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Motivations & Issues

• Using Inheritance context coverage, control- and data-flow techniques can be used to test methods - what about classes?
• It is argued that testing a class aims at finding the sequence of operations for which a class will be in a state that is contradictory to its invariant or what output is expected
• Testing classes for all possible sequences is not usually possible
• The resources required to test a class increase exponentially with the increase in the number of its methods
• It is necessary to devise a way to reduce the number of sequences and still provide sufficient confidence
Example

• Coin box of a vending machine implemented in C++
• The coin box has a simple functionality and the code to control the physical device is omitted
• It accepts only quarters and allows vending when two quarters are received
• It keeps track of total quarters received \( \text{totalQrts} \), the current quarters received \( \text{curQrts} \), and whether vending is enabled \( \text{allowVend} \)
• Functions: adding a quarter, returning current quarters, resetting the coin box to its initial state, and vending
class CCoinBox
{
  unsigned totalQtrs;
  unsigned curQtrs;
  unsigned allowVend;

public:
  CCoinbox(){Reset();}
  void AddQtrs();
  void ReturnQtrs()
  {curQtrs=0;}
  unsigned isAllowedVend()
  {return allowVend;}
  void Reset()
  {
    totalQtrs = 0;
    allowVend = 0;
    curQtrs = 0;
  }
  void Vend();
};

void CCoinBox ::AddQtr()
{
  curQtrs = curQtrs + 1;
  if (curQtrs > 1)
    allowVend = 1;
}

void CCoinBox::Vend()
{
  if(isAllowedVend())
  {
    totalQtrs = totalQtrs + 2;
    curQtrs = curQtrs - 2;
    if (curQtrs < 2) allowVend=0;
  }
}
Statechart corresponding to the code, not fully specified

• One corrupt state missing: allowVend = 1 curQrts = 1
• One transition missing on state allowVend = 1 curQrts = 0: AddQtr(
• allowVend=0 curQrts=0: ReturnQtr() allowVend=1 curQrts:[2,M]: AddQtr()
UML Statechart Transitions

- state transitions caused by events, enabled by guard conditions

- have the following general form (all elements are optional)

  \[
  \text{event(name)} \quad \text{guard} \quad \text{event(dispatch)} \quad \text{executed operation}
  \]

  
  
  Engine Off \quad \text{start [transmission= neutral]} \quad \text{Engine On}
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Data Slices: Basic Principles

- **Goal:** Reduce the number of method sequences to test
- The (concrete) state of an object at a single instance of time is equivalent to the aggregated state of each of its data members at that instance
- The correctness of a class depends on
  - Whether the data members are correctly representing the intended state of an object
  - Whether the member functions are correctly manipulating the representation of the object
Slice

• A class can be viewed as a composition of slices
• A slice is a quantum of a class with only a single data member and a set of member functions such that each member function can manipulate the values associated with this data member
• Bashir and Goel’s class testing strategy is to test one slice at a time
• For each slice, test possible sequences of the methods belonging to that slice - equivalent to testing a specific data member, i.e., class partial correctness
• Repeat for all slices to demonstrate class correctness
Slice Formalism

- A class $K$ encapsulates a set of data elements and provides a set of operations
  - $K = \langle D(K), M(K) \rangle$
  - $D(K) = \{d_i \mid d_i \in K\}$
  - $M(K) = \{m_i \mid m_i @ K\}$
  (where @ denotes the relationship between a class and its elements)

- A Data Slice
  - $\text{Slice}_{d_i}(K) = \langle d_i, M_{d_i}(K) \rangle$
    - $d_i \in D(K)$
    - $M_{d_i}(K) = \{m_i \mid m_i @@ d_i\}$
    (where @@ denotes the usage relationship)
Issues

- This is a code-based approach: Many potential problems.
- What if the code is faulty and a method that should access a data member does not? Then sequences of methods that interact through that data member won’t be tested and the fault may remain undetected.
- How to identify legal sequences of methods?
- What strategy to use when there is a large, possibly infinite, number of legal sequences?
Example C++ (I)

