#### Model-Based Testing (DIT848 / DAT261) Spring 2016

Lecture 12 Revision

Gerardo Schneider Department of Computer Science and Engineering Chalmers | University of Gothenburg

# Revision request...

Go through a previous exam

### Exam MBT Disclaimer!

- Note that the following is only a sample of a previous exam!
- The precise content or format of the incoming exam might be slightly different!

# Exam MBT (General issues)

- ALLOWED AID:
  - One book on testing
  - Only one piece of paper (both sides)
  - English dictionary
  - NOT ALLOWED: Any form of electronic device (dictionaries, agendas, computers, mobile phones, etc), nor any other kind of material!
- Remember: Long exam (7.5 HEC) vs Short exam (4.5 HEC)

## Exam MBT (General issues)

- PLEASE OBSERVE THE FOLLOWING:
  - Motivate your answers (a simple statement of facts not answering the question is considered to be invalid);
  - Start each task on a new paper;
  - Sort the tasks in order before handing them in;
  - Write your student code on each page and put the number of the task on every paper;
  - Read carefully the section below "ABOUT THE FORMAT OF THE EXAM"
    - Available from the course homepage (under "Examination" tab)

## Exam MBT - May 21, 2012

- MBT-exam-2012-05-21.pdf
  - Available from the course homepage:

http://www.cse.chalmers.se/edu/year/2016/course/DAT261/examination.html

#### Task 1 - Test in general Part 1

Solution

1. F - testing is always dynamic

2. T

3. F - debugging is testing + correcting the errors

4. F - This is the less advisable way to do it since identifying the source of the error becomes difficult when considering the full tystem. Bottom-up or Top-down are more suitable (depending on how you build your system)

5. F - No, you don't need a full implementation (you might use some mock code - stubs and drivers)

#### Task 1 - Test in general Part 2

Solution:

- 1. Acceptance test (g) (also during system test e)
- 2. stress/system test (e) and also acceptance (g)
- 3. Combination of coverage analysis (c) and unit tests (b)
- 4. timing response test (system test e)
- 5. configuration test (system test e)



- Many other solutions depending on how much do you abstract
  - A "good" solution should be abstract enough as to capture the informal description (but not too much as to be useless)

9

10 min

"logout" could be eliminated (as it is automatic)

No check on whether login is correct or not (not in the specification)

Implicit loop in state "C" on "look\_for\_provider"

### Task 2 - State Machines Part 2

Proposed Solution

- Test cases you can extract:
  - 1. After login if there is provider then the demander gets an sms indicating that.
  - 2. If no provider exists for that ride then the user is logged out after getting a notification.
- Test cases you cannot extract:
  - 1. If a provider does exist for the ride, the user may still not get the guarantee of a ride due to overbooking.
  - 2. Any timing constraints in what concerns how much time to wait for getting a confirmation of a ride.



• Brackets ("[.]") are used as a short for "If ... then ..."

t: timer; c: number of times a demander may request a ride; p: nr of passengers (stored in the DB; get using "get\_p")

Assumption: the timer is automatically incremented (implicit loop in state E)<sub>11</sub> 15 min

### Task 3 - White box testing and coverage Part 1

Solution

a-b-g (not finishing in the final state though
-> a-c-d-e )

- b. (Considering the state as being between the transitions) s1: d-a, d-e s2: a-b, a-c s3: c-d, g-d s4: e-g, e-f, b-g, b-f, f-f, f-g
- d. Add to the above visiting "f" too
- e. a-b-g-d-e-f, a-c-d-e

С. е, a-b

NOTE: The definition doesn't allow to repeat a configuration (state) so any other sequence is not included as they must pass through S1

### Task 3 - White box testing and coverage Part 2

Solution

- a. Deterministic (i), initially connected (ii), minimal (iii), strongly connected (iv)
- Add copies of transitions a, g, d (e.g: a-c-d-e-f-g-d'-a'-b-g'-d")
- c. Transform the graph using de Brujin's algorithm (dual graph) and then "Eulerize" it (see lecture 7)

13

### Task 4 - MBT / ModelJUnit

#### Solution

- F you should aim at least at a 100% transition coverage
- F You might use transformation and adaptation.
- 3. F you might need to change the code
- F this is the case for the transformation, not the adaptation

6. T

7. T

8. T

- 9. F It doesn't as there might be many branches in the SUT abstracted away in the EFSM
- F Transition-based is control oriented, while pre/post is data-oriented.

14

### Task 5 - Property-based test. and QuickCheck Part 1

Solution

- a. prop\_delete1 x t = delete x (delete x t) == delete x t
- b. prop\_delete2 x t = not (member x t) ==> flatten (delete x (insert x t)) == flatten t (Note that the it is not necessarily true that you get the same tree!)
- C. prop\_delete3 x t = (member x t) ==> (flatten (insert x (delete x t)) == flatten t) (Note that the it is not necessarily true that you get the same tree!)

d. (The statement should be read as "Write a property that checks that 2 BSTs are not equal if they don't contain the same elements.") prop\_equal t1 t2 = not (flatten t1 == flatten t2) ==> t1 /= t2

### Task 5 - Property-based test. and QuickCheck Part 2

Solution

- a. F you write properties, not necessarily a full model.
- b. T
- C. F There is no guarantee of getting the same tree. You should write: prop\_merge1 x y t1 t2 = flatten (merge (insert x t1) (insert y t2)) == flatten (insert x (insert y (merge t1 t2)))
- d. F The problem is that the symbols < and > are interchanged. You should make the following change: "&& all (<y) (flatten lt) && all (>y) (flatten rt)"

Exam

#### • June 1st, at 08:30

"Maskin"-salar, M-Huset - Johanneberg