

Doric: Foundations for Statistical Fault Localisation

David Landsberg
University College London
d.landsberg@ucl.ac.uk

Earl T. Barr
University College London
e.barr@ucl.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

To fix a software bug, you must first find it. As software grows in size and complexity, finding bugs is becoming harder. To solve this problem, measures have been developed to rank lines of code according to their "suspiciousness" wrt being faulty. Engineers can then inspect the code in descending order of suspiciousness until a fault is found. Despite advances, ideal measures — ones which are at once lightweight, effective, and intuitive — have not yet been found. We present DORIC, a new formal foundation for statistical fault localisation based on classical probability theory. To demonstrate DORIC's versatility, we derive CL , a lightweight measure of the likelihood some code caused an error. CL returns probabilities, when spectrum-based heuristics (SBH) usually return difficult to interpret scores. CL handles fundamental fault scenarios that spectrum-based measures cannot and can also meaningfully identify causes with certainty. We demonstrate its effectiveness in, what is to our knowledge, the largest scale experiment in the fault localisation literature. For Defects4J benchmarks, CL permits a developer to find a fault after inspecting 6 lines of code 41.1.8% of the time. Furthermore, CL is more accurate at locating faults than all known 127 SBH. In particular, on Steimann's benchmarks one would expect to find a fault by investigating 5.02 methods, as opposed to 9.02 with the best performing SBH.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Software and its engineering** → **Error handling and recovery**;

KEYWORDS

fault localisation, debugging

1 INTRODUCTION

Software fault localisation is the problem of quickly identifying the parts of the code that caused an error. Accordingly, the development of effective and efficient methods for fault localisation has the potential to greatly reduce costs, wasted programmer time, and the possibility of catastrophe [1]. In this paper, we focus on methods of lightweight statistical software fault localisation. In general, statistical methods use a given fault localisation measure to assign lines of code a real number, called that line of code's "suspiciousness" degree, as a function some statistics about the program and test suite. In spectrum-based fault localisation, the engineer then inspects the code in descending order of suspiciousness until a fault is found. The driving force behind research in spectrum-based fault localisation is the search for an "ideal" measure.

What is the ideal measure? We assume it should satisfy three properties. First, the measure should be effective at finding faults. A measure is effective if an engineer would find a fault more quickly using the measure than not. Following Parmin and Orson, and in the absence of user trials to validate it, we assume that experiment can

estimate a measure's effectiveness by determining how often a fault is within the top "handful" of most suspicious lines of code under the measure [39]. Second, the measure should be lightweight. A measure is lightweight if an algorithm can compute it fast enough that an impatient developer does not lose interest. The current gold standard in speed is spectrum-based, whose values usually take seconds to compute and scale to large programs [51]. Third, an ideal measure should compute meaningful values that describe more than simply which lines of code are more/less "suspicious" than others. A canonical meaningful value is the likelihood, under probability theory, that the given code was faulty.

Debugging is an instance of the scientific method: developers observe, hypothesise about causes, experiment by running code, then *crucially* update their hypotheses. DORIC allows the definition of fault localisation measures that model this process — measures that we can update in light of new data. In Section 3.6, we present CL_u , a method for updating our CL measure that does just this.

To advance the search for an ideal measure, we propose a ground-up re-foundation of statistical fault localisation based on probability theory. The contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We propose DORIC: a new formal foundation for statistical fault localisation. Using DORIC, we derive a causal likelihood measure and integrate it into a novel localisation method.
- We provide a new set of fundamental fault scenarios which, we argue, any statistical fault localisation method should analyze correctly. We show our new method does so, but that no SBH can.
- We demonstrate the effectiveness of CL in, what is to our knowledge, the largest-scale fault localisation experiment to date: CL is more accurate than all 127 known SBHs, and when a developer investigates only 6 non-faulty lines, no SBH outperforms it on Defects4J where the developer would find a fault 41.18% of the time.

All of the tooling and artefacts needed to reproduce our results are available at utopia.com.

2 PRELIMINARIES

To reconstruct statistical fault localisation (SFL) from the ground up, we must precisely define our terms. SFL conventionally assumes a number of artifacts are available. This includes a program (to perform fault localisation on), a test suite (to test the program on), and some units under test located inside the program (as candidates for a fault) [45]. From these, we define coverage matrices, the formal object at the heart of many statistical fault localisation techniques [51], including our own.