- Part of the GNU C++ library

```cpp
class SampleStatistic {
    friend TestSS;

protected :
    int n;
    double x;
    double x2;
    double minValue, maxValue;

public :
    SampleStatistic();
    virtual ~SampleStatistic();
    virtual void reset();
    virtual void operator += (double);
    int samples();
    double mean();
    double stdDev();
    double var();
    double min();
    double max();
    double confidence(int p_percentage);
    double confidence (double p_value);
    void error(char * msg);
};
```
SampleStatistic::mean() {
    if (n>0)
        return (x/n);
    else
        return (0.0);
}

SampleStatistic::operator+=(double value){
    n += 1;
    x += value;
    x2 += (value * value);
    if(minValue > value)
        minValue = value;
    if(maxValue < value)
        maxValue = value;
}

double SampleStatistics::stdDev() {
    if (n<=0 || this->var()<=0)
        return(0);
    else
        return (double)sqrt(var());
}

double SampleStatistics::var() {
    if (n>1)
        return ((x2 - ((x*x)/2)) / (n-1));
}
Generate MaDUM

- **MaDUM**: Minimal Data Member Usage Matrix
- \( n \times m \) matrix where \( n \) is the number of data members and \( m \) represents the number of member methods – it reports on the usage of data members by methods
- **Different usages**: reads, reports, transforms
- Account for *indirect* use of data members, through intermediate member functions
Categorize Member Functions

- Categories: Constructors, Reporters, Transformers, Others

- $M_{\text{di}}(K) = \{R_{\text{di}}, C, T_{\text{di}}, O_{\text{di}}\}$,
  - $R_{\text{di}} = \{r_{\text{di}} | r_{\text{di}}$ is a reporter method for data member $d_i\}$
  - $C = \{c_i | c_i$ is a constructor of class $K\}$
  - $T_{\text{di}} = \{m_{\text{di}} | m_{\text{di}} \notin R_{\text{di}}$ and $m_{\text{di}} \notin C$ and $m_{\text{di}} \rightarrow d_i\}$
  - $O_{\text{di}} = \{o_{\text{di}} | o_{\text{di}} @@ d_i$ and $o_{\text{di}} \notin R_{\text{di}}$ and $o_{\text{di}} \notin C$ and $o_{\text{di}} \notin T_{\text{di}}\}$

- Account for *indirect* use of data members, through intermediate member functions
MaDUM for SampleStatistic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Statistic</th>
<th>reset</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>samples</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>stdDev</th>
<th>var</th>
<th>min</th>
<th>max</th>
<th>confidence (int)</th>
<th>confidence (dbl)</th>
<th>error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x2</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min-Value</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max-Value</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Matrix account for indirect use, through called methods**
- `stdDev()` does not directly access `x` and `x2`, but calls `var()` that does
- **All SampleStatistic() does is call reset()**
Test Procedure

• Classification of methods is used to decide the test steps to be taken:
  1. Test reporters
  2. Test constructors
  3. Test transformers
  4. Test others

• We would like to automate that procedure to the extent possible
Test the Reporters

• I would simply make sure that all classes have get and set methods for all their data members (standard class interface)

• Then I would systematically set and get values of data members and compare the input of the former with the output of the latter.
Test the Constructors

- Constructors initialize data members
- You may have several per class
- We test that
  - All data members are correctly initialized
  - All data members are initialized in correct order
- Run the constructor and append the reporter method(s) for each data member
- Verify if in correct initial state (state invariant)
- Only one simple constructor in SampleStatistic
Test the Transformers

- **Rationale:** Test interactions between methods

- **For each slice** $d_i$
  1. Instantiate object under test with constructor (already tested)
  2. Create sequences, e.g., all legal permutations of methods in $T_{d_i}$
     - Maximum # sequences: $|C| \times |T_{d_i}|$
     - For example, if 7 member functions in $T_{d_i}$, with one constructor, this leads to 5040 possible permutations!
     - Question: are permutations sufficient to test interactions between methods?
  3. Append the reporter method(s) (already tested)

- **If several control flow paths in member function:**
  All the paths where the slice $d_i$ is being manipulated must be executed
Test Others

- They do not change the data member di
- They do not report on the data member di
- They may not even use the data member di
- They may not use and change ANY data member
- They should be tested as a *stand-alone entity*
- Any standard test technique can be used (WB, BB, Mutation)
CCoinBox Slices

• Slice allowVend:
  - $T_{\text{allowVend}}(\text{CCoinBox}) = \{\text{Reset, AddQrt, ReturnQrts, Vend}\}$

