

Testing, Debugging, and Verification re-exam  
DIT082/TDA567

Day: 5 April 2016

Time: 14<sup>00</sup> – 18<sup>00</sup>

---

Responsible:	Atze van der Ploeg
Results:	Will be published mid May or earlier
Extra aid:	Only dictionaries may be used. Other aids are <i>not</i> allowed!
Grade intervals:	<b>U</b> : 0 – 21p, <b>3</b> : 22 – 32p, <b>4</b> : 32 – 40p, <b>5</b> : 40 – 46p, <b>G</b> : 22 – 39p, <b>VG</b> : 40 – 46p, <b>Max.</b> 46p.

**Please observe the following:**

- This exam has 8 numbered pages.  
**Please check immediately that your copy is complete**
- Answers must be given in English
- Please use page numbering on your pages
- Please write clearly
- Fewer points are given for unnecessarily complicated solutions
- Indicate clearly when you make assumptions that are not given in the assignment
- Answers to the exam will be published on the course website tomorrow.

Good luck!



## 1 Testing

---

### Assignment 1 Testing debugging and verification (3p)

Professor Brainy McSmartyants thinks that all software should be fully verified. “Why would anyone not verify their software, certainty is of the utmost import!”, he argues.

- Give a reason why a company would not verify its software but rely on testing instead.

---

### Assignment 2 Logic coverage (3p)

Consider the following piece of java code:

```
if (x < 1 || (y > z && z == 3) )
    return x;
else
    return z;
```

- Construct a minimal set of test-cases for the code snippet above, which satisfy *Modified Condition decision coverage*.

---

**Assignment 3 Branch coverage**

(5p)

Consider the following Java method:

```
/* merges two sorted lists
```

```
requires: input left and right are non-null arrays which are sorted
           in non-decreasing order
```

```
ensures: output is the number of elements that are present in
          both arrays
```

```
*/
```

```
public static int inBoth(int[] left, int[] right){
    int il = 0, ir = 0, res = 0;
    while(il < left.length && ir < right.length){
        if(left[il] == right[ir]) {
            il += 1; ir += 1; res += 1;
        } else if(left[il] < right[ir]) {
            il += 1;
        } else {
            ir += 1;
        }
    }
    {
        return res;
    }
}
```

- (a) Explain why a test set for this program that has statement coverage must also have branch coverage. (2p)
- (b) Write down one or more test cases, such that this/these test case(s) together satisfy *branch coverage*. State clearly which parts of the test(s) cover which part of the code. (3p)

---

**Assignment 4 Property based testing**

(3p)

A fast way to see if a sorted list contains a certain element is binary search, but its implementation is a bit tricky.

- How would you use randomized testing of the pointwise equivalence of functions to get some certainty about an implementation of binary search?
-

**Assignment 5 Minimization using DdMin**

(7p)

An method for computing the checksum of a string fails if there are two identical characters in a string, for example in "aa" or "ada".

- (a) List *all* 1-minimal failing subsequences in the following string: (2p)  
[f,a,e,c,c,a,e,g].
- (b) Simulate a run of the `ddMin` algorithm and compute a 1-minimal failing input from the following initial failing input: [f,a,e,c,c,a,e,g]. (5p)  
Clearly state what happens at *each step* of the algorithm and what the final result is.

---

**Assignment 6 Stateful property based-testing**

(6p)

Sven has implemented a stateful set with the following interface:

```
class SvenSet {  
    SvenSet() ...  
  
    void add(int x) ...  
  
    void remove(int x) ...  
  
    boolean contains(int x) ...  
}
```

- (a) Write down the specification of the methods `add` and `remove`. The specifications should be such that the behavior can only that what one would expect from a mutable *set*. (2p)

Sven has implemented the mutable set as follows:

```
class SvenSet {

    ListInteger elems;
    SvenSet() {
        elems = new LinkedListInteger();
    }

    void add(int x) {
        elems.add(x);
    }

    void remove(int x) {
        int i = elems.indexOf(x);
        if( i >= 0) {
            elems.remove(i);
        }
    }

    boolean contains(int x) {
        return elems.indexOf(x) >= 0;
    }
}
```

The documentation of the used methods from `ListInteger` are as follows:

```
public void add(int element)
//Appends the specified element to the end of this list.

public void remove(int index)
// Removes the element at the specified position in this list.

public int indexOf(int element)
// Returns the index of the first occurrence of the specified element
// in this list, or -1 if this list does not contain the element.
```

However, `SvenSet` does not work as one would expect from a *set*.

- (b) Describe what is wrong with the implementation. (1p)
- (c) Give an example of an *algebraic property* of mutable sets that does not hold for the implementation of `SvenSet`, but should for mutable sets. In other words give an example of an *algebraic property* with which randomized stateful testing could have found the incorrect behavior of `SvenSet`. (3p)

---

**Assignment 7 Formal Specification**

(8p)

We want to specify the following method in Dafny:

```
method binarySearch( a : array<int>, element : int)
    returns (index : int)
requires sorted(a)
ensures ?
```

Which, informally takes a sorted array and searches for the given number in the array. It returns  $-1$  if the given number is not present in the array, and otherwise returns an index such that the number is at that place in the array.

- (a) Make the above informal description formal by filling in the **ensures** (4p) clause above. You can assume that **sorted** is defined correctly. Use Dafny syntax.

The sorted predicate is partially defined as follows:

```
predicate sorted(a : array<int>)
reads a
{ ? }
```

Sorted here means “non-decreasing”: elements at bigger indices are never smaller than elements at smaller indices.

- (b) Write down the definition of the body of the predicate **sorted**. Use (4p) Dafny syntax.

---

**Assignment 8 (Formal Verification)**

(11p)

The *Fibonacci* numbers, 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, .. are defined as follows in Dafny:

```
function fib(n : int) : int
{ if n <= 1 then 1 else fib(n-1) + fib(n-2) }
```

Examples:

```
fib(0) == 1, fib(1) == 1, fib(3) == 3
```

The following method computes the  $n$ th Fibonacci number, for  $n \geq 1$ :

```
method fibfast(n: int) returns (r : int)
requires n >= 1
ensures r == fib(n)
{
  var i := 1;
  var p := 1;
  r := 1;
  while(i < n)
  invariant ?
  {
    var tmp := r;
    r := r + p;
    p := tmp;
    i := i + 1;
  }
}
```

The variable  $p$  always contains the previous fibonacci number, and  $r$  the current.

- (a) Give a suitable loop invariant (i.e. a loop invariant such that the post-condition is provable). (2p)
- (b) Prove partial correctness (no termination proof) for `fibfast` using the loop invariant from the previous sub-question. You may compute `fib` in your answer (for example replace `fib(1)` by 1). You may also assume that `p == fib(i-1) && r == fib(i) ==> p + r == fib(i + 1)` (5p)
- (c) What is a suitable variant (decreases clause) for the while loop in the above program? (1p)
- (d) Prove termination of the while-loop for the above program using the variant from the previous sub-question. (3p)

---

(total 46p)