

Random Testing in PVS

- Random testing can be an effective way to test code
- It has recently been applied to functional programs (QuickCheck) [Claessen and Hughes 2000] and to Isabelle/HOL specifications [Berghofer and Nipkow 2004]
- Here we describe the implementation in PVS, along with examples of use, and some future plans

- A universally quantified formula is given usually derived from a sequent, but may be directly supplied in the ground evaluator
- For each variable, a *random value generator* is created based on the type
- The random test then executes the following loop:
 - the generators are invoked
 - $\circ~$ the results are substituted into the formula
 - $\circ\,$ the formula is translated to lisp and evaluated
 - if the result is false, the values are printed and the loop terminates
 - otherwise, the loop continues until the loop counter is reached

- Random value generators are closures defined on ground types - no uninterpreted types or constants involved
- For the basic types bool and enumeration types, the lisp *random* function is invoked on the size of the type, and the result is mapped to the corresponding element
- For below(i) and upto(i), or subrange(i, j), the lisp random function is invoked with the obvious mapping
- Natural numbers are generated between 0 and the size parameter
- Integers are generated between -size and size
- Random rationals (and reals) are gotten by generating a numerator and a nonzero denominator



Random Function Generators

- For function types, a closure is created that memoizes the values it produces
- When the function is applied to a value it has been applied to before, that value is returned
- Otherwise a new random value is generated for the range type, and associated with the argument value
- Note that this only works for function applications this does not work:

```
\forall (F: [[real -> real] -> bool], g:[real -> real]): F(g)
```

Subtypes

- In general, values are randomly generated for the supertype until one is found that satisfies the subtype predicate
- This can be very ineffective it depends on both the probability of satisfying the predicate as well as the computational cost of the predicate



- The random tester may be used from the ground evaluator or the prover
- Ground evaluator:

```
(test "FORALL (n: nat): even?(n)")
```

• Prover:

```
take_drop_comm :
    |------
{1} FORALL (i, j: nat, l: list[T]):
        take(j, drop(i, 1)) = drop(i, take(j, 1))
Rule? (random-test :instance "ex1[int]")
The formula is falsified with the substitutions:
    i ==> 4
    j ==> 3
    l ==> (: -4, -64, 0, -57, 39 :)
```

