### Coverage Testing

Barbara Russo SwSE - Software and Systems Engineering research group





- One way to judge a test suite is to ask how thoroughly it exercises the program
- This is called coverage



#### Example text

```
1
   int foo (int a, int b, int c, int d, float e) {
       if (a == 0) {
2
           return 0;
3
       }
4
       int x = 0;
5
       if ((a==b) || ((c == d) && bug(a) )) {
6
7
             x=1;
8
       }
       e = 1/x;
                                          bug(): if a=1 it returns true
9
10
      return e;
                                          and false if a!=1.
11 }
```

### Coverage

- Coverage is a measure of the completeness of the set of test cases
  - Method coverage
  - Statement coverage
  - Branch coverage
  - Condition coverage

# Method coverage

- Measure: percentage of methods that have been executed at least once by test cases
- Tests should call 100% of the methods
- It seems irresponsible to deliver methods in the product when testing never used these methods
  - you need to ensure you have 100% method coverage

### Test Case 1

- There is only one method
- int foo (int a, int b, int c, int d, float e)
- for a=0 foo returns 0 no matter the values of the other parameters
- calling foo with input (0,0,0,0,0) we attain 100% method coverage in our example

### Statement coverage

- Measure: percentage of statements that have been executed by test cases
  - Achieve 100% statement coverage. Count the number of statements and cover all of them with a test

# Example

- With Test Case 1, we executed the program statements on lines 1-4 out of 11 lines of code
- As a result, we had 42% (5/12) statement coverage from Test Case 1

# Example

- We can attain 100% statement coverage by one additional test case,
- Test Case 2: foo(1, 1, 1, 1, 1), expected return value of 1.
- we have now executed the program statements on lines 5-11

# Branch Coverage

- Measure: percentage of the decision points have been evaluated as both true and false in test cases.
- Two decision points one on line 2 and the other on line 6
- 2 if (a == 0) {}
- 6 if ((a==b) OR ((c == d) AND bug(a) )) {}

- For decision/branch coverage, we evaluate an entire Boolean expression as one true-or-false predicate
- We need to ensure that each of these predicates (compound or single) is tested as both true and false

| Line # | Predicate                | True                 | False              |
|--------|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 3      | (a == 0)                 | Test Case 1 foo(0,   | Test Case 2        |
|        |                          | 0, 0, 0, 0) return 0 | foo(1, 1, 1, 1, 1) |
|        |                          |                      | return 1           |
| 7      | ( (a==b) OR              | Test Case 2 foo(1,   |                    |
|        | ((c == d) AND bug(a) ) ) | 1, 1, 1, 1) return 1 |                    |

### TestCase3

- With TewstCase1 and TestCase2 we have executed three of the four necessary conditions
  - we have achieved 75% branch coverage so far
- TestCase3 foo(1, 2, 1, 2, 1) return ??
- in calculating the output, we discover a division by 0 that can cause future failures!
  - That was due to a local variable that we could not control before!

| Line # | Predicate               | True                 | False              |
|--------|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 3      | (a == 0)                | Test Case 1 foo(0,   | Test Case 2        |
|        |                         | 0, 0, 0, 0) return 0 | foo(1, 1, 1, 1, 1) |
|        |                         |                      | return 1           |
|        |                         |                      |                    |
| 7      | ((a==b) OR              | Test Case 2 foo(1,   | TestCase3 foo(1,   |
|        | ((c == d) AND bug(a) )) | 1, 1, 1, 1) return 1 | 2, 1, 2, 1)        |
|        |                         |                      | division by zero!  |
|        |                         |                      |                    |

# Condition Coverage

- Measure: percentage of Boolean subexpressions of the program that have been evaluated as both true or false outcome in test cases
  - applies to compound predicates
- Condition coverage measures the outcome of each of these sub-expressions independently of each other

| Predicate | True                                      | False   |
|-----------|---|---|
| (a==b)    | Test Case 2 foo(1, 1,<br>1,1, 1) return 1 | Test Case 3 foo(1, 2, 1, 2,<br>1) division by zero! |
| (c==d)    |   | Test Case 3 foo(1, 2, 1, 2,<br>1) division by zero! |
| bug(a)    |   |   |

Only the 50% coverage!



### TestCase4

- We examine our available information on the bug method and determine that is should return true when a=1
- foo(1, 2, 1, 1, 1), expected return value 1

| Predicate | True                                      | False   |
|-----------|---|---|
| (a==b)    | Test Case 2 foo(1, 1,<br>1,1, 1) return 1 | Test Case 3 foo(1, 2, 1, 2,<br>1) division by zero! |
| (c==d)    | Test Case 4 foo(1, 2,<br>1,1, 1) return 1 | Test Case 3 foo(1, 2, 1, 2,<br>1) division by zero! |
| bug(a)    | Test Case 4 foo(1, 2,<br>1,1, 1) return 1 |   |



### TestCase5

- To finalize our condition coverage, we must force bug(a) to be false
- We again examine our bug() method, which informs us that it should return a false value if fed any integer a different from 1
- So we create Test Case 5, foo(3, 2, 1, 1, 1), expected return value "division by zero".

#### Note

- We could have (2,2,1,1,1). The input would have been fine but we would never reach the AND condition. Thus, we must make the (a==b) false to be sure to test the AND condition for FALSE.
- The same applies for (c==d): we need to have it TRUE to be sure that FALSE is due to the bug(a) condition.

# Traceability matrix

| Predicate | True                  | False                       |
|-----------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| (a==b)    | Test Case 2 foo(1, 1, | Test Case 3 foo(1, 2, 1, 2, |
|           | 1,1, 1) return 1      | 1) division by zero!        |
| (c==d)    | Test Case 4 foo(1, 2, | Test Case 3 foo(1, 2, 1, 2, |
|           | 1,1, 1) return 1      | 1) division by zero!        |
| bug(a)    | Test Case 4 foo(1, 2, | Test Case 5 foo(3, 2, 1,1,  |
|           | 1,1, 1) return 1      | 1) division by zero!        |



# Path coverage

- Path coverage is every possible combination of branches every path through the program taken by some test case
- McCabe complexity is used to determine how many complete execution paths (i.e. test built on them) a tester need to consider
- As with code coverage this is a measure that approximates exhaustiveness

### JaCoCo

- It is an Eclipse plug-in
- In the node build and sub-node plugins of the POM file include

<groupId>org.jacoco</groupId> <artifactId>jacoco-maven-plugin</artifactId> <version>0.8.2</version> <executions> <execution> <goals> <goal>prepare-agent</goal> </goals> </execution> <!-- attached to Maven test phase --> <execution> <id>report</id> <phase>test</phase> <qoals> <goal>report</goal> </goals> </execution> </executions> </plugin>

#### Exercise

```
public class Hailstone {
  public static void main(String[] args) {
    int n = 3;
    while (n != 1) {
        if (n % 2 == 0) {
            n = n / 2;
        } else {
            n = 3 * n + 1;
        }
    }
  }
```

- Run this class with JaCoCo code coverage highlighting turned on, by choosing Run → Coverage As → Java Application.
- By changing the initial value of n, you can observe how JaCoCo highlights different lines of code differently.

When n=3 initially, what color is the line n = n/2 after execution?

When n=16 initially, what color is the line n = 3 \* n + 1 after execution?

What initial value of n would make the line while (n != 1) yellow after execution?