Search-Based Test Generation

Gordon Fraser, University of Sheffield

Acknowledgements

The material in some of these slides has kindly been provided by:

Phil McMinn (University of Sheffield) Mark Harman (KCL/UCL) Joachim Wegener (Berner & Matner)

Contents

- I. Search Based Software Testing
- 2. Building an SBST Tool Hill climbing simple programs Alternating Variable Method Genetic Algorithms
- 3. The EvoSuite Test Generation Tool Running experiments with EvoSuite Extending EvoSuite
- 4. Lessons Learned
- 5. Future Work

Contents

I. Search Based Software Testing

- 2. Building an SBST Tool Hill climbing simple programs Alternating Variable Method Genetic Algorithms
- 3. The EvoSuite Test Generation Tool Running experiments with EvoSuite Extending EvoSuite
- 4. Lessons Learned
- 5. Future Work







Random Test Data Generation









Generating vs Checking

Conventional Software Testing Research

Write a method to construct test cases

Search-Based Testing

Write a method to determine how good a test case is

Generating vs Checking

Conventional Software Testing Research

Write a method to construct test cases

Search-Based Testing

Write a fitness function to determine how good a test case is



Input



Input

Components of an SBST Tool



Search Algorithm

Representation

Fitness Function

Components of an SBST Tool



Collect data/traces for fitness calculation during execution





000	-		Address	Book		
New conta	ct				New category	
First name	Last name	E-mail Categ	Phone Create a co gory name: ' already exists Abbrechen	Mobile ategory OK		Apply
Last name Phone Mobile			Second e	-mail URL		
Notes						



Ke Mao, Mark Harman, Yue Jia. Sapienz: Multi-objective automated testing for Android applications, ISSTA 2016



First publication on SBST



Webb Miller



David Spooner

Automatic Generation of Floating-Point Test Data IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering, 1976

First publication on SBST



Webb Miller



Automatic Generation of Floating-Point Test Data IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering, 1976

Publications since 1976



Getting started in SBSE

M. Harman and B. Jones: Search-based software engineering. Information and Software Technology, 43(14): 833–839, 2001.

D. Whitley: An overview of evolutionary algorithms: Practical issues and common pitfalls. Information and Software Technology, 43(14):817–831, 2001.

Phil McMinn: Search-based software test data generation: a survey. Software Testing, Verification and Reliability 14(2): 105-156, 2004

Wasif Afzal, Richard Torkar and Robert Feldt: A Systematic Review of Search-based Testing for Non-Functional System Properties. Information and Software Technology, 51 (6):957-976, 2009

Shaukat Ali, Lionel Briand, Hadi Hemmati and Rajwinder Panesar-Walawege: A Systematic Review of the Application and Empirical Investigation of Search-Based Test-Case Generation. IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering, 36(6), pp.742-762, 2010

Mark Harman, Yue Jia and Yuanyuan Zhang: Achievements, open problems and challenges for search based software testing. ICST, 2015

International Search-Based Testing Workshop

2008 ICST, Lillehammer, Norway 2009 ICST, Colorado, Denver 2010 ICST, Paris, France 2011 ICST, Berlin, Germany 2012 ICST, Montreal, Canada 2013 ICST, Luxembourg 2014 ICSE, Hyderabad, India 2015 ICSE, Florence, Italy 2016 ICSE, Austin, USA 2017 ICSE, Buenos Aires, Argentina?

http://www.searchbasedsoftwaretesting.org/



Raleigh, North Carolina <u>www.ssbse.org</u>

Contents

I. Search Based Software Testing

- 2. Building an SBST Tool Hill climbing simple programs Alternating Variable Method Genetic Algorithms
- 3. The EvoSuite Test Generation Tool Running experiments with EvoSuite Extending EvoSuite
- 4. Lessons Learned
- 5. Future Work