• Slice curQrts:
  - $T_{\text{curQrts}}(\text{CCoinBox}) = \{\text{Reset, AddQrt, ReturnQrts, Vend}\}$

• As a result of the fault, possibly important, sequences would not have been tested

• When the code is correct, both slices show the same set of methods!
Discussions

• Slicing may not be helpful for many classes (see CCoinBox example)
• # sequences may still be large
• Many sequences may be impossible (illegal)
• Automation? , e.g., oracle, impossible sequences
• Are we missing many faults by testing slices independently? , e.g., if faults lead to incorrectly defined slices
• Implicitly aimed at classes with no state-dependent behavior? (transformers may need to be executed several times to reach certain states and reveal state faults)
Testing Derived Classes

• When two classes are related through inheritance, a class is derived from another class.
• The derived class may add facilities or modify the ones provided by the base class – it inherits data members and methods from its base class.
• Two extreme options for testing a derived class:
  - Flatten the derived class and retest all slices of the base class in the new context.
  - Only test the new/redefined slices of derived class.
Bashir and Goel’s Strategy

- Assuming the base class has been *adequately* tested, what needs to be tested in the derived class?
- Extend the MaDUM of the base class to generate MaDUM\textsubscript{derived}
  - Take the MaDUM of the base class
  - Add a row for each newly defined or re-defined data member of the derived class
  - Add a column for each newly defined or re-defined member function of the derived class
Example: SampleHistogram

Class SampleHistogram : public SampleStatistic {
    protected:
        short howmanybuckets;
        int *bucketCount;
        double *bucketLimit;
    public:
        SampleHistogram(double low, double hi, double bucketWidth = -1.0);
        ~SampleHistogram();
        virtual void reset();
        virtual void operator+=(double);
        int similarSamples(double);
        int buckets();
        double bucketThreshold(int i);
        int inBucket(int i);
        void printBuckets(ostream&);
    }
Filling the MaDUM\textsubscript{Derived}

- \( C(\text{method}) = \) column corresponding to “method” in MaDUM
- If a newly defined member function \( m_{\text{derived}} \) calls an inherited member function \( m_{\text{base}} \) of the base class, then the column of the two methods are unioned and the result is stored in the column of the \( m_{\text{derived}} \)
  \[
  C(m_{\text{derived}}) = C(m_{\text{derived}}) \cup C(m_{\text{base}})
  \]
- Even though the base class has no a priori knowledge about the data members defined in its derived classes, it may still act on them through dynamic binding and polymorphism. Such a scenario would arise if a member function \( m_{1\text{base}} \) calls another member function \( m_{2\text{base}} \) and the method \( m_{2} \) is redefined \( (m_{2\text{derived}}) \) in one of the derived classes
  \[
  C(m_{1\text{base}}) = C(m_{1\text{base}}) \cup C(m_{2\text{derived}})
  \]
The MaDUM of SampleHistogram has eight rows, three of them for local data members, and twenty columns, eight for local member functions (2 of them re-defined).

Both reset and += are re-defined/overridden in SampleHistogram and invoke their counterpart in SampleStatistics - they therefore indirectly access all the data members of SampleStatistics.
Test Procedure for Derived Class

- **Local attributes**: Similar to base class testing
- **Retest inherited attributes** (i.e., their slices):
  - If they are directly or indirectly accessed by a new or re-defined method of the derived class.
  - Check upper right quadrant of \( \text{MaDUM}_{\text{derived}} \)
  - We have to ascertain which inherited attributes mandate re-testing - \( \text{MaDUM}_{\text{derived}} \) can be used for automation
  - Once these inherited attributes are identified, the test procedure is similar to slice testing in the base class, but using inherited and new/redefined methods => more testing ...
Identify Inherited Attributes to be Re-tested

• An inherited data member needs to be re-tested if the number of entries in its MaDUM row has increased between \( \text{MaDUM}_{\text{base}} \) and \( \text{MaDUM}_{\text{derived}} \).

