Test Input Generation for Red-Black Trees using Abstraction
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ABSTRACT
We consider the problem of test input generation for code that manipulates complex data structures. Test inputs are sequences of method calls from the data structure interface. We describe test input generation techniques that rely on state matching to avoid generation of redundant tests. Exhaustive techniques use explicit state model checking to explore all the possible test sequences up to predefined input sizes. Lossy techniques rely on abstraction mappings to compute and store abstract versions of the concrete states; they explore under-approximations of all the possible test sequences. We have implemented the techniques on top of the Java PathFinder model checker and we evaluate them using a Java implementation of red-black trees.

Categories and Subject Descriptors: D.2.4 [Software Engineering]: Testing and Debugging—Testing Tools

General Terms: Algorithms, Verification

Keywords: Testing Object Oriented Programs, Model Checking, Abstraction, Coverage, Red-Black Trees

1. INTRODUCTION
Almost all large software systems contain portions of code that manipulate complex data. This is all the more true today since object oriented programming languages are becoming more and more popular. It is imperative for the reliability of these systems that this code is tested adequately. The most time consuming aspect of unit testing for this kind of software is the generation of sequences of API calls that cover the relevant structural and behavioral aspects of the code. This process is difficult due to the fact that the software under test (SUT) has "state" and it will react differently depending on this state when a new call is made.

In this paper, we address the problem of automated generation of such sequences of API calls to ensure high degrees of code coverage. Many approaches for doing such automated test sequence generation have been proposed - see Section 5. Here we consider one class of search algorithms that seems particularly promising for generating test sequences to achieve high code coverage: algorithms that use state matching to avoid generation of redundant tests. Essentially the idea is to exhaustively try all combinations of API calls and parameters to these calls up to a specified limit, but after each call the state of the SUT is analyzed to see if the "same" state has been seen before; if so, that sequence is discarded, if not the search continues with the next call. During this search the code coverage is measured and whenever new coverage is obtained the sequence of calls to achieve that coverage is recorded.

Our contribution is an integrated framework that uses state matching for automated test generation. The framework also incorporates a technique based on random selection - to be used as a point of comparison with state matching techniques. We show that there are a number of different options for the state matching and not all of them need to be a precise/complete matching, i.e. two states that are not exactly the same can be considered equivalent and that can improve the efficiency of the search - although it is a lossy search since parts of the feasible input space can be discarded. In particular we show that a matching on the structure or shape of a container is a very efficient way to achieve good coverage. We use the Java PathFinder [11, 13] model checker as the basis for building the test generation framework. We evaluate the framework on a Java implementation of red-black trees.

2. EXAMPLE
We illustrate our test input generation framework on a Java implementation of a binary search tree (see Figure 1). Each tree has a root node. Each node has an integer elem field and left and right children. Values are added and removed from the tree using the add and remove methods respectively.

```java
class Node {
    public int elem;
    public Node left, right;
}

public class BinTree {
    private Node root;
    ...
    public void add(int x) { ... }
    public boolean remove(int x) { ... }
}
```

Figure 1: Java declaration of a binary tree
static int M; /* sequence length */
static int N; /* parameter values */

static BinTree t = new BinTree();
public static void main(String[] args) {...
    for (int i=0;i<M;i++) {
        Verify.beginAtomic();
        int v = Verify.random(N-1);
        switch (Verify.random(1)) {
            case 0: t.add(v); break;
            case 1: t.remove(v); break;
        }
        Verify.endAtomic();
    }
    /* Verify.ignoreIf(store(abstractMap(t))); */
}

Figure 2: Environment for concrete search

A test input for BinTree consists of a sequence of method calls in the class interface (e.g. add and remove), with corresponding method arguments, that builds relevant object states and exercise the code in some desired fashion. Here is an example of a test input for BinTree:

BinTree t = new BinTree();
t.add(1); t.add(2); t.remove(1);

Typically, checking the correctness of executions for such test inputs relies on design-by-contract annotations translated into run-time assertions. One can also check class invariants (repOK predicates [3]) or just absence of run-time errors (e.g. absence of uncaught exceptions).

Our approach integrates several techniques for test input generation in a unified model checking framework. The approach requires the user to produce an environment, i.e. a test driver for the Java implementation (the system under test SUt). In this paper, we consider nondeterministic environments that execute all sequences of API method calls up to a user-specified size \( N \). The user also needs to specify the range of values for the method parameters \([0, N-1]\).

The model checker analyzes the composition of the container and the environment and it generates sequences that achieve the desired testing coverage. We use basic block coverage, as a representative example of a widely used structural coverage measure. We also consider a simple form of predicate coverage [2] that measures whether all combinations of a predetermined set of predicates are covered at each basic block. The user may choose between several techniques that our framework implements (they are described in detail in the next section).