Faulty Programs. Following Steimann *et al.*'s terminology [45], a *faulty program* is a program that fails to always satisfy a *specification*, which is a property expressible in some formal language and describes the intended behavior of some part of the program. When a specification fails to be satisfied for a given execution (i.e.,

```

int main() {

  int in1, in2, in3;
  int least = in1;
  int most = in1;

  if (most < in2)
    most = input2; // u1

  if (most < in3)
    most = in3; // u2

  if (least > in2)
    most = in2; // u3 (fault)

  if (least > in3)
    least = in3; // u4

  assert(least <= most)
}

```

Figure 1: minmax.c.

	u_1	u_2	u_3	u_4	e
t_1	0	1	1	0	1
t_2	0	0	1	1	1
t_3	0	0	1	0	1
t_4	1	0	0	1	0
t_5	1	1	0	0	0

Figure 2: Coverage Matrix.

	Vector	Oracle
t_1	$\langle 1, 0, 2 \rangle$	fail
t_2	$\langle 2, 0, 1 \rangle$	fail
t_3	$\langle 2, 0, 2 \rangle$	fail
t_4	$\langle 1, 2, 0 \rangle$	pass
t_5	$\langle 0, 1, 2 \rangle$	pass

Figure 3: Test Suite.

an *error* occurs), we assume there exists some lines of code in the program that cause the error for that execution, identified as the *fault* (aka *bug*).

Example 2.1. An example of a faulty c program is given in Fig. 1 (minmax.c), taken from Groce *et al.* [16]). We use it as our running example throughout this paper. Some executions of minmax.c violate the specification $\text{least} \leq \text{most}$ (i.e., there are some executions where there is an error). Accordingly, in these executions, a corresponding assertion (the last line of the program) is violated. Thus, the program fails to always satisfy the specification. The fault in this example is labeled u_3 , which should be an assignment to least instead of most .

Test Suites. Each program has a set of test cases called a test suite T . Following Steimann *et al.* [45], a *test case* is a repeatable execution of some part of a program. We assume each test case is associated with an input vector to the program and some oracle which describes whether the test case fails or passes. A test case *fails* if, by executing the program on the test case’s input vector, the resulting execution violates a given specification, and *passes* otherwise.

Example 2.2. The test case associated with input vector $\langle 0, 1, 2 \rangle$ is an execution in which in1 is assigned 0, in2 is assigned 1, and in3 is assigned 2, the u1 , u2 are executed, but the u3 and u4 , are not executed. As the specification $\text{least} \leq \text{most}$ is satisfied in that execution (i.e. there is no violation to the assertion statement), an error does not occur. For the running example we assume a test suite exists consisting of five test cases $T = \{t_1, \dots, t_5\}$. Each test case is associated with an input vector and oracle as described in Figure 3. For our example of minmax.c, the oracle is an error report which tells the engineer in a commandline message whether the assertion has been violated or not.

Name	Expression
Ochiai	$\frac{ef^2}{(ef+nf)(ef+ep)}$
D3	$\frac{ef^3}{ep+nf}$
Zoltar	$\frac{ef}{ef+nf+ep+\frac{1000nfep}{ef}}$
GP05	$\frac{(ef+np)\sqrt{ef}}{(ef+ep)(nfnf+\sqrt{ep})(ep+np)\sqrt{ ep-np }}$
Naish	$ef - \frac{ep}{ep+np+1}$

Table 1: Some Suspiciousness Functions

Units Under Test. A *unit under test* (uut) is a concrete artifact in a given program. Intuitively, a uut can be thought of as a candidate for being faulty. The collection of uuts is chosen by software engineer, according to their requirements. Many types of uuts have been used in the literature, including methods [44], blocks [3, 12], branches [41], and statements [21, 30, 53]. A uut is said to be *covered* by a test case if that test case executes the uut . Notationally, we define a set of *units* as U . For notational convenience in the definition of coverage matrices, U also contains a special unit e , called the *error*, that a test case covers if it fails. We let $U^* = U - \{e\}$ and $U_{|U|} = e$.