• For SampleHistogram, the set of inherited data members that needs re-testing includes all inherited data members \( \{n, x, x2, \text{minValue}, \text{maxValue}\} \).
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Method’s pre- and post-conditions

• Method pre-condition:
  - A predicate that must be true before an operation is invoked.
  - Specifies constraints that a caller must meet before calling an operation.
• Method post-condition:
  - A predicate that must be true after an operation is invoked.
  - Specifies constraints that the object must ensure after the invocation of the operation.
• Possible notations:
  - Natural language
  - Object Constraint Language (OCL) in the context of UML
  - Extensions to programming languages
    • Eiffel
    • JML
Example - Queue

Class Queue (unbounded queue)
   Attribute: Number of elements in the queue, count

Init(q:Queue)
   pre: Queue q does not exist
   post: Queue q exists and is empty

Empty(q:Queue)
   pre: Queue q exists
   post: Returns 1 if q is empty (count=0), 0 otherwise (count>0)

Enque(q:Queue, e:Element)
   pre: Queue q exists
   post: Element e has been added to the tail of queue q, and q is not empty (count=old(count)+1)

Dque(q:Queue, e:Element)
   pre: Queue q exists and is not empty (count>0)
   post: Element e has been removed from q (count=old(count)-1)

Top(q:Queue, e:Element)
   pre: Queue q exists and is not empty (count>0)
   post: The first element is returned (e)
Approach


1. Get pre- and post-conditions
   - e.g., from UML analysis and design documents
   - or devise them

2. Derive method sequence constraints from pre- and post-conditions
   - They indicate which method sequences (pairs) are allowed or not and under which conditions
   - Automation?

3. Choose a criterion
   - We will define 7 criteria

4. Derive method sequences satisfying the criterion from the method sequence constraints
   - Automation?
Sequencing Constraints

• Pre- and post-conditions imply method sequencing constraints for pairs of methods.

• Assuming \( m_1 \) and \( m_2 \) are two methods of a class, a sequencing constraints between \( m_1 \) and \( m_2 \) is defined as a triplet:
  \((m_1, m_2, C)\)
  - Such a triplet indicates that \( m_2 \) can be executed after \( m_1 \) under condition \( C \).

• \( C \) is a Boolean expression or a Boolean literal (True, False).
  - \( C=\text{True} \Rightarrow m_2 \text{ can always be executed after } m_1. \)
    - \( m_1 \text{’s post-condition implies } m_2 \text{’s pre-condition} \)
  - \( C=\text{False} \Rightarrow m_2 \text{ can never be executed after } m_1. \)
    - \( m_1 \text{’s post-condition implies the negation of } m_2 \text{’s pre-condition} \)
  - \( C=\text{BoolExp} \Rightarrow m_2 \text{ can be executed after } m_1 \text{ under some conditions.} \)
    - \text{BoolExp lists the conditions under which the sequence is possible (disjunctive normal form): } C=C_1 \lor C_2 \lor \ldots \)
Criteria (I)

• **Always Valid Coverage (T)**
  - Each always-valid constraint must be covered at least once
  - i.e., each \((m1, m2, T)\).

• **Always/Possibly True Coverage (T/pT)**
  - Each always-valid constraint and each possibly-true constraint must be covered at least once.
  - i.e., each \((m1, m2, T)\) and each \((m1, m2, C)\) using one of the disjunction in \(C (C_1 \text{ or } C_2 \text{ or } ...)\)

• **Always/Possibly True Coverage Plus (T/pT+)**
  - Each always-valid constraint and each possibly-true constraint (using in turn each of the disjunctions) must be covered at least once.
  - i.e., each \((m1, m2, T)\) and each \((m1, m2, C_i)\) using each of the disjunction in \(C (C_1, C_2 \text{ and } ...)\)
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Criteria (II)

- **Never Valid Coverage (F)**
  - Each never-valid constraint must be covered at least once.
  - i.e., each \((m_1, m_2, F)\)

- **Never Valid/Possibly False (F/pF)**
  - Each never-valid constraint and each possibly false constraint must be covered at least once.
  - i.e., each \((m_1, m_2, F)\) and each \((m_1, m_2, \neg C)\)

- **Never Valid/Possibly False Plus (F/pF+)**
  - Each never-Valid constraint and each possibly false constraint must be covered at least once.
  - \(\neg C = C'_1 \lor C'_2 \lor \ldots\)
  - i.e., each \((m_1, m_2, F)\) and each \((m_1, m_2, \neg (C'_1)), (m_1, m_2, \neg (C'_2))\) ...