Contents

- I. Search Based Software Testing
- 2. Building an SBST Tool Hill climbing simple programs Alternating Variable Method Genetic Algorithms
- 3. The EvoSuite Test Generation Tool Running experiments with EvoSuite Extending EvoSuite
- 4. Lessons Learned
- 5. Future Work

```
def testMe(x, y):
if x == 2 * (y + 1):
    return True
else:
    return False
```

http://goo.gl/8mj8HC - I.zip



Components of an SBST Tool









4. Repeat until optimum is found
Components of an SBST Tool







```
def testMe(x, y):
    if x == 2 * (y + 1):
        return True
    else:
        return False
```

http://goo.gl/8mj8HC - 2.zip

Components of an SBST Tool







```
def testMe(x, y):
    if x == 2 * y and y > 1:
        return True
    else:
        return False
```

http://goo.gl/8mj8HC - 3.zip

Branch Distance

Expression	Distance True	Distance False
x == y	x - y	1
x != y	1	x - y
x > y	y - x + 1	x - y
x >= y	y - x	x - y + 1
x < y	x - y+ 1	x - y
x <= y	х - у	x - y + 1

```
def testMe(x, y):
    if x == 2 * y and y > 1:
        return True
    else:
        return False
```

http://goo.gl/8mj8HC - 3.zip

from Instrumentation import BranchPredicate

```
def testMe(x, y):
    if (BranchPredicate(1, 'Eq', x, 2 * y) and
        BranchPredicate(2, 'Gt', y, 1)):
        return True
    else:
        return False
```

http://goo.gl/8mj8HC - 3.zip

Components of an SBST Tool



Normalisation Functions

Since the 'maximum' branch distance is generally unknown we need a non-standard normalisation function



Normalisation Functions

Since the 'maximum' branch distance is generally unknown we need a non-standard normalisation function



from Instrumentation import BranchPredicate

```
def testMe(x, y):
    if (BranchPredicate(1, 'Eq', x, 2 * y) and
        BranchPredicate(2, 'Gt', y, 1)):
        return True
    else:
        return False
```

http://goo.gl/8mj8HC - 3.zip











Control Dependence

- A is control dependent on B if:
- B has at least two successors in the CFG
- B dominates A
- B is not post-dominated by A
- There is a successor of B that is post-dominated by A







Covering a structure





The test data executes the 'wrong' path

Analysing control flow



is control

dependent

Approach Level = 2 minimisation = 0TARGET

Putting it all together

Fitness = approach Level + *normalised* branch distance



normalised branch distance between 0 and 1 indicates how close approach level is to being penetrated



Simulated Annealing

- Accept also worse solutions with $p=e^{T(t)}$
- **Temperature** $T(t) = \frac{d}{log(t)}$
- δ = difference in objective value



Components of an SBST Tool







The 'Flag' Problem

```
void testme(int a, int b, ....)
{
      • • •
     flag = (a == 0 & b == 0);
     if (flag) {
                                                  0.0012
     }
                                                  0.0010
}
                                                  8000.0
                                                Fitness
                                                  0.0006
                                                   0.0004
                                                   0.0002
                                                    0.0000
```

400

200

0

a

-200

-400

400

200

Ý

-200

-400

Program Transformation



Programs will inevitably have features that heuristic searches handle less well

Testability transformation:

change the program to improve test data generation

... whilst preserving test adequacy

Mark Harman, Lin Hu, Rob Hierons, Joachim Wegener, Harmen Sthamer, Andre Baresel and Marc Roper. Testability Transformation.

IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering. 30(1): 3-16, 2004.
```
def testMe(x, y, z):
    if x * z == 2 * (y + 1):
        return True
    else:
        return False
```

http://goo.gl/8mj8HC - 4.zip

Alternating Variable Method

'Probe' moves



Alternating Variable Method

Accelerated hill climb



Alternating Variable Method



```
def testMe(x, y, z):
    if x * z == 2 * (y + 1):
        return True
    else:
        return False
```

http://goo.gl/8mj8HC - 5.zip

Components of an SBST Tool



Contents

- I. Search Based Software Testing
- 2. Building an SBST Tool Hill climbing simple programs Alternating Variable Method Genetic Algorithms
- 3. The EvoSuite Test Generation Tool Running experiments with EvoSuite Extending EvoSuite
- 4. Lessons Learned
- 5. Future Work

Contents

- I. Search Based Software Testing
- 2. Building an SBST Tool Hill climbing simple programs Alternating Variable Method Genetic Algorithms
- 3. The EvoSuite Test Generation Tool Running experiments with EvoSuite Extending EvoSuite
- 4. Lessons Learned
- 5. Future Work