Example 2.3. In Figure 1, the uuts are the statements labeled in comments marked u_1, \dots, u_4 . Accordingly, the set of units is $U = \{u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, e\}$.

Coverage Matrices. A useful way to represent the coverage details of a test suite is in the form of a coverage matrix. It will first help to introduce some notation. For a matrix c , we let $c_{i,k}$ be the value of the i th column and k th row of c .

Definition 2.4. A *coverage matrix* is a Boolean matrix c of height $|T|$ and width $|U|$, where for each $u_i \in U$ and $t_k \in T$:

$$c_{i,k} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t_k \text{ covers } u_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We abbreviate $c_{|U|,k}$ with e_k . Intuitively, for all $u_i \in U^*$, $c_{i,k} = 0$ just in case t_k executed u_i , and 0 otherwise. $e_k = 1$ just in case t_k fails, and 0 otherwise. We use the notational abbreviations of Souza et al [10]. \sum_k is $\sum_{k=1}^{|T|}$. $\sum_k c_{i,k} e_k$ is c_{ef}^i . Intuitively, this is the number of test cases that execute u_i and fail. $\sum_k \bar{c}_{i,k} e_k$ is \bar{c}_{ef}^i . Intuitively, this is the number of test cases that do not execute u_i but fail. $\sum_k c_{i,k} \bar{e}_k$ is c_{ep}^i . Intuitively, this is the number of test cases that execute u_i and pass. $\sum_k \bar{c}_{i,k} \bar{e}_k$ is \bar{c}_{np}^i . Intuitively, this is the number of test cases that do not execute u_i but pass. When the context is clear, we drop the leading c and the index i . A coverage matrix for the running example is given in Fig. 2.

Spectrum-Based Heuristics. One way to measure the suspiciousness of a given unit wrt how faulty it is is to use a spectrum-based heuristic, sometimes called a spectrum-based "suspiciousness" measure [10].

Definition 2.5. A *spectrum-based heuristic* (SBH) is a function s with signature $s : U^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For each $u \in U^*$ $s(u_i)$ is called u_i 's degree of *suspiciousness*, and is defined as a function of u_i 's *spectrum*, which is the vector $\langle c_{ef}^i, c_{nf}^i, c_{ep}^i, c_{np}^i \rangle$.

The intuition behind SBH's is that $s(u_i) > s(u_j)$ just in case u_i is more "suspicious" wrt being faulty than u_j . In *spectrum-based fault localisation* (SBFL), UUTs are inspected by the engineer in descending order of suspiciousness until a fault is found. When two units are equally suspicious some tie-breaking method is assumed. One method is choosing the unit which appears earlier in the code to inspect first. We shall assume this method in this paper.

We discuss a property of some SBH's. If a suspiciousness function s is *single fault optimal* then for all $u_i, u_j \in U$, if $c_{ef}^i = c_{ef}^j + c_{nf}^j$ and $c_{ef}^i > c_{ef}^j$, then $s(u_i) > s(u_j)$. Intuitively, this states if a measure is single-fault optimal then UUTs executed by all failing traces are more suspicious than ones that aren't [28, 36]. This property is based on the observation that the fault will be executed by all failing test cases in a program with only one fault. An example of a single fault optimal measure is the Naish measure (see Table 1).

Example 2.6. To illustrate how an SBH can be used in SBFL, we perform SBFL with Wong-II measure $s(u_i) = c_{ef}^i - c_{ep}^i = \sum_k c_{i,k} e_k - \sum_k c_{i,k} \bar{e}_k$ [54] on the running example. $s(u_1) = -2, s(u_2) = 0, s(u_3) = 3$, and $s(u_4) = 2$. Thus the most suspicious UUT (u_3) is successfully identified with the fault. Accordingly, in a practical instance of SBFL the fault will be investigated first by the engineer.

3 DORIC: NEW FOUNDATIONS

We present DORIC¹, our formal framework based on probability theory. We proceed in four steps. First, we define a set of models to represent the universe of possibilities. Each model represents a possible way the error could have been caused (Section 3.1). Second, we define a syntax to express hypotheses, such as "the i th uut was a cause of the error" and a semantics that maps a hypothesis to the set of models where it is true (Section 3.2). Third, we outline a general theory of probability (Section 3.3). Then, we develop a classical interpretation of probability (Section 3.4). Using this interpretation, we define a measure usable for fault localisation (Section 3.5). Finally, we present our fault localisation methods 3.6.

