

# SM2-TES: Functional Programming and Property-Based Testing, Day 12

Jan Midtgaard

MMMI, SDU

# Today

---

- Project presentations
- Final course evaluation
- Exam/project report
- Course summary

---

[Project presentations]

---

[Final course evaluation]

# Exam and project report

---

Due to the corona situation

the oral exam in June will be online.

The form is:

- you make a group presentation of your project
- you receive and answer questions individually
- you get a combined grade for the written+oral part

The deadline for hand-in is unchanged: May 31

# Course Summary

# Functional programming, briefly

---

Functional programming emphasizes **purity over side-effects** (assignment and state, exceptions):

- ❑ functions (as first-class citizens)
- ❑ recursion
- ❑ **lists** (+ `fold`, `map`, `iter` for typical list processing)
- ❑ algebraic data types
- ❑ pattern matching

# Functional programming, briefly

---

Functional programming emphasizes **purity over side-effects** (assignment and state, exceptions):

- ❑ functions (as first-class citizens)
- ❑ recursion
- ❑ **lists** (+ `fold`, `map`, `iter` for typical list processing)
- ❑ algebraic data types
- ❑ pattern matching

A function's type signature induces a code skeleton.

# Functional programming, briefly

---

Functional programming emphasizes **purity over side-effects** (assignment and state, exceptions):

- functions (as first-class citizens)
- recursion
- **lists** (+ `fold`, `map`, `iter` for typical list processing)
- algebraic data types
- pattern matching

A function's type signature induces a code skeleton.

With **tail-call optimization** a recursive function compiles down to a loop.

# Functional programming, briefly

---

Functional programming emphasizes **purity over side-effects** (assignment and state, exceptions):

- functions (as first-class citizens)
- recursion
- **lists** (+ `fold`, `map`, `iter` for typical list processing)
- algebraic data types
- pattern matching

A function's type signature induces a code skeleton.

With **tail-call optimization** a recursive function compiles down to a loop.

OCaml's type system even corresponds to a formal logic!

# Property-based testing (PBT)

---

Property-based testing is also known as **QuickCheck**.

It phrases tests in terms of

- **a generator** (producing test input)
- **a property** (what must hold?)

# Property-based testing (PBT)

---

Property-based testing is also known as **QuickCheck**.

It phrases tests in terms of

- **a generator** (producing test input)
- **a property** (what must hold?)

**A shrinker** cuts a counterexample down to a more comprehensible one.

# Property-based testing (PBT)

---

Property-based testing is also known as **QuickCheck**.

It phrases tests in terms of

- **a generator** (producing test input)
- **a property** (what must hold?)

**A shrinker** cuts a counterexample down to a more comprehensible one.

QuickCheck offers builtin generators (`float`, `char`, ...)

Generators compose nicely (`pair`, `triple`, `list`, ...)

# Property-based testing (PBT)

---

Property-based testing is also known as **QuickCheck**.

It phrases tests in terms of

- **a generator** (producing test input)
- **a property** (what must hold?)

**A shrinker** cuts a counterexample down to a more comprehensible one.

QuickCheck offers builtin generators (`float`, `char`, ...)

Generators compose nicely (`pair`, `triple`, `list`, ...)

Properties depend heavily on the domain, but there are common patterns (`idempotency`, `round-trip`, `oracle`, ...)

# Model-based testing

---

Model-based testing with a state-machine framework compares the system-under-test to a model.

# Model-based testing

---

Model-based testing with a state-machine framework compares the system-under-test to a model.

For systems with state this may be a viable option.

Random command sequences help bring the system-under-test into arbitrary states. . .

# Model-based testing

---

Model-based testing with a state-machine framework compares the system-under-test to a model.

For systems with state this may be a viable option.

Random command sequences help bring the system-under-test into arbitrary states. . .

This approach tests the interaction of several commands.

State-machine preconditions further describe which commands are allowed when (a protocol).

# Model-based testing

---

Model-based testing with a state-machine framework compares the system-under-test to a model.

For systems with state this may be a viable option.

Random command sequences help bring the system-under-test into arbitrary states. . .

This approach tests the interaction of several commands.

State-machine preconditions further describe which commands are allowed when (a protocol).

State-dependent command generation can be useful.

Write model-based tests by hand – or use a framework.

# Applicability of property-based testing

---

We studied PBT of a range of setups:

- **a simple deterministic API:** testing simple properties
- **a system/API with state:** using a model-based test
- **a concurrent system:** using a parallelized model test

# Applicability of property-based testing

---

We studied PBT of a range of setups:

- **a simple deterministic API:** testing simple properties
- **a system/API with state:** using a model-based test
- **a concurrent system:** using a parallelized model test

We don't (necessarily) need to PBT a system in language X from language X itself.

PBT can be used both black-box and white-box.

PBT can be used both for positive and negative testing.

For negative testing and security hardening, fuzz testing is a good choice.

# Improving property-based tests

---

Generated tests are only as good as the generators and properties that produce them:

- generators should exercise boundary cases and not be confined to a subset of the input space
- properties should characterize intended behavior

# Improving property-based tests

---

Generated tests are only as good as the generators and properties that produce them:

- generators should exercise boundary cases and not be confined to a subset of the input space
- properties should characterize intended behavior

Several tools can help us understand and improve PBTs:

- Statistics
- Coverage reports
- Fault injection
- Thinking like the devil's advocate
- Wrong properties (and counterexamples)

**SDU**  Grammars for capturing all valid input in a spec.