## MODEL TRANSFORMATION TESTING, THE STATE OF THE ART

Gehan Selim, James Cordy, Juergen Dingel,

Presented by: Lobna AbuSerrieh

## INTRODUCTION

#### Model Driven Development



Programming



Modeling --> Generating





2

## TRANSFORMATION CORRECTNESS

Formal Methods : Heavyweight

Testing :

- executes a transformation on input models then
  validates the actual output matches the expected output.
- Automatable test activities
- Lightweight, Low computational complexity



## PHASE 1: TEST CASE GENERATION

- Define test adequacy criteria, then Build test cases that achieves its coverage. And it can be done by using:
  - Black-Box testing: based on transformation specification.
  - Gray-box testing: based on the accessible parts of transformation implementation.
  - White-Box testing: based on transformation implementation

## BLACK- BOX TEST CASE GENERATION METAMODEL COVERAGE

• Adequacy criteria for Class diagrams

- Association end multiplicity criterion
- Generalization criterion
- Class attribute criterion

## BLACK- BOX TEST CASE GENERATION METAMODEL COVERAGE

Adequacy criteria for Interaction diagrams

- Each message on a link
- All message path
- Collection coverage
- Condition coverage
- Full predicate coverage
- Transition coverage

## BLACK- BOX TEST CASE GENERATION METAMODEL COVERAGE

Adequacy criteria for statecharts

- Full predicate coverage
- All content- dependency relationships
- Transition coverage
- transition- pair coverage
- Complete sequence coverage
- All configurations transition coverage

## BLACK- BOX TEST CASE GENERATION CONTRACT COVERAGE

Achieving input contracts of Model transformation

 Constructing metamodel of only those elements are actually used in pre/post conditions of transformation

 Combine contract-based and metamodel based.
 And footprints(number of times test model covers each criterion).

## WHITE-BOX TEST CASE GENERATION

- Most of the Studies are done without case studies and no detailed results.
- Transforming rules to a source metamodel template.
- Assessing ATL rules by profiling:
  - 1. Compilation resulted XML file to extract the rules.
  - Transformation to be executed. And using the resulted log file to assess the coverage(rule, instruction, decision).
- Grammar testing, Each rule to be triggered in every possible context.

## PHASE 2: TEST SUITE ASSESSMENT

- Achieved Coverage to assess the test suite quality.
- Mutation analysis, evaluate the sensitivity of the test case to faults in transformation.
- Injecting faults by applying mutation operators and generate mutants.
  - Different results: Killed mutant.
  - No faults: the mutant is alive

## PHASE 3: BUILDING THE ORACLE FUNCTION

Compares The actual output with expected one.

- if the expected output is available, then Compare.
- If it is not available, validates the resulted output with the predefined output properties or contracts

# PHASE 3: BUILDING THE ORACLE FUNCTION COMPARISON

if the expected output is available, then Compare:



**Test Engine** Execute, Compare

#### Test Analyzer

Visualize using colors and shapes

A framework uses Model comparison

## PHASE 3: BUILDING THE ORACLE FUNCTION CONTRACTS

If the expected output is not available, validates the

result with the predefined output properties or contracts.

• Tracts, set of OCL constraints and a tract test suite.

• Improving Transformation contracts:

1. Vigilance: dynamically detect errors

2. Diagnosability: effort to locate a fault

# PHASE 3: BUILDING THE ORACLE FUNCTION CONTRACTS

- Vigilance can be improved by Analyzing a test suit and repeatedly using mutation analysis, until achieving an acceptable mutation score.
- Other proposed an improved vigilance and diagnosabiliy by using mathematical modeling.

#### QUESTIONS

- Gray-Box Testing , is it feasible to depend on partial implementation while considering other parts as black box testing?
- Class diagrams, statecharts, and sequence diagrams are the common used while testing transformation, what about other types of diagrams?
- Is Model comparison as oracle function clear enough?
- Since 2012 when this paper was written, and many related studies were without case studies or reliable results, any new updates were added to testing MDT?