10 Verification and Validation Continued

Dr. Spencer Smith

Faculty of Engineering, McMaster University

October 20, 2017

Verification and Validation Continued

- Administrative details
- Questions?

Administrative Details

- GitHub issues for colleagues
  - Assigned 1 colleague (see `Repos.xlsx` in repo)
  - Provide at least 5 issues on their SRS
- Reading week, no 741 classes
- V&V template updated in repo

Administrative Details: Deadlines

SRS Issues	Reading week	Oct 10
V&V Present	Week 06	Week of Oct 16
V&V Plan	Week 07	Oct 25
MG Present	Week 08	Week of Oct 30
MG	Week 09	Nov 8
MIS Present	Week 10	Week of Nov 13
MIS	Week 11	Nov 22
Impl. Present	Week 12	Week of Nov 27
Final Documentation	Week 13	Dec 6

Administrative Details: Presentation Schedule

- V&V Present
  - **Tuesday: Steven, Alexandre P., Alexander S.**
  - **Friday: Geneva, Jason, Yuzhi**
- MG Present
  - Tuesday: Xiaoye, Shusheng, Devi, Keshav, Alex P, Paul
  - Friday: Yuzhi, Jason, Geneva, Alex S, Isobel, Steven
- MIS Present
  - Tuesday: Isobel, Keshav, Paul
  - Friday: Shusheng, Xiaoye, Devi
- Impl. Present
  - Tuesday: Alexander S., Steven, Alexandre P.
  - Friday: Jason, Geneva, Yuzhi

Questions?

- Questions about SRS?
- Questions about V&V?

White-box Testing

- Intuitively, after running your test suites, what percentage of the lines of code in your program should be exercised?

White-box Coverage Testing

- (In)adequacy criteria - if significant parts of the program structure are not tested, testing is inadequate
- Control flow coverage criteria
  - Statement coverage
  - Edge coverage
  - Condition coverage
  - Path coverage

Examples that follow are from [1]

Statement-Coverage Criterion

- Select a test set T such that every elementary statement in P is executed at least once by some d in T
- An input datum executes many statements - try to minimize the number of test cases still preserving the desired coverage

Example

```
read (x); read (y);
if x > 0 then
        write ("1");
else
        write ("2");
end if;
if y > 0 then
        write ("3");
else
        write ("4");
end if;
```

How would you write a test case?

What is the minimum number of test cases?

Example

```
read (x); read (y);
if x > 0 then
        write ("1");
else
        write ("2");
end if;
if y > 0 then
        write ("3");
else
        write ("4");
end if;
```

{<x = 2, y = -3>, <x = - 13, y = 51>, <x = 97, y = 17>, <x = - 1, y = - 1>} covers all statements

{<x = - 13, y = 51>, <x = 2, y = - 3>} is minimal

Weakness of the Criterion

```
if x < 0 then
        x := -x;
end if;
z := x;
```

{<x=-3>} covers all statements. Why is this not enough?

Weakness of the Criterion

```
if x < 0 then
        x := -x;
end if;
z := x;
```

{<x=-3} covers all statements

it does not exercise the case when x is positive and the then branch is not entered

Edge-Coverage Criterion

- Select a test set T such that every edge (branch) of the control flow is exercised at least once by some d in T
- This requires formalizing the concept of the control graph and how to construct it
  - Edges represent statements
  - Nodes at the ends of an edge represent entry into the statement and exit

Control Graph Construction Rules



Simplification

A sequence of edges can be collapsed into just one edge



Example: Euclid's Algorithm

```
begin
        read (x); read (y);
        while x ≠ y loop
                if x > y then
                        x := x - y;
                else
                        y := y - x;
                end if;
        end loop;
        gcd : = x;
end;
```

Draw the control flow graph

Example: Euclid's Algorithm

```
begin
        read (x); read (y);
        while x ≠ y loop
                if x > y then
                        x := x - y;
                else
                        y := y - x;
                end if;
        end loop;
        gcd : = x;
end;
```