- **Always/Possibly True Plus/Never/Possibly False Plus (T/pT+/F/pF+)**
Subsumption

T/pT+/F/pF+

T/pT+  F/pF+

T/pT  F/pF

T  F
Example - Queue

Sequencing constraints:

\[ \begin{align*}
C_1. \; (#, \text{Init}, T) & \quad C_6. \; (#, \text{Eque}, F) & \quad C_{11}. \; (#, \text{Dque}, F) & \quad C_{16}. \; (#, \text{Top}, F) \\
C_2. \; (\text{Init}, \text{Eque}, T) & \quad C_7. \; (\text{Eque}, \text{Dque}, T) & \quad C_{12}. \; (\text{Dque}, \text{Eque}, T) & \quad C_{17}. \; (\text{Top}, \text{Dque}, T) \\
C_3. \; (\text{Init}, \text{Dque}, F) & \quad C_8. \; (\text{Eque}, \text{Top}, T) & \quad C_{13}. \; (\text{Dque}, \text{Init}, F) & \quad C_{18}. \; (\text{Top}, \text{Eque}, T) \\
C_4. \; (\text{Init}, \text{Init}, F) & \quad C_9. \; (\text{Eque}, \text{Eque}, T) & \quad C_{14}. \; (\text{Dque}, \text{Dque}, C) & \quad C_{19}. \; (\text{Top}, \text{Init}, F) \\
C_5. \; (\text{Init}, \text{Top}, F) & \quad C_{10}. \; (\text{Eque}, \text{Init}, F) & \quad C_{15}. \; (\text{Dque}, \text{Top}, C) & \quad C_{20}. \; (\text{Top}, \text{Top}, T) \\
\end{align*} \]

Where: \( C = \text{count}>0 \)

Criterion T requires the use of:

\[ \begin{align*}
C_1. \; (#, \text{Init}, T) & \quad C_2. \; (\text{Init}, \text{Eque}, T) & \quad C_7. \; (\text{Eque}, \text{Dque}, T) & \quad C_{12}. \; (\text{Dque}, \text{Eque}, T) \\
C_{17}. \; (\text{Top}, \text{Dque}, T) & \quad C_8. \; (\text{Eque}, \text{Top}, T) & \quad C_{18}. \; (\text{Top}, \text{Eque}, T) & \quad C_9. \; (\text{Eque}, \text{Eque}, T) \\
C_{20}. \; (\text{Top}, \text{Top}, T) & \\
\end{align*} \]
Example - Queue

Criterion T

Partial tree based on sequencing constraints

C. (Init,T)

C2. (Init,Eque,T)

C9. (Eque,Eque,T)

C8. (Eque,Top,T)

C20. (Top,Top,T)

C17. (Top,Dque,T)

C18. (Top,Eque,T)

C12. (Dque,Eque,T)

C7. (Eque,Dque,T)

C7. (Eque,Top,T)

C8. (Eque,Top,T)

C17. (Top,Dque,T)

C18. (Top,Eque,T)

C17. (Top,Dque,T)

C12. (Dque,Eque,T)

C8. (Eque,Top,T)

C8. (Eque,Top,T)

C8. (Eque,Top,T)

C17. (Top,Dque,T)

C18. (Top,Eque,T)
Discussion

• Automation?
  - From pre- and post-conditions to sequencing constraints
  - From sequencing constraints to ‘complete’ sequences
• Several sequences can be adequate for a particular criterion
  - Which branch in the tree do we choose?
  - Are they equivalent in terms of fault detection?
    • E.g., the set of statements executed in methods may be different
  - May need to cover some pT constraints to cover certain T ones
• Selecting another criterion than T
  - Criterion F
    • Another representation than the tree we used before may be necessary
  - Criterion pT+
    • The execution of sequence ab, constrained by \((a, b, C_{\text{Bool}})\), may require specific calls before the call to a (because of pre- and post-conditions of a).
• Empirical comparison of the different criteria
Empirical Study

- From Daniels and Tai
- 3 C++ programs
- Mutation tool Proteum for C
- 71 mutation operators, 155 mutants
- Criteria (and their names) are not exactly the ones defined here for $T/pT+$ and $F/pF+$
- Different oracles: simple self-checks, checking return values (oracles), checking postconditions
- When using appropriate oracles (e.g., check post-conditions and return values), most or all mutants were killed with $T/pT+$-type criteria
- The thoroughness of the oracle has a very significant impact on results.
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Motivations

