multiple-Condition Coverage


## Statement coverage - $\mathrm{C}_{0}$

- When is statement coverage achieved?


## Statement coverage $-\mathrm{C}_{0}-2$

- Achieved when all statements in a method have been executed at least once
- A test case that will follow the path expression below will achieve statement coverage in our example


## A B C (D E F)* D G H (I J K)* I L

- One test case is enough to achieve statement coverage!

Segment coverage

- When is segment coverage achieved?


## Segment coverage - 2

- Achieved when all segments have been executed at least once
- Segment coverage counts segments rather than statements
- May produce drastically different numbers
- Assume two segments P and Q
- P has one statement, Q has nine
- Exercising only one of the segments will give either 10\% or 90\% statement coverage
- Segment coverage will be $50 \%$ in both cases

Statement coverage problems

- What problems are there with statement coverage?


## Statement coverage problems - 2

- Important cases may be missed
- Predicate may be tested for only one value
- misses many bugs
- Loop bodies may only be iterated only once

```
String s = null;
if (x != y) s = "Hi";
String s2 = s.substring(1);
```

- What coverage solves this problem?
- Define it


## Branch coverage $-C_{1 p}$

- Achieved when every edge from a node is executed at least once
- At least one true and one false evaluation for each predicate
- How many test cases are required?


## Branch coverage $-\mathrm{C}_{1 \mathrm{p}}-2$

- Can be achieved with $\mathrm{D}+1$ paths in a control flow graph with D 2-way branching nodes and no loops
- Even less if there are loops
- In the Java example displayLastMsg branch coverage is achieved with three paths - see next few slides

```
XL
X C (Y F)* Y G L
X C (Y F)* Y G H (Z K)* Z L
```

Java example program displayLastMsg - DD-path graph

$\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}$ \& Z are shorthand for the nodes within the dotted boxes; used for branch testing

## Java example program displastLastMsg

 - aggregate predicate DD-path graph

## Aggregate Paths - decision table - part 1

Path condition by Segment Name

|  | Branch Coverage | A | B | D | E | G | I | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | X L | F | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2 | XL | T | F | - | - | - | - | - |
| 3 | X C Y G L | T | T | F | - | F | - | - |
| 4 | X C Y G L | T | T | T | F | - | - | - |
| 5 | X C (Y F)* Y G L | T | T | T/F | T/- | F | - | - |
| 6 | X C (YF)* Y G L | T | T | T/T | T/F | F | - | - |
| 7 | XCYGHZL | T | T | F | - | T | F | - |
| 8 | XCYGHZL | T | T | F | - | T | T | F |
| 9 | X C Y G H (Z K)* I L | T | T | F | - | T/F | T/- | T |
| 10 | X C Y G H (Z K)* I L | T | T | F | - | T/T | T/F | T |
| 11 | XCYGHZL | T | T | T | F | T | F | - |

$\mathrm{x} / \mathrm{x}$ Conditions at loop-entry / loop-exit $\quad$ - is don't care

## Aggregate Paths - decision table example - part 2

Path condition by Segment Name

|  | Branch Coverage | A | B | D | E | G | I | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | X C Y G H Z L | T | T | T | F | T | T | F |
| 13 | X C Y G H (Z K)* Z L | T | T | T | F | T | T/F | T/- |
| 14 | X CYG H (Z K)* ZL | T | T | T | F | T | T/T | T/F |
| 15 | X C (Y F)* Y G H Z L | T | T | T/F | T/- | T | F | - |
| 16 | X C (Y F)*Y G H Z L | T | T | T/T | T/F | T | T | F |
| 17 |  | T | T | T/F | T/- | T | T/F | T/- |
| 18 | X C (Y F)* ${ }^{\text {Y G H }}$ (Z K)* Z L | T | T | T/F | T/- | T | T/T | T/F |
| 19 |  | T | T | T/T | T/F | T | F | - |
| 20 | X C (Y F)* Y G H Z L | T | T | T/T | T/F | T | T | F |
| 21 | X C (Y F)* ${ }^{*} \mathrm{GH}(\mathrm{Z} \mathrm{K})^{*} \mathrm{ZL}$ | T | T | T/T | T/F | T | T | T |
| 22 | X C (Y F)* Y G H (Z K)* Z L | T | T | T/T | T/F | T | T | T |

$\mathrm{x} / \mathrm{x}$ Conditions at loop-entry / loop-exit $\quad$ - is don't care

## Branch coverage problems

- What are the problems with branch coverage?