3.1 The Models of Doric

In our framework, classical probabilities are defined in terms of the proportion of models in which a given formula is true. To achieve this, we first define a set of models for our system. We first describe some notation used in the forthcoming definition of models here. Let $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and m^j be a matrix, then $m_{i,k}^j$ is the value of the cell located at the i th column and k th row of matrix m^j , where this value is in $\{1, 0, \bullet\}$. As with coverage matrices, the rows represent test cases and the columns represent units. Informally, for each cell $m_{i,k}^j$, 0 denotes u_i was neither executed by t_k nor a cause of the error e , 1 denotes u_i was executed but was not a cause of e , and \bullet denotes u_i was executed by t_k and was a cause of e .

¹Given our goal of providing a simple foundation to statistical fault localisation, we name our framework after this simple type of Greek column




Figure 4: Causal Models.

Definition 3.1. Let T be a test suite and U a set of units. The set of *models* for a coverage matrix c is a set of matrices $\mathcal{M} = \{m^1, \dots, m^{|\mathcal{M}|}\}$ of height $|T|$ and width $|U|$ satisfying:

$$m_{i,k}^j \in \begin{cases} \{1, \bullet\} & \text{if } c_{i,k} e_k = 1 \text{ \& } i \neq |U| \\ \{c_{i,k}\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where for each $t_k \in T$ there is some $u_i \in U$ such that $m_{i,k}^j = \bullet$.

Informally, each model (also called a *causal model*) describes a possible scenario in which errors were caused. The scenario is epistemically possible — logically possible and (we have assumed) consistent with what the engineer knows. Underlying our definition are three assumptions about the nature of causation. First, causation is *factive*: if a unit causes an error in a given test case, then the UUT has to be executed and the error both have to factually obtain for a causal relation to hold between them. Second, errors are caused: if an error occurs in a given test case, then the execution of some UUT caused it. Third, causation is *irreflexive*: no error causes itself.

Example 3.2. The set of causal models \mathcal{M} of the running example is given in Fig. 4. Following Def. 3.1, there are 9 models $\{m^1, \dots, m^9\}$. \mathcal{M} represents all the different combinations of ways UUTs can be said to be a cause of the error in each test case. In Fig. 4, we associate m^1, m^2, m^3 with the top three models, m^4, m^5, m^6 with the middle three models, and m^7, m^8, m^9 with the bottom three models.

3.2 The Syntax and Semantics of Doric

What sort of hypotheses does the engineer want to estimate the likelihood of? In this section, we present a language fundamental to the fault localisation task. This language includes hypotheses about which line of code was faulty, which caused the error in which test case, etc. We develop such a language as follows. First, we define a set of basic *partial causal hypotheses* $H = \{h_1, \dots, h_{|U|}\}$, where h_i has the reading "the i th UUT was a cause of the error". Second, we

define set of *basic propositions* $U = \{u_i, \dots, u_{|U|}\}$, where u_i here takes a propositional reading "the i th UUT was executed".

Definition 3.3. L is called the *language*, defined inductively over a given set of basic propositions U and causal hypotheses H as follows:

- (1) if $\phi \in U \cup H$, then $\phi \in L$
- (2) if $\phi, \psi \in L$, then $\phi \wedge \psi, \neg\psi, \diamond_k \phi \in L$, for each $t_k \in T$

We use the following abbreviations and readings. $\phi \vee \psi$ abbreviates $\neg(\neg\phi \wedge \neg\psi)$, read " ϕ or ψ ". $\phi \wedge \psi$ is read " ϕ and ψ ". $\phi \vee \psi$ is read " ϕ or ψ ". $\neg\phi$ is read "it is not the case that ϕ ". $\diamond_k \phi$ is read " ϕ in the k th test case". e is read "the error occurred". In addition, we define L^* , called the *basic language*, which is a subset of L defined as follows: If $u_i \in U$ then $u_i \in L^*$, if $\phi, \psi \in L$, then $\phi \wedge \psi, \neg\phi \in L$.