• Does not apply to class (cluster) testing only. Can be applied to any component (e.g., subsystem) modeled by a state machine - we will however refer to classes in the slides
• Started with the testing of communication protocols
• Finding which method sequences to execute to gain confidence in the classes under test may not be easy
• Bashir and Goel’s approach can be used for simpler classes. But more complex, modal classes should have their behavior modeled by a state-transition model (e.g., Finite State Machine or FSM)
• Such a model can be used as a basis to measure the coverage of class testing and derive test cases to improve that coverage
• This is a natural information source for class testing in a UML context where statecharts (a specific state model) are defined for classes whose behavior is state dependent
• The question is now, what does “coverage” mean in the context of a state-transition model?
Simple State Machine

- No Request
- Up Request
- Down Request
- Up Request
- Down Request
- Elevator Started
- Elevator Started
- Checking
- Next Destination
- Moving to Floor
- Preparing to Move Up
- Preparing to Move Down
- Elevator Idle
Finite State Machines (I)

- An initial state
- A set of states
- Finite sets of input \((X)\) and output \((Y)\) events
- Transfer function
- Output function
Finite State Machines (II)

\[ S : \text{finite set of states} \]
\[ S_0 : \text{initial state} \]
\[ \Sigma : \text{finite input alphabet} \]
\[ \Omega : \text{finite output alphabet} \]
\[ \delta : \text{transfer function, } \delta : S \times \Sigma \to S \]
\[ \lambda : \text{output function, } \lambda : S \times \Sigma \to \Omega \]

**First steps:**
- Deterministic ? Fully specified? Minimal ? Strongly connected ?
- Verify completeness, e.g., add a transition ' \( \beta/\_ \)' which loops on

**Choosing test coverage:** All states, all transitions, ...

- Impact on test effort?
- Controlability (reach state \( i \)): does a 'reset' function exist?
- Observability (observe state \( i \)): does a 'status' function exist?

**Graphical representation**

**Tabular representation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>state</th>
<th>( \alpha )</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/r</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/s 2/r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Properties of FSMs

• *Completely specified:* An FSM is said to be completely specified if from each state in M there exists a transition for each input symbol.

• *Strongly connected:* An FSM M is considered strongly connected if for each pair of states \((q_i, q_j)\) there exists an input sequence that takes M from state \(q_i\) to \(q_j\).

• *Minimal:* A FSM M is considered minimal if the number of states in M is less than or equal to any other FSM equivalent to M.
Application Domains of FSMs

- Modeling GUIs, network protocols, pacemakers, Teller machines, WEB applications, safety software modeling in nuclear plants, and many more.

- While the FSM’s considered in examples are abstract machines, they are abstractions of many real-life machines.

- Embedded systems can commonly be modeled with FSMs: Many real-life devices have computers embedded in them. For example, an automobile has several embedded computers to perform various tasks, engine control being one example. Another example is a computer inside a toy for processing inputs and generating audible and visual responses.
Embedded Systems

• An embedded computer often receives inputs from its environment and responds with appropriate actions. While doing so, it moves from one state to another.

• The response of an embedded system to its inputs depends on its current state. It is this behavior of an embedded system in response to inputs that is often modeled by a finite state machine (FSM).

• For example, the elevator control FSM
• Events such as “switch on” and “switch off” may cause the machine to change state, as in the state diagram below for a light with a rocker switch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>input events</th>
<th>current state</th>
<th>next state</th>
<th>outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Switch on</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switch on</td>
<td>off</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>click</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switch off</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>off</td>
<td>click</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switch off</td>
<td>off</td>
<td>off</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- state event | On | Off
Switch on     | -  | click, on
Switch off    | click, off | -

• Some events don’t cause a state transition at all, as in attempting to turn on a light that is already on.

• Behaviour of the system in each state has to be defined: State ON - light is emitted out of bulb, State OFF - no light emitted.
Equivalence

- Two states are equivalent if
  - for every input sequence, the output sequences from the two states are the same

\[ s_1 \text{ and } s_2 \] are equivalent?
\[ s_2 \text{ and } s_3 \] are equivalent?