Evolutionary Testing





Components of an SBST Tool







a

a

Mutation



a	b	С	d
20	10	20	40

Selection

- Selective pressure: The higher, the more likely the fittest are chosen
- Stagnation:
 Selective pressure too small
- Premature convergence: Selective pressure too high

Individual	Fitness
	2
2	I.8
3	I.6
4	I.4
5	I.2
6	
7	0.8
8	0.6
9	0.4
10	0.2
	0



- Chosen value: 0,81
- Chosen value: 0,32
- Chosen value: 0,01







Individual	Fitness
	2
2	0.58
3	0.4
4	0.21
5	0.12
6	0.11
7	0.1
8	0.08
9	0.05
10	0.01
	0



def testMe(a, b, c, d):
 if a == b and c == d:
 return True
 else:
 return False

http://goo.gl/8mj8HC - 6.zip

Other Heuristics in SBST

- Particle Swarm Optimisation
- Chemical Reaction Optimisation
- Ant Colony Optimisation
- Estimation of Distribution Algorithms
- Novelty Search

Hybrid SBST Approaches



Memetic Algorithms SBST+DSE

Interactive GA

No Free Lunch Theorem

- In the entire domain of search problem, all search algorithms perform equally on average
- Each algorithm makes assumptions on the underlying problem
- Choose / adapt algorithms to specific domain



Contents

- I. Search Based Software Testing
- 2. Building an SBST Tool Hill climbing simple programs Alternating Variable Method Genetic Algorithms
- 3. The EvoSuite Test Generation Tool Running experiments with EvoSuite Extending EvoSuite
- 4. Lessons Learned
- 5. Future Work

Contents

- I. Search Based Software Testing
- 2. Building an SBST Tool Hill climbing simple programs Alternating Variable Method Genetic Algorithms
- 3. The EvoSuite Test Generation Tool Running experiments with EvoSuite Extending EvoSuite
- 4. Lessons Learned
- 5. Future Work



@Test public void test() { int x = 2;int y = 2;int result = x + y; assertEquals(4, result); }

EVSUITE

@Test public void test() {

int var0 = 10

YearMonthDay var1 = new YearMonthDay(var0);

TimeOfDay var2 = new TimeOfDay();

DateTime var3 = var1.toDateTime(var2);

DateTime var4 = var3.minus(var0);

DateTime var5 = var4.plusSeconds(var0);

EVSUITE

Test Suite Generation



EVSUITE

Test Suite Generation



Crossover



Mutation



Mutation







Getting EvoSuite

http://www.evosuite.org/downloads

- Jar release for command line usage
- Maven plugin
- IntelliJ plugin
- Eclipse plugin
- Jenkins plugin



Testing a Class

Demo - command line

- Main options:
 -projectCP
 -class
 - -criterion



Properties

- Dproperty=value
- Search budget (s)
 Dsearch_budget=60
- Assertion generation

 Dassertions=false
 Dassertion_strategy=all
- Minimisation (length and values)
 Dminimize=false
- Inlining
 Dinline=false



EvoSuite Sandbox

- Demo Nondeterministic class
- Runtime library to execute tests


Testing multiple classes

Demo:

- Target / prefix
- Continuous
- Maven
- Jenkins
- IntelliJ



Experiment Exercise

- EvoSuite by default uses a combination of different coverage criteria.
- RQI: Does the combination lead to larger test suites than just using branch coverage?
- RQ2: Does the combination lead to better test suites than just using branch coverage?

Experiment Exercise

- Get evosuite-1.0.3.jar from http://evosuite.org/downloads
- Get http://evosuite.org/files/tutorial/Tutorial_Experiments.zip
- Common Options:
 - -projectCP target/classes -prefix tutorial -Dsearch_budget=20
 -Doutput_variables=configuration_id,TARGET_CLASS,
 - Size, Length, MutationScore
 - Treatment I:

java -jar evosuite-1.0.3.jar -Dconfiguration_id=Default
<common options>

Treatment 2:

java -jar evosuite-1.0.3.jar -Dconfiguration_id=Branch
-criterion branch <common options>

• Resulting data:

evosuite-report/statistics.csv



Building EvoSuite

• Git repository:

git clone https://github.com/EvoSuite/evosuite.git

Maven

mvn package
(mvn -DskipTests package)

• Where is EvoSuite now?

master/target/evosuite-master-1.0.4-SNAPSHOT.jar

• Why is the jar file so huge?