An important feature of L is that we abbreviate two additional types of hypotheses, as follows: First, H_i is $h_i \wedge_{h_j \in H - \{h_i\}} \neg h_j$, where H_i is read "the i th UUT was the cause of the error", is called a *total causal hypothesis* for the error, and intuitively abbreviates the property that the i th unit was a cause of the error, and nothing else was. Second, we let f_i is abbreviated $\bigvee_{t_k \in T} \diamond_k h_i$, where f_i is read "the i th UUT is a fault", is called a *fault hypothesis*, and intuitively abbreviates the property that the i th unit was a cause of the error in some test case.

We now treat the semantics of Doric. To determine which propositions in the language L are true in which models M , we provide valuation functions mapping propositions to models, as follows:

Definition 3.4. Let M be a set of models and let L be the language. Then the set of *valuations* is a set $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_{|V|}\}$, where for each $t_k \in T$ there is some $v_k \in V$ with signature $v_k : L \rightarrow 2^M$, defined inductively as follows:

- (1) $v_k(u_i) = \{m^j \in M | m_{i,k}^j \in \{1, \bullet\}\}$, for $u_i \in U$
- (2) $v_k(h_i) = \{m^j \in M | m_{i,k}^j = \bullet\}$, for $h_i \in H$
- (3) $v_k(\phi \wedge \psi) = v_k(\phi) \cap v_k(\psi)$, for $\phi, \psi \in L$
- (4) $v_k(\neg\phi) = M - v_k(\phi)$, for $\phi \in L$
- (5) $v_k(\diamond_n \phi) = v_n(\phi)$, for $\phi \in L$

$v_k(\phi)$ is read "the models where ϕ in the k th test case". We give an example to illustrate.

Example 3.5. We continue with the running example. Each of the following can be visually verified by checking the causal models in Figure 4. $v_1(u_1) = \emptyset$. Intuitively, this is because t_1 executes u_1 in no models. $v_1(u_2) = M$. Intuitively, this is because t_1 executes u_1 in all models. $v_1(h_2) = \{m^1, \dots, m^6\} = M - \{m^7, m^8, m^9\}$. Accordingly, u_1 was a cause of the error in 6 out of 9 models. In contrast, $v_1(H_2) = v_1(h_2 \wedge \neg h_1 \wedge \neg h_3 \wedge \neg h_4) = \{m^4, m^5, m^6\}$. Accordingly, u_2 was the cause of the error in 3 out of 9 models. Finally, $v_1(\diamond_3 h_3) = v_3(h_3) = M$. Accordingly, in the third test case the 3rd UUT was a cause of the error.

3.3 The Probability Theory of Doric

We want to determine the probability of a given hypothesis. We do this by presenting our theory of probability. The theory is based around the following assumptions: We assume the engineer does not always know which hypotheses are true of each test case. Accordingly, we want our probabilities about hypotheses to take

an *epistemic* interpretation, in which the probabilities describe how much a given hypothesis should be believed.

Definition 3.6. Let M, L, V be non-empty sets of models, a language and set of valuations respectively. Then, a *probability theory* is a tuple $\langle \mathbf{P}, P, w \rangle$, where

- (1) $w : 2^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$
- (2) $\mathbf{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_{|T|}\}$ is a set of *probability functions*, where for each $v_k \in V$ there is some $P_k \in \mathbf{P}$ such that

$$P_k(\phi) = \frac{w(v_k(\phi))}{w(M)}, \text{ for each } \phi \in L \quad (1)$$

- (3) P is the *expected likelihood* function defined as follows:

$$P(\phi) = \sum_k \frac{P_k(\phi)}{|T|}, \text{ for each } \phi \in L \quad (2)$$

The *weight* function is w and describes the relative likelihood of a set of models. $P_k(\phi)$ is the probability that ϕ holds in the k th test case, and is defined as the proportion of models in which ϕ holds. $P(\phi)$ is the expected likelihood that ϕ , and is defined as the average probability that ϕ holds in a test case. We use the following readings: $w(X)$ is "the relative likelihood of the models in X ". $P_k(\phi)$ is "the probability that ϕ in the k th test case". $P(\phi)$ is "the expected likelihood that ϕ ". We use the standard abbreviation of $P(\phi|\psi)$ for $P(\phi \wedge \psi)/P(\psi)$, which reads "the probability that ϕ when ψ ".