## Branch coverage problems - 2

- Ignores implicit paths from compound paths
- $\mathbf{1 1}$ paths in aggregate model vs 22 in full model


## Branch coverage problems - 3

- Ignores implicit paths from compound paths
- 11 paths in aggregate model vs 22 in full model
- Short-circuit evaluation means that many predicates might not be evaluated
- A compound predicate is treated as a single statement. If $\mathbf{n}$ clauses, $\mathbf{2}^{\text {n }}$ combinations, but only 2 are tested


## Branch coverage problems - 4

- Ignores implicit paths from compound paths
- 11 paths in aggregate model vs 22 in full model
- Short-circuit evaluation means that many predicates might not be evaluated
- A compound predicate is treated as a single statement. If $n$ clauses, $2^{n}$ combinations, but only 2 are tested
- Only a subset of all entry-exit paths is tested
- Two tests for branch coverage vs 4 tests for path coverage
- $a=b=x=y=0$ and $a=x=0 \wedge b=y=1$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { if }(a==b) x++; \\
& \text { if }(x==y) x--;
\end{aligned}
$$

Overcoming branch coverage problems

- How do we overcome branch coverage problems?


## Overcoming branch coverage problems - 2

- Use Multiple condition coverage
- All true-false combinations of simple conditions in compound predicates are considered at least once
- Guarantees statement, branch and predicate coverage
- Does not guarantee path coverage
- A truth table may be necessary
- Not necessarily achievable
- lazy evaluation - true-true and true-false are impossible
- mutually exclusive conditions - false-false branch is impossible

$$
\text { if }((x>0)|\mid(x<5))
$$

## Overcoming branch coverage problems - 3

- Can have infeasible paths due to dependencies and redundant predicates
- Paths perpetual .. motion and free .. lunch are impossible
- In this case indicates a potential bug
- At least poor program text

```
if x = O then oof.perpetual
    else off.free
fi
if x != O then oof.motion
    else off.lunch
fi
```


## Dealing with Loops

- Loops are highly fault-prone, so they need to be tested carefully
- Based on the previous slides on testing decisions what would be a simple view of testing a loop?


## Dealing with Loops - 2

- Simple view
- Involves a decision to traverse the loop or not
- Test as a two way branch
- What would functional testing suggest as a better way of testing?
- What tests does it suggest?


## Dealing with Loops - 3

- A bit better
- Boundary value analysis on the index variable
- Suggests a zero, one, many tests
- How do we deal with nested loops?


## Dealing with Loops - 3

- Nested loops
- Tested separately starting with the innermost
- Once loops have been tested what can we do with the control flow graph?


## Dealing with Loops - 4

- Once loops have been tested
- They can be condensed to a single node


## Condensation graphs

- Condensation graphs are based on removing strong components or DD-paths
- For programs remove structured program constructs
- One entry, one exit constructs for sequences, choices and loops
- Each structured component once tested can be replaced by a single node when condensing its graph


## Violations of proper structure

- Program text that violates proper structure cannot be condensed
- Branches either into or out of the middle of a loop
- Branches either into or out of then and else phrases of if... then...else statements
- Increases the complexity of the program
- Increases the difficulty of testing the program


## Cyclomatic number

- The cyclomatic number for a graph is given by
- $C N(G)=e-v+2^{*} C$
- e number of edges $v$ number of vertices c number of connected regions
- For strongly connected graphs, need to add edges from every sink to every source


## Cyclomatic number for programs

- For properly structured programs there is only one component with one entry and one exit. There is no edge from exit to entry.
- Definition 1: $\mathbf{C N}(\mathbf{G})=\mathbf{e - v}+\mathbf{2}$
- Only 1 component, not strongly connected
- Definition 2: $\mathbf{C N}(\mathbf{G})=\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{1}$
- p is the number of predicate nodes with out degree $=2$
- Definition 3: $\mathbf{C N}(\mathbf{G})=\mathbf{r}+\mathbf{1}$
- $r$ is the number of enclosed regions