EVSUITE

Module Structure

- master
- client
- runtime
- standalone-runtime
- plugins
- generated
- shaded

EVSUITE

Testing EvoSuite

Example Test:

public class NullStringSystemTest extends SystemTestBase {

```
@Test
public void testNullString() {
    EvoSuite evosuite = new EvoSuite();
    String targetClass = NullString.class.getCanonicalName();
    Properties.TARGET_CLASS = targetClass;
    String[] command = new String[] { "-generateSuite", "-class", targetClass };
    Object result = evosuite.parseCommandLine(command);
    GeneticAlgorithm<?> ga = getGAFromResult(result);
    TestSuiteChromosome best = (TestSuiteChromosome) ga.getBestIndividual();
    int goals = TestGenerationStrategy.getFitnessFactories().
        get(0).getCoverageGoals().size();
    Assert.assertEquals("Wrong number of goals: ", 3, goals);
    Assert.assertEquals("Non-optimal coverage: ", 1d, best.getCoverage(), 0.001);
```

}



Extending EvoSuite

• (Artificial) Example: Middle point crossover



Extending EvoSuite

• (Artificial) Example: Middle point crossover



Extending EvoSuite

 Demo: MiddleCrossOver class
 Additional property
 Test case

Contents

- I. Search Based Software Testing
- 2. Building an SBST Tool Hill climbing simple programs Alternating Variable Method Genetic Algorithms
- 3. The EvoSuite Test Generation Tool Running experiments with EvoSuite Extending EvoSuite
- 4. Lessons Learned
- 5. Future Work

Contents

- I. Search Based Software Testing
- 2. Building an SBST Tool Hill climbing simple programs Alternating Variable Method Genetic Algorithms
- 3. The EvoSuite Test Generation Tool Running experiments with EvoSuite Extending EvoSuite
- 4. Lessons Learned
- 5. Future Work



I. Java

...is a weird language and never ceases to surprise me

My personal enemy: Java Generics

Bytecode over sourcecode - yes!



2. Corner Cases

The more corner cases you cover ...the more can go wrong ...the more new corner cases you will find

...the slower EvoSuite becomes

EVSUITE

2. Corner Cases

- Constant Seeding: +5%
- Virtual FS: +1.4%
- Mocking +4.7%
- JEE support: +3%
- DSE: +1.2%



3. Developers

...some really care only about coverage

... others don't care about coverage:

"I wouldn't normally in real life be aiming for 100% coverage. I'd probably end up with fewer tests without this tool but I couldn't tell you if they would be all the right tests."

- ...do not want their tests to be generated
- ...hate ugly tests
- ...don't like waiting
- Talk to them!



3. Developers

public class Example {

private Example() {}



}



4. Testing

Testing randomised algorithms is difficult Make the implementation deterministic Always use LinkedHashSet over HashSet, LinkedHashMap over HashMap ava reflection is not deterministic Avoid static state (e.g. singletons)



4. Testing

EvoSuite uses one central random number generator

Any change will affect something at a completely different part of the program

Change seeds frequently during testing to find flaky tests



5. Documentation

I don't comment my code

Students struggle

I spend more time explaining things than it would take me to implement them



6. Tool Comparisons

Reviewers want to see them I don't like doing them It's impossible to make them fair Contact tool authors **Report** bugs Make your own tools usable

EVSUITE

7. Open Source

"The source code will be released under an open source library (most likely GPL2) at a later point, as soon as a number of refactorings are completed." — FSE'II tool paper appendix

Public GitHub repo: 2015

It will never be clean enough, just release it!



8. Licensing

License matters Google will not touch GPL

BSD, MIT - do you want others to become rich with your idea?

Gnu Lesser Public License, Apache



9. Tool Papers

The first one will be cited The rest no one will cite It shouldn't be this way

EVSUITE

IO. Robustness

Creating a robust tool... ...is a huge effort ...it will never be finished

EvoSuite is a black hole swallowing all my time!