- A FSM with no two equivalent states is reduced or minimized
Fault Taxonomy

1. Missing or incorrect transition to a valid state, based on a correct input (Transfer fault)
   - Transition from 2 to 1 on input $\beta$ is missing
   - Transition from 1 to 2 (on input $\gamma$) is in fact from 1 to 3

2. Missing or incorrect output (action), based on a correct input and transition
   - Transition from 1 to 2 (on input $\gamma$) outputs $r$ (instead of $u$)

3. Corrupt state: Based on a correct input, the implementation computes a state that is not valid (additional state).

4. Sneak path (extra transition): The implementation accepts an input that is illegal or unspecified for a state
   - Transition from 1 to 4 on input $\varphi$

5. Illegal input failure: The implementation fails to handle an illegal message correctly (incorrect output, state corrupted)
Output faults

**Specification**

- State s1:
  - Transition: a/1 to s2
  - Transition: b/0 to s3

- State s2:
  - Transition: a/1 to s1
  - Transition: b/1 to s3

- State s3:
  - Transition: a/0 to s1
  - Transition: b/0 to s2

**Implementation**

- State s1:
  - Transition: a/1 to s2
  - Transition: b/0 to s3

- State s2:
  - Transition: a/1 to s1
  - Transition: b/0 to s3

- State s3:
  - Transition: a/1 to s1
  - Transition: b/0 to s2
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Transfer faults

Specification

Implementation
Transfer faults with additional (corrupt) states

Specification

Implementation
Transition Tour (TT) (1)

- A transition tour of a FSM
  - A path starting at the initial state, traverses every transition at least once, and returns to the initial state

```
bababa
s1->s1 ->s2->s2->s3->s3->s1
0 1 1 1 0 0
```
TT-method (2)

- From a transition tour, we identify a test suite consisting of an input sequence and its expected output sequence
  - The input sequence *bababa* and
  - Its expected output sequence *011100*
  - *Observed sequence is .... ?*
  - *Oracle: compare sequences*
TT-method (3)

• Transition tours can find all output faults

Specification
Input sequence: bababa
Expected output sequence: 011100

Implementation
Input sequence: bababa
Observed output sequence: 111100
TT-method problem

- Transition tours cannot always distinguish transfer faults

**Specification**

Input sequence: **bababa**

Expected output sequence: **011100**

**Implementation**

Input sequence: **bababa**

Observed output sequence: **010001**
Detecting Transfer Faults

• The main idea
  - *Generate a test suite such that, for every transition* \((s, i, o, s')\):
    • Step 1: Puts the implementation into state \(s\) (Setup)
    • Step 2: Applies input \(i\) and check whether the actual output is \(o\) (Output fault)
    • Step 3: Determines whether the target state of the implementation is \(s'\) (Transfer fault)
  
• Step 3: one possibility is that the implementation makes the state observable (e.g., “status” function) - but it is not always possible, so let’s put it aside for now
Distinguishing sequence

• An input sequence is a distinguishing sequence if
  - After applying the input sequence, we can determine the source state by observing the produced output sequence
Example 1

• *a* is not a distinguishing sequence ...
Example 2

• *ab* is a distinguishing sequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial state</th>
<th>Input seq</th>
<th>Output seq</th>
<th>Final state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DS-method

- For every transition \((s, i, o, s')\)
  - Step 1: Put the implementation into state \(s\) (Setup)
  - Step 2: Apply input \(i\) and check whether the actual output is \(o\) (Output fault)
  - Step 3: Determine whether the target state of the implementation is \(s'\) using a distinguishing sequence (Transfer fault)
DS-method: A test suite

**Diagram:**
- States: s1, s2, s3
- Transitions:
  - t1: a / 0
  - t2: b / 1
  - t3: a / 1
  - t4: b / 1
  - t5: a / 0
  - t6: b / 0

**Transitions with Outputs:**
- t1: reset/null a/0 a/0 b/1
- t2: reset/null b/1 a/1 b/1
- t3: reset/null b/1 a/1 a/1 b/1
- t4: reset/null b/1 b/1 a/0 b/0
- t5: reset/null b/1 b/1 a/0 a/0 b/0
- t6: reset/null b/1 b/1 b/0 a/0 b/1

**Steps:**
- **Setup**
- **Output**
- **Transfer**
DS-method pros and cons

- Few FSMs possess a distinguishing sequence.
- Even if an FSM has a distinguishing sequence, the sequence may be too long.
- Example: there is no DS
  - A DS cannot start with a \((s1, s2)\)
  - A DS cannot start with b \((s2, s3)\)
W-method

