

# Automatic Testing of Sequential and Concurrent Substitutability

Paper by: Michael Pradel & Thomas R. Gross

Presented by: Erik Henriksson

12 Mars 2014

# Organization

- Motivation
- The paper's approach
- Evaluation
- Limitations

# Motivation

```
class Set() {  
    Set() { ... }  
    ...  
}
```

```
class BoundedSet extends Set {  
    BoundedSet(int bound) { ... }  
    ...  
}
```

```
Set s = new Set();  
s.add(1); // OK
```

```
Set s = new BoundedSet(0);  
s.add(1); // Error
```

# Safe Substitute

A class *Sub* is a safe substitute of a class *Super* if and only if we can substitute *Sub* with *Super* without changing the visible behavior of the program.

# Motivation

```
class Set() {  
    Set() { ... }  
    ...  
}
```

```
class BoundedSet extends Set {  
    BoundedSet(int bound) { ... }  
    ...  
}
```

```
Set s = new Set();  
s.add(1); // OK
```

```
Set s = new BoundedSet(0);  
s.add(1); // Error
```

**BoundedSet is not a safe substitute for Set!**

# Motivation

However, these classes compile fine under Java and an unexperienced programmer will not see this error.

We want an automatic tool for finding such mistakes.

# Pradel's and Gross's Approach

- Easy to apply
- Precise
- Incomplete

# Test Generator

Generate test cases:

1. Generic tests
2. Constructor mappings
3. Finding good method arguments
4. Concurrent test cases



# Generic Tests

- Test both *Super* and *Sub* with same arguments
- Static type is always *Super*, but dynamic type can vary between *Sub* and *Super*.

# Constructor Mappings

- Due to classes not inheriting the constructor in Java, we run into problems

Set s = Set() OR BoundedSet(?)



What should we write here?

Subclass may not have a constructor that takes same number of arguments as the superclass!

# Constructor Mappings

- If constructors have the **same signature**, the tool assumes two objects are semantically equivalent after calling the constructors with the same arguments.
- Otherwise the **user** needs to specify a mapping

```
Person p1 = new Person("Foo");  
        p2 = new Student("Foo");
```

# Constructor Mappings

- Otherwise the **user** needs to specify a mapping

```
class Student {  
    //CM super(name) -> Student(name, 0)  
    Student(String name, int credits) {  
        ...  
    }  
}
```

# Method Arguments

If a method needs arguments, we choose between

1. If there exists a variable of the correct type, use it
2. Call a method that returns the correct type
3. Randomly generate a value if type is primitive

# Concurrent Tests

- Only 2 threads are considered
- We use a pair of methods
- All interleavings are checked
- Error if *Sub* is not thread-safe when *Super* is

# The Two Oracles

- The Output Oracle
- The Crash Oracle

# Evaluation

- Crash Oracle (CO) works well, 96% of reported bugs should be fixed
- Output Oracle (OO) not that well, only 7% of reported bugs is actual bugs
- The tool found 47 bugs in 4 libraries



# Limitations

- No evaluation comparison with related work
- Constructor Mappings which are automatically generated is not precise
- User is responsible for giving correct mappings where the tool fails
- The tool is both incomplete and unprecise
- The tool is not completely automatic, but this is stated in the paper

# Constructor Mappings

- If constructors have the same signature, the tool assumes two objects are semantically equivalent after calling the constructors with the same arguments.

Is this sound? No!

```
class Person {  
    Person(int age) {...}  
    ...  
}
```

```
class Student extends Person {  
    Student(int credits) {...}  
    ...  
}
```

# Constructor Mappings

- Otherwise the user needs to specify a mapping

`Set()` → `BoundedSet(?)`

What mapping should we  
provide the tool with?

How do we know our mapping is correct?

Questions?