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Today
- Mutation-based testing discussion
- Formal reasoning and Z3
- In-class 5

Mutation-based testing: recap and discussion

Recap: mutation testing
Mutants
lhs < rhs
lhs <= rhs
lhs != rhs
stmt no-op
Program
Tests

lhs < rhs  \rightarrow  lhs <= rhs
lhs < rhs  \rightarrow  lhs != rhs
stmt  \rightarrow  no-op
A mutant is not effective if:
- it cannot be detected (semantically equivalent)
- it fails for any given test (trivial)
- it is dominated by other mutants (subsumed)

Mutants
Program
Tests

Recap: not all mutants are effective
Desirable tests

A mutant is not effective if:
- it cannot be detected (semantically equivalent)
- it fails for any given test (trivial)
- it is dominated by other mutants (subsumed)

A more nuanced view
- Killable vs. equivalent is too simplistic
- Productive mutants elicit effective tests, but
  - Killable mutants can be unproductive
  - Equivalent mutants can be productive

A mutant is productive if it is
1. killable and elicits an effective test or
2. equivalent and advances code quality or knowledge

Recap: killable vs. productive mutants
Status quo
- Killable mutants are good $\rightarrow$ tests
- Equivalent mutants are bad $\rightarrow$ no tests

In-class discussion: mutation-based testing
Effectiveness of mutation-based testing
- Do you see value in mutation-based testing?
- What mutants did you consider unproductive?
- When and how would you apply mutation-based testing?

Reasoning about mutants
- How did you reason about equivalence?
- What was challenging about this task?

Formal reasoning and Z3
Reasoning about programs

Use cases
- Verification: ensure code is correct
- Testing: constraint-based test generation
- Debugging: understand why code is incorrect

Prove facts to be true about a program, e.g.:
- $x$ is never null
- $y$ is always greater than 0
- input array $a$ is sorted
- $x + y > z$

Forward vs. backward reasoning

Forward reasoning
- Knowing a fact that is true before execution.
- Reasoning about what must be true after execution.
- Given a precondition, what postcondition(s) are true?

Backward reasoning
- Knowing a fact that is true after execution.
- Reasoning about what must be true before execution.
- Given a postcondition, what precondition(s) must hold?

What is Z3?
- An SMT (Satisfiability Modulo Theories) solver.
- Uses a standard language (SMT-LIB).
  - Print to the screen.
  - Declare variables and functions.
  - Define constraints.
  - Check satisfiability and obtain a model.
- ...
A first example

```java
1 int simpleMath(int a, int b) {
2   assert(b>0);
3   if(a + b < a) {
4     return 1;
5   }
6   return 0;
7 }
```

Does this method ever return 1? Let's ask Z3...

```z3
(declare-const a Int)
(declare-const b Int)
(assert (> b 0))
(assert (< (+ a b) a))
(check-sat)
```

A first example: correctly modeling data types

```java
1 int simpleMath(int a, int b) {
2   assert(b>0);
3   if(a + b < a) {
4     return 1;
5   }
6   return 0;
7 }
```

Z3 supports Bitvectors of arbitrary size. Let's model Java ints (32 bits) and ask the same question...

```z3
(declare-const a (_ BitVec 32))
(declare-const b (_ BitVec 32))
(assert (bvsgt b #x00000000))
(assert (bvslt (bvadd a b) a))
(check-sat)
```

A more complex example: modeling control flow

```java
1 int doesStuff(int a, int b, int c) {
2   if (c==0) return 0;
3   if (c==4) return 0;
4   if (a + b <  c) return 1;
5   if (a + b >  c) return 2;
6   if (a * b == c) return 3;
7   return 4;
8 }
```

Does this method ever return 3?
A more complex example: modeling control flow

```c
int doesStuff(int a, int b, int c) {
    if (c==0) return 0;
    if (c==4) return 0;
    if (a + b < c) return 1;
    if (a + b > c) return 2;
    if (a * b == c) return 3;
    return 4;
}
```

All of the following must be true (why?):
- !(c == 0)
- !(c == 4)
- !(a + b < c)
- !(a + b > c)
- a * b == c

Does this method ever return 3?

```
(define-sort JInt () (_ BitVec 32))
(declare-const a JInt)
(declare-const b JInt)
(declare-const c JInt)
(assert (not (= c #x00000000)))
(assert (not (= c #x00000004)))
(assert (not (bvslt (bvadd a b) c)))
(assert (not (bvsgt (bvadd a b) c)))
(assert (= (bvmul a b) c))
(check-sat)
(get-model)
```

Reasoning about program equivalence

```c
int originalSum(int a, int b) {
    return a + b;
}

int mutatedSum(int a, int b) {
    return a * b;
}
```

Are these two methods equivalent?

```
(declare-const a Int)
(declare-const b Int)
(declare-const rOrig Int)
(declare-const rMut Int)
(assert (= rOrig (+ a b)))
(assert (= rMut (* a b)))
(assert (= rOrig rMut))
(check-sat)
(get-model)
```
Reasoning about program equivalence

```
int originalSum(int a, int b) {
    return a + b;
}
```

```
int mutatedSum(int a, int b) {
    return a * b;
}
```

(declare-const a Int)
(declare-const b Int)
(declare-const rOrig Int)
(declare-const rMut Int)
(assert (= rOrig (+ a b)))
(assert (= rMut (* a b)))
(assert (not (= rOrig rMut)))
(check-sat)
(get-model)

Yes, for a=0 and b=0.
What have we actually proven here?

Our goal is to prove that no model for equivalence exists (i.e., the defined constraints are unsatisfiable)!