3. TEST GENERATION TECHNIQUES

"Classical" Exhaustive State Space Search We illustrate this technique using the BinTree example introduced in the previous section. The testing environment is illustrated in Figure 2. The environment contains special JPF annotations (Verify): beginAtomic() ... endAtomic() specify that the execution of the enclosed block should proceed atomically; random(N-1) returns values \([0, N - 1] \) nondeterministically.

By default, JPF stores all the explored states (and it backtracks when it visits a previously explored state). This straight-forward approach does not scale well for large values of \( N \) - the number of possible test sequences becomes quickly intractable (the state space explosion problem). One way to address this problem is to use heuristic search; JPF supports several heuristics (guided search, beam search). Another solution is to perform concrete execution with abstract matching as described below.

Concrete Search with Abstract Matching The idea is to use the model checker to perform the concrete execution of all the possible method sequences (as above) but to store abstract versions of the concrete states, and use these abstract states to perform state matching (and to backtrack if an abstract state has been visited before). This effectively explores an under-approximation of the space of possible method executions.

In order to apply this technique for BinTree we use the environment illustrated in Figure 2, which includes statement 8: Verify.ignoreIf(store(abstractMap(t))).

abstractMap computes an abstraction of the concrete container state of the binary tree referenced by \( t \);

store directs the model checker to store the computed abstraction;

Verify.ignoreIf directs the model checker to backtrack if it has seen this abstraction before.

Note that state matching is now performed only on the state of the container object (referenced by \( t \)). This allows us to abstract away the information that is irrelevant to test generation, i.e. the values of local variables \( i \) and \( v \) are no longer considered to be part of the state. The user may choose from several default abstractions that are provided by JPF or may create new abstraction mappings.

One default abstraction that we have found useful records only the (concrete) heap shape of a container, while it abstracts away the data fields from each container element. This abstraction is illustrated in Figure 3, which depicts two binary search trees. Circles denote tree nodes; numbers inside circles denote the elem values; null nodes are not represented. The trees have the same heap shape - hence they will be matched during model checking (although the actual elem values are not the same). Heap shapes are represented in a normalized form, as sequences of integers (depicted in rectangles in Figure 3), and are obtained through a process called linearization [10, 15]. The linearization of an object (e.g. the tree root) starts from the root and traverses the heap in depth first search order; it assigns a unique identifier to each object and it backtracks when it detects a cycle.
null pointers have values 0. Comparing shapes reduces to comparing sequences.

This abstraction can be made more precise by extending it to record information about the container elements. For example, consider two red-black trees in Figure 4. Red-black trees are binary search trees with one extra bit of information per node: its color, which can be black or red (in Figure 4, filled circles denote black nodes while empty circles denote red nodes). In Section 4, we will analyze red-black trees as given in the javutil.TreeMap library.

Figure 4 also shows the new abstract representations which augment the shape with the color values. Note that the two trees will no longer be considered to be the same (although they have the same shape). The abstraction for red-black trees can be augmented further, to also encode the actual concrete elem values of each node. Here is an example: 1B 2R 3B 0 0 0 4B 0 0 5R 8 0 0.

In general, the user can specify which data fields to be added to the linearization of an object. When all the fields are selected the state matching is complete and it can form the basis of an exhaustive technique (see Section 4); the approach is similar to the linearization used for representing the complete concrete heap (shape plus data), to achieve heap symmetry reduction in model checking [10].

Random Search The environment that we use for random search is similar to the one presented in Figure 2, except that the nondeterminism is solved by random choice. When one (random) run is completed the search is restarted from the initial state and this process is repeated up to a user specified limit. In our experiments, we set the limit on the number of runs to 1000. Random search can be run stand-alone or using JPF - for our experiments we chose to run it inside of JPF. Note that due to technical reasons of JPF implementation, states are stored during the search (but they are never used).

4. EVALUATION

As mentioned, we used the JPF model checking tool to implement our testing framework. We used the listener mechanism [11] to observe the sequences of API calls performed and output the sequence when a specific coverage goal is reached. This test listener keeps track of the coverage obtained and calculates the average test input length. For the abstraction mappings the user can select the fields to be added to the linearized nodes of a structure.

As a system under test we used a Java implementation of red-black trees (from javutil.TreeMap). The Java methods were instrumented to measure basic block coverage (which implies statement coverage). At each basic block,
We only focussed here on obtaining code coverage and not on finding errors - this was a conscious decision to avoid bias from different fault seeding approaches. However in the future we would like to investigate whether the tests that obtain high coverage are also likely to detect faults.
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