We now discuss immutable assumptions on w . In order to ensure P_k satisfies standard measure theoretic properties, we assume $w(\emptyset) = 0$, $w(M) > 0$, and $w(X \cup Y) = w(X) + w(Y)$ when $X \cap Y = \emptyset$. We allow any extension to the definition of w satisfying the above properties. When w is so defined, we say it provides an interpretation of the probability functions. For instance, one option is to formally define the relative likelihood of models in terms of the number of faults in them.

Finally, we establish the intuitive result that the likelihood of a given formula in the basic language is simply the proportion of test cases in which it is true. Let f be a function which intuitively measures the frequency in which a proposition is true in a test suite. Defined: $f(\phi) = \sum f_k(\phi)$, where $f_k(\phi) = 1$ if $v_k(\phi) = M$ and 0 otherwise. We then have the following result:

PROPOSITION 3.7. For all $\phi \in L^*$, $P(\phi) = \frac{f(\phi)}{|T|}$

PROOF. See Appendix. \square

Using this result, we can identify many SBH's with an intuitive probabilistic expression stated within Doric. For example, $P(u_i \wedge e) = c_{ef}^i/|T|$, $P(u_i \wedge \neg e) = c_{ep}^i/|T|$, $P(\neg u_i \wedge \neg e) = c_{np}^i/|T|$, and $P(\neg u_i \wedge e) = c_{nf}^i/|T|$. Using these four identities alone one can express the 40 SBH's of Lucia et al. [32], and the 20 causal and confirmation SBH's of Landsberg et al. [26, 28].

3.4 Classical Interpretation

What conditions hold on the relative likelihood function? The question here is which causal models are more likely than others. To illustrate our framework, we will impose conditions on the relative likelihood function to give us a classical interpretation of

probability. Informally, probability has a classical interpretation if it satisfies the condition that if there are a total of n mutually exclusive possibilities, the probability of one of them being true is $1/n$ [19]. The rationale for this is *the principle of indifference* (aka *the principle of insufficient reason*), which states that if there are a total of n mutually exclusive possibilities, and there is not sufficient reason to believe one over the other, then their relative likelihoods are equal. Formally, for all $x, y \in M$, $w(\{x\}) = w(\{y\})$. This condition is also known to describe a uniform distribution over the set of models. In the remainder of this paper, we assume this condition. The assumption is sufficient for the following result:

$$P_k(\phi) = \frac{|v_k(\phi)|}{|M|}, \text{ for each } \phi \in L \quad (3)$$

PROPOSITION 3.8. *Equation 3 follows given indifference*

PROOF. See Appendix. \square

Intuitively, the probability of a proposition is the ratio of models in which it is true. Equation 3 is tantamount to assuming that, *ab initio*, the engineer knows next to nothing about what caused the error in each test case (each causal model is equally likely). In practice, we think is probably wrong for the purposes of software fault localisation (causal models with a small number of faults are probably more likely). The main reason for its assumption is that it keeps our forthcoming fault localisation methods simple and tractable.

We now illustrate how we can use the classical interpretation to give us a definition of $P(f_i)$. Following our readings, $P(f_i)$ measures the likelihood the i th unit was a fault. This describes is the proportion of models where i is a cause of the error in some test case (Intuitively, $P(f_i)$ is the the proportion of models where there is a "•" somewhere in the i th column of a model). We call this measure a measure of *fault-likelihood*. Accordingly, the assumption of indifference gives us the following result. Let $i \in [0, |U|]$ and $m, t \in [0, |T|]$ be free variables, and let $\rho^k = \sum_{u_i \in U^*} c_{j,k}$, then:

$$P(f_i) = P\left(\bigvee_{k=1}^{|T|} \diamond_k h_i\right) \quad (4)$$

$$P\left(\bigvee_{k=m}^{|T|} \diamond_k h_i\right) = (1 - P_k(h_i))P\left(\bigvee_{j=k+1}^{|T|} \diamond_j h_i\right) + P_k(h_i) \quad (5)$$

$$P_t(h_i) = \begin{cases} \frac{2^{\rho^t-1}}{2^{\rho^t}-1} & \text{if } c_{i,t} e_t = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

PROPOSITION 3.9. *Equations 4, 5, & 6 follow given indifference.*

PROOF. See Appendix. \square

On the running example, the equations can be used to find $P(f_1) = 0$, $P(f_2) = P(f_4) = 2/3$, $P(f_3) = 1$.