Weakness

```
found := false; counter := 1;
while (not found) and counter < number_of_items loop
        if table (counter) = desired_element then
                found := true;
        end if;
        counter := counter + 1;
end loop;
if found then
        write ("the desired element is in the table");
else
        write ("the desired element is not in the table");
end if;
```

test cases: (1) empty table, (2) table with 3 items, second of which is the item to look for

Weakness

```
found := false; counter := 1;
while (not found) and counter < number_of_items loop
        if table (counter) = desired_element then
                found := true;
        end if;
        counter := counter + 1;
end loop;
if found then
        write ("the desired element is in the table");
else
        write ("the desired element is not in the table");
end if;
```

test cases: (1) empty table, (2) table with 3 items, second of which is the item to look for

Do not discover the error ($<$ instead of $\leq$)

```
if c1 and c2 then
    st;
else
    sf;

// equivalent to

if c1 then
    if c2 then
        st;
    else
        sf;
else
    sf;
```

Condition-Coverage Criterion

- Select a test set T such that every edge of P's control flow is traversed and all possible values of the constituents of compound conditions are exercised at least once
- This criterion is finer than edge coverage

Weakness

```
if x ≠ 0 then
        y := 5;
else
        z := z - x;
end if;
if z > 1 then
        z := z / x;
else
        z := 0;
end if;
```

{<x = 0, z = 1>, <x = 1, z = 3>} causes the execution of all edges, but fails to expose the risk of a division by zero

Path-Coverage Criterion

- Select a test set T that traverses all paths from the initial to the final node of Ps control flow
- It is finer than the previous kinds of coverage
- However, number of paths may be too large, or even infinite (see while loops)
- Loops
  - Zero times (or minimum number of times)
  - Maximum times
  - Average number of times

The Infeasibility Problem

- Syntactically indicated behaviours (statements, edges, etc.) are often impossible
- Unreachable code, infeasible edges, paths, etc.
- Adequacy criteria may be impossible to satisfy
  - Manual justification for omitting each impossible test case
  - Adequacy "scores" based on coverage - example 95 % statement coverage

Further Problem

- What if the code omits the implementation of some part of the specification?
- White box test cases derived from the code will ignore that part of the specification!

Testing Boundary Conditions

- Testing criteria partition input domain in classes, assuming that behavior is “similar” for all data within a class
- Some typical programming errors, however, just happen to be at the boundary between different classes
  - Off by one errors
  - $<$ instead of $\leq$
  - equals zero

Criterion

- After partitioning the input domain D into several classes, test the program using input values not only "inside" the classes, but also at their boundaries
- This applies to both white-box and black-box techniques
- In practice, use the different testing criteria in combinations

The Oracle Problem

When might it be difficult to know the "expected" output/behaviour?

The Oracle Problem

- Given input test cases that cover the domain, what are the expected outputs?
- Oracles are required at each stage of testing to tell us what the right answer is
- Black-box criteria are better than white-box for building test oracles
- Automated test oracles are required for running large amounts of tests
- Oracles are difficult to design - no universal recipe

The Oracle Problem Continued

- Determining what the right answer should be is not always easy
  - Scientific computing
  - Machine learning
  - Artifical intelligence

The Oracle Problem Continued

What are some strategies we can use when we do not have a test oracle?

Strategies Without An Oracle

- Using an independent program to approximate the oracle (pseudo oracle)
- Method of manufactured solutions
- Properties of the expected values can be easier than stating the expected output
  - Examples?

Strategies Without An Oracle

- Using an independent program to approximate the oracle (pseudo oracle)
- Method of manufactured solutions
- Properties of the expected values can be easier than stating the expected output
  - Examples?
  - List is sorted
  - Number of entries in file matches number of inputs
  - Conservation of energy or mass
  - Expected trends in output are observed (metamorphic testing [5, 4, 6])
  - etc.