Contents

- I. Search Based Software Testing
- 2. Building an SBST Tool Hill climbing simple programs Alternating Variable Method Genetic Algorithms
- 3. The EvoSuite Test Generation Tool Running experiments with EvoSuite Extending EvoSuite
- 4. Lessons Learned
- 5. Future Work

Contents

- I. Search Based Software Testing
- 2. Building an SBST Tool Hill climbing simple programs Alternating Variable Method Genetic Algorithms
- 3. The EvoSuite Test Generation Tool Running experiments with EvoSuite Extending EvoSuite
- 4. Lessons Learned
- 5. Future Work

I. SBST is Slow

- Fitness evaluation means executing tests
- Executing tests is slow
- How to reduce the number of fitness evaluations?
- How to improve search operators?
- Can we use ML to predict test execution results?

2. OO Guidance

- Object oriented code has a terrible search landscape
- Complex dependency objects are a problem
- Include dependency objects in fitness functions?
- Better testability transformations?
- Better fitness functions?

3. Technical Challenges

- Integration testing
- Concurrent code
- GUI handling code
- Database dependent code
- Prioritising tests
- Dynamically typed languages

4. SBST Usability

- Assertion/contract testing code?
- Coverage isn't a great objective
- Usability as optimisation goal
- Study developers using SBST tools

5. Anything but Coverage

- Energy consumption
- Performance
- Tests for diagnosis and repair














Method Names

@Test(timeout = 4000)public voi test3() throws Throwable { StringExample stringExample0 = new StringExample(); boolean boolean0 = stringExample0.foo(""); assertFalse(boolean0); } @Test(timeout = 4000)public void testFooReturningFalse() throws Throwable { StringExample stringExample0 = new StringExample(); boolean boolean0 = stringExample0.foo(""); assertFalse(boolean0);

Variable Names

@Test(timeout = 4000)

}

public void testFooReturningFalse() throws Throwable {
 StringExample stringExample0 = new StringExample();
 boolean boolean0 = stringExample0.foo("");
 assertFalse(boolean0);



@Test(timeout = 4000)
public void testFooReturningFalse() throws Throwable {
 StringExample invokesFoo = new StringExample();
 boolean resultFromFoo = invokesFoo.foo("");
 assertFalse(resultFromFoo);

Variable Names

```
public class Foo {
   public void foo() {
      StringExample sx = new StringExample();
      boolean bar = sx.foo("");
   }
}
```

}



@Test(timeout = 4000)
public void testFooReturningFalse() throws Throwable {
 StringExample sx = new StringExample();
 boolean bar = sx.foo("");
 assertFalse(bar);





Further attributes

Normative Model







Java Unit Testing Study X



Test Case A

package org.apache.commons.cli;

import static org.junit.Assert.*; import org.junit.Test; import org.apache.commons.cli.CommandLine; import org.apache.commons.cli.Option;

```
public class CommandLine_ESTest {
```

@Test

```
public void test0() throws Throwable {
   CommandLine commandLine0 = new CommandLine();
   boolean boolean0 = commandLine0.hasOption("!VW
   String string0 = commandLine0.getOptionValue('
   Option option0 = new Option((String) null, "!V
   commandLine0.addOption(option0);
   boolean boolean1 = commandLine0.hasOption("!VW
   assertFalse(boolean1 == boolean0);
   assertTrue(boolean1);
}
```

Test Case B

package org.apache.commons.cli;

```
import static org.junit.Assert.*;
import org.junit.Test;
import org.apache.commons.cli.CommandLine;
import org.apache.commons.cli.Option;
```

public class CommandLine_ESTest {

(Test

3

}

public void test0() throws Throwable {
 CommandLine commandLine0 = new CommandLine();
 Option option0 = new Option("", false, "");
 commandLine0.addOption(option0);
 boolean boolean0 = commandLine0.hasOption('-')
 assertTrue(boolean0);

() 0 ≡

숬

Gordon

```
Test A Test B
Next »
```

Contents

- I. Search Based Software Testing
- 2. Building an SBST Tool Hill climbing simple programs Alternating Variable Method Genetic Algorithms
- 3. The EvoSuite Test Generation Tool Running experiments with EvoSuite Extending EvoSuite
- 4. Lessons Learned
- 5. Future Work

Contents

- I. Search Based Software Testing
- 2. Building an SBST Tool Hill climbing simple programs Alternating Variable Method Genetic Algorithms
- 3. The EvoSuite Test Generation Tool Running experiments with EvoSuite Extending EvoSuite
- 4. Lessons Learned
- 5. Future Work



Submit your SBST papers here: <u>http://aster.or.jp/conference/icst2017</u>

http://goo.gl/kyO2Jq