3.5 Measure for Fault Localisation

To develop an efficient fault localisation method based on our framework, we need to do two things. First, we need to identify a probabilistic expression which tells us which unit should be investigated first when looking for faults. Second, we need to identify an efficient way to compute this. In this section, we address these issues in turn.

Which unit should be investigated first when looking for faults? To answer this, it is tempting to answer — the unit which is the most likely fault ($\max_{u_i \in U^*} P(f_i)$). However, under the classical interpretation, this will be ineffective for fault localisation as it ignores passing test cases. Moreover, we do not think that this is necessarily the unit which should be investigated first. Rather, we think that the unit which is estimated to have the highest *propensity* to cause the error should be investigated first. To see the difference, we observe that something might have a high fault-likelihood, but simultaneously have a low propensity to cause errors. Think of a rarely executed bug — we think these will be of less interest to an engineer. Accordingly, the measure we should use will be an expression describing this propensity.

We make two assumptions in our development. First, we make the assumption that it is possible to find *the* cause, as opposed to *a* cause, where finding *the* cause is preferable. Second, following Popper [40], we assume the propensity of some x to y is described by probabilistic expressions of the form $P(y|x)$. Accordingly, the propensity of a unit to cause an error can be analogously described in our framework with $P(H_i|u_i)$. Following our readings of this section, this is read "the likelihood a given `UUT` was the cause of an error when it was executed". We call this measure a measure of *causal likelihood* (or `CL` for short), and for some cases is able to identify a some faults with certainty, in the sense that if $P(H_i|u_i) = 1$ then $P(f_i) = 1$. Our answer to our question is thus $\max_{u_i \in U^*} P(H_i|u_i)$.

We now address the question of how to compute `CL` efficiently. One option is to generate all the matrices in the set of causal models, and (following our assumption of indifference) find the probability directly by counting models. However, this is intractable in general. A more tractable alternative is to find an expression for $P(H_i|u_i)$ which is stated purely as a function of a given coverage matrix c and is also tractable. We present this in Eq. 7 and show it follows from the definitions of this section. As follows: Let c be a given coverage matrix. Let ρ_k abbreviate $\sum_{u_j \in U^*} c_{j,k}$. Informally, ρ_k is the number of units executed by t_k . Then for each $u_i \in U^*$:

$$P(H_i|u_i) = \frac{\sum_k c_{i,k} e_k^{-2^{\rho_k}-1}}{\sum_k c_{i,k}} \quad (7)$$

PROPOSITION 3.10. *Equation 7 follows using the definitions.*

PROOF. To aid in the proof, it will be useful to establish the following equations. Let $t \in [1, |T|]$ and $i \in [1, |U|]$, then:

$$P(H_i|u_i) = \frac{P(H_i \wedge u_i)}{P(u_i)} \quad (8)$$

$$P(H_i \wedge u_i) = P(H_i) \quad (9)$$

$$P(H_i) = \sum_k \frac{P_k(H_i)}{|T|} \quad (10)$$

$$P_t(H_i) = \begin{cases} 1/(2^{\rho t} - 1) & \text{if } c_{i,t}, e_t = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

$$P(u_i) = \sum_k \frac{c_{i,k}}{|T|} \quad (12)$$

We now sketch the proof of these equations. 8 follows by the definition of conditional probability. 10 follows by def. 3.6. It remains to give the proofs for equations 9, 11 and 12. As these are longer they are consigned to the appendix in proposition A.3.