Challenges Specific to Scientific Computing

- Unknown solution
- Approximation of real numbers
- Nonfunctional requirements
- Parallel computation

Mutation Testing for SC

- Generate changes to the source code, called mutants, which become code faults
- Mutants include changing an operation, modifying constants, changing the order of execution, etc.
- The adequacy of a set of tests is established by running the tests on all generated mutants
- Need to account for floating point approximations
- See [3]

Specific SC V&V Approaches

Summary of most points below in [10]

- Compare to closed-form solutions
- Method of manufactured solutions [8]
- Interval arithmetic [2]
- Convergence studies
- Compare to other program (parallel testing)
- Can also consider using code inspection
  - [7, 9]
  - Sample checklists

Specific SC V&V NonFunctional

- Installability, consider VMs
- Portability, consider VMs, Docker, CI
- Describe (rather than specify) impact of changing inputs
  - Accuracy
  - Performance
  - Relative comparison
- Usability
  - Fairly simple standard survey
  - Example

Validation Testing Report for PMGT

- Prepared by Wen Yu
- Do not know the correct solution, but know properties of the correct solution
- Automated correctness validation tests
  - The area of each element is greater than zero
  - The boundary of the mesh is closed
  - Vertices in a clockwise order
  - $nc + nv - ne = 1$
  - ...
- Visual correctness validation tests
  - No vertex outside the input domain
  - No vertex inside a cell
  - No dangling edges
  - All cells connected
  - The mesh is conformal

Validation Testing Report for PMGT (Continued)

- List and description of test cases
- Test cases are labelled and numbered
- Traceability to SRS requirements
- Traceability to MG
- Summary of results
- Analysis of results
  - Focus on nonfunctional requirements
  - Speed

Test Plan From BlankProjectTemplate

References I

Carlo Ghezzi, Mehdi Jazayeri, and Dino Mandrioli.
Fundamentals of Software Engineering.
Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA, 2nd edition, 2003.

Timothy Hickey, Qun Ju, and Maarten H. Van Emden.
Interval arithmetic: From principles to implementation.
J. ACM, 48(5):1038–1068, September 2001.

Daniel Hook and Diane Kelly.
Testing for trustworthiness in scientific software.
In *Proceedings of the 2009 ICSE Workshop on Software Engineering for Computational Science and Engineering*, SECSE '09, pages 59–64, Washington, DC, USA, 2009. IEEE Computer Society.

References II

U. Kanewala and J. M. Bieman.
Techniques for testing scientific programs without an oracle.
In *Software Engineering for Computational Science and Engineering (SE-CSE), 2013 5th International Workshop on*, pages 48–57, May 2013.

Upulee Kanewala, James M. Bieman, and Asa Ben-Hur.
Predicting metamorphic relations for testing scientific software: A machine learning approach using graph kernels.
Software Testing Verification and Reliability, preprint, 2015.

References III

Upulee Kanewala and Anders Lundgren.
Automated metamorphic testing of scientific software.
In Jeffrey C. Carver, Neil Chue Hong, and George Thiruvathukal, editors, *Software Engineering for Science*, Chapman & Hall/CRC Computational Science, chapter Examples of the Application of Traditional Software Engineering Practices to Science, pages 151–174. Taylor & Francis, 2016.

Diane Kelly and Terry Shepard.
Task-directed software inspection technique: an experiment and case study.
In *CASCON '00: Proceedings of the 2000 conference of the Centre for Advanced Studies on Collaborative research*, page 6. IBM Press, 2000.

References IV

Patrick J. Roache.
Verification and Validation in Computational Science and Engineering.
Hermosa Publishers, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1998.

Terry Shepard and Diane Kelly.
How to do inspections when there is no time.
In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Software Engineering*, page 718. IEEE Computer Society, 2001.

References V

W. Spencer Smith.
A rational document driven design process for scientific computing software.
In Jeffrey C. Carver, Neil Chue Hong, and George Thiruvathukal, editors, *Software Engineering for Science*, chapter Section I – Examples of the Application of Traditional Software Engineering Practices to Science, pages 33–63. Taylor & Francis, 2016.