Intro to Software Testing
Chapter 8.1.1

Logic Coverage

Brittany Johnson
SWE 437

Adapted from slides by Paul Ammann & Jeff Offutt

Semantic Logic Criteria (8.1)

Logical expressions can come from many sources

- Decisions in programs
- Decisions in **UML** activity graphs and **finite state machines**
- **Requirements**, both formal and informal
- **SQL** queries

Covering logic expressions is required by the US Federal Aviation Administration for safety critical software

- Used by other transportation industries

Used by Electronc Arts (EA) game company

- FIFA, Battlefield, …

Tests are intended to choose some subset of the total number of truth assignments to the expressions

Logic Predicates and Clauses

A ***predicate*** is an expression that evaluates to a **boolean** value

Predicates can contain

- boolean variables
- non-boolean variables that contain >, <, ==, >=, <=, !=
- boolean function calls

Internal structure is created by logical operators

- ¬ or ! – the negation operator
- ∧ or & – the and operator
- ∨ or | – the or operator
- → – the implication operator
- ⊕ or **xor** – the exclusive or operator
- ↔ – the equivalence operator

A **clause** is a predicate with no logical operators

Example

P = (a & (b | c))

P has three clauses:

1. a
2. b
3. c

Most predicates have few clauses

- 88.5% have 1 clause
- 9.5% have 2 clauses
- 1.35% have 3 clauses
- Only 0.65% have 4 or more !

Logic Coverage Criteria (8.1.1)

We use predicates in testing as follows :

Develop a model of the software as one or more predicates

Require tests to satisfy some combination of clauses

Predicate Coverage (PC) : For each *p* in *P*, *TR* contains two requirements: *p* evaluates to true, and *p* evaluates to false.

PC: Each full predicate evaluates to true and false (2 tests)

Clause Coverage (CC) : For each *c* in *C*, *TR* contains two requirements: *c* evaluates to true, and *c* evaluates to false.

CC: Each clause in each predicate evaluates to true and false (at least 2 tests per predicate

In-Class Exercise

P = (a & (b | c))

Give predicate coverage (**PC**) and clause coverage (**CC**) abstract tests for our example predicate.

"Abstract tests" include truth assignments for each clause, for example:

a = true

In-Class Exercise

P = (a & (b | c))

PC: a=true, b=true, c=true
a=f, b=f, c=f
CC: a, !b, !c
!a, b, c
Any format is fine, the answers for CC are more compact

Give predicate coverage (**PC**) and clause coverage (**CC**) abstract tests for our example predicate.

"Abstract tests" include truth assignments for each clause, for example:

a = true

Problems with PC and CC

PC does not **fully exercise** all the clauses, especially in the presence of short circuit evaluation

CC does not always **ensure PC**

- That is, we can satisfy CC without causing the predicate to be both true and false
- This is definitely not what we want !

The simplest solution is to test **all combinations** …

Combinatorial Coverage (CoC)

CoC requires every possible combination

Sometimes called Multiple Condition Coverage (MCC)

Every possible combination of truth values

- 2^N possibilities, where N is the number of clauses

Combinatorial Coverage (CoC) : For each p in P, TR has test requirements for the clauses in Cp to evaluate to each possible combination of truth values.

In-Class Exercise

P = (a & (b | c))

Give abstract tests to satisfy combinatorial coverage (**CoC**) for our example predicate.

Hint: There should be 8

In-Class Exercise

P = (a & (b | c))

CoC
a=true, b=true, c=true
a=f, b=t, c=f
a !b c
a !b !c
!a b c
!a b !c
!a !b c
!a !b !c

Give abstract tests to satisfy combinatorial coverage (**CoC**) for our example predicate.

Hint: There should be 8

Combinatorial Coverage

This is simple, neat, clean, and comprehensive …

But can be **expensive**

- Impractical for predicates with more than 3 or 4 clauses

The literature has lots of suggestions – some confusing

The general idea is simple:

Test each clause independently from the other clauses

Getting the details right is hard

What exactly does "independently" mean ?

The book presents this idea as "***making clauses active***" …