• A set of input sequences is a characterizing set if
  - After applying all input sequences in the set, we can determine the source state by observing the output sequences
Example

• \{a, b\} is a characterizing set ....?
W-method: A test suite

\[
\begin{align*}
t1: & \text{ reset/null } a/0 \ a/0 \\
t1: & \text{ reset/null } a/0 \ b/1 \\
t2: & \text{ reset/null } b/1 \ a/1 \\
t2: & \text{ reset/null } b/1 \ b/1 \\
t3: & \text{ reset/null } b/1 \ a/1 \ a/1 \\
t3: & \text{ reset/null } b/1 \ a/1 \ b/1 \\
t4: & \text{ reset/null } b/1 \ b/1 \ a/0 \\
t4: & \text{ reset/null } b/1 \ b/1 \ b/0 \\
t5: & \text{ reset/null } b/1 \ b/1 \ a/0 \ a/0 \\
t5: & \text{ reset/null } b/1 \ b/1 \ a/0 \ b/0 \\
t6: & \text{ reset/null } b/1 \ b/1 \ b/0 \ a/0 \\
t6: & \text{ reset/null } b/1 \ b/1 \ b/0 \ b/1
\end{align*}
\]
W-method pros and cons

• Although every FSM has a characterizing set, the set may have too many elements (expensive)

• Both distinguishing sequences and characterizing sets impose too strong requirements
  • We are just interested in determining whether the target state is a specific state or not
    • State identification versus state verification
Another Example of $W$

$W=\{\text{baaa,aa,aaa}\}$

$O(\text{baaa}, q1) = 1101$

$O(\text{baaa}, q2) = 1100$

Thus baaa distinguishes state $q1$ from $q2$ as $O(\text{baaa}, q1) \neq O(\text{baaa}, q2)$
Unique-input-output (UIO) - method

• Let \( s \) be a state.
• An input sequence is a UIO sequence for \( s \) if
  - After applying the input sequence, we can determine the source state is \( s \) or not by observing the output sequence.
UIO-method & states s2, s3

- $a$ is a UIO sequence for s2
- $b$ is a UIO sequence for s3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial state</th>
<th>Input seq</th>
<th>Output seq</th>
<th>Final state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial state</th>
<th>Input seq</th>
<th>Output seq</th>
<th>Final state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UIO-method and state s1

- \(ab\) is a UIO sequence for \(s1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial state</th>
<th>Input seq</th>
<th>Output seq</th>
<th>Final state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UIO-method - Test suite

t1: reset/null a/0 a/0 b/1
t2: reset/null b/1 a/1
t3: reset/null b/1 a/1 a/1
t4: reset/null b/1 b/1 b/0
t5: reset/null b/1 b/1 a/0 b/0
t6: reset/null b/1 b/1 b/0 a/0 b/1
UIO-method pros and cons

- Many states in FSMs have UIO sequences
- UIO sequences are usually short
- However, fault detection capability is not powerful (See Mathur’s book)
Extended FSMs

- A set of states
- An initial state
- Finite sets of input (X) and output (Y) events
- A finite set of variables (V)
- Transition relation
  - Guards
  - Update blocks
Tests for EFSM models

- EFSM executions depend on input signals and data
- A test consists of:
  - test sequence
  - test data
- Executability problem:
  - Find data to execute the test sequence
    - Undecidable, in general 😞
EFSM control and data flow testing

- EFSM executions are data-dependent
- Control flow FSM testing methods (e.g., cover all transitions) are not adequate for EFSM models
- Data flow testing methods account for data dependencies
Data flow: definitions and uses

• Data variables are
  - defined by inputs and updates (def)
  - used in
    • updates (c-use)
    • guards (p-use)

• Data-flow graph captures data dependencies
Data flow graph

• Directed graph with nodes labeled with definitions and uses of variables

\[ v = 0 \rightarrow \{ \text{input } u \} \]
\[ u < 0 \rightarrow \{ v := u + 1 \} \]

\[ p\text{-use } v \quad \text{def } u \]
\[ p\text{-use } u \quad \text{c-use } u \quad \text{def } v \]
Data-flow coverage criteria

• all-def
  - test suite covers each definition at least once

• all-use
  - cover each def-use association at least once

• all-du-paths
  - exercise all paths from each definition of a variable to every one of its uses.
all-use coverage

- Find at least one definition-free path for every def-use association