Finally, it is easily observed that Eq. 7 holds using equations 8-12. As follows: $P(H_i|u_i) = P(H_i|u_i)/P(u_i)$ (by Eq.8). Thus, $P(H_i|u_i) = P(H_i)/P(u_i)$ (by Eq.9). So, $P(H_i|u_i) = \sum_k P_k(H_i)/|T|/P(u_i)$ (by Eq.10). Thus, $P(H_i|u_i) = \sum_k (P_k(H_i)/|T|)/(\sum_k c_{i,k}/|T|)$ (by Eq.12). So, $P(H_i|u_i) = \sum_k P_k(H_i)/\sum_k c_{i,k}$ (by cancellation). It remains to show that $P_k(H_i) = c_{i,k}e_k/2^{\rho k-1}$. Assume $c_{i,k}, e_k = 1$. Then by the first condition of Eq. 11 $P_k(H_i) = 1/2^{\rho k-1}$. This is equal to $c_{i,k}e_k/2^{\rho k-1}$ by our assumption. Assume it is not the case that $c_{i,k}, e_k = 1$. Then by the second condition of Eq. 11 $P_k(H_i) = 0$. Now, as either $c_{i,k}$ or e_k is 0 (by def. 2), $c_{i,k}e_k = 0$, and thus $c_{i,k}e_k/2^{\rho k-1} = 0$. Thus, $P_k(H_i) = c_{i,k}e_k/2^{\rho k-1}$. \square

Example 3.11. To illustrate CL, we find $P(H_i|u_i)$ for each of u_1, \dots, u_4 for the the running example of minmax. c. We begin with $P(H_1|u_1)$. We begin by evaluating the numerator of Eq. 7, which is equal to $(0 \times 0)/(2^2 - 1) + (0 \times 0)/(2^2 - 1) + (0 \times 0)/(2^1 - 1) + (1 \times 0)/(2^2 - 1) + (1 \times 0)/(2^2 - 1) = 0$. The denominator is equal to 2. Thus $P(H_2|u_2) = 0/2 = 0$. We now do $P(H_2|u_2)$. The numerator is equal to $(1 \times 1)/(2^2 - 1) + (1 \times 0)/(2^2 - 1) + (1 \times 0)/(2^1 - 1) + (0 \times 0)/(2^2 - 1) + (0 \times 1)/(2^2 - 1) = (1 \times 1)/(2^2 - 1) = 1/3$. The denominator is equal to 2. Thus $P(H_2|u_2) = (1/3)/2 = 1/6$. $P(H_3|u_3) = (1/3 + 1/3 + 1)/3 = 0.5$, and $P(H_4|u_4) = (1/3)/2 = 0.16$. Accordingly, the fault u_3 is estimated to have the highest likelihood of causing an error when executed.

We now discuss time-complexity. It is observed that the time complexity of computing the value of both fault and causal likelihood ($P(f_i)$ and $P(H_i|u_i)$ respectively) is a (small) constant function of the size of the given coverage matrix. This makes it comparable to spectrum-based heuristics in terms of efficiency, which also has this property. To answer our stated question explicitly, to compute $\max_{u_i \in U^*} P(H_i|u_i)$ efficiently we can simply compute Equation 7 for each $u_i \in U$ using the given coverage matrix c , and return the unit with the highest likelihood.

Finally, we illustrate how our measures of fault and causal likelihood provide a small armory of meaningful measures useful to the engineer. Returning the running example, the engineer might assume the principle of insufficient reason and say of the third unit "the probability it is a fault is 1" and "will likely cause the error when executed" (given $P(f_3) = 1$ and $P(H_3|u_3) > \frac{1}{2}$ respectively). We think these quantities are more meaningful than what is reported by some of most effective established SBFL's customized to SBFL. For instance "the GP05 measure reports the third unit to have a suspiciousness degree of 0.5576" does not have the same meaning, or suggest actionability to the engineer in the same way.

3.6 Semi-Automated Methods

We now address the question of how to use Eq 7 in a fault localisation method. We present two such methods. We then compare our methods to SBFL.

Our first method is similar to the SBFL procedure discussed in Section 2. Here, each $u_i \in U$ is associated with a causal likelihood, as determined by using Eq. 7. The engineer then inspects units in the program in descending order of causal likelihood (also called suspiciousness) until a fault is found. When two units are equally suspicious, the unit higher up in the code is inspected first. We call this procedure CL_n (which abbreviated "causal likelihood with no updating").

We now present our second method. We begin with some motivation. To start the fault localisation process, we assume the engineer will want to investigate $\max_{u_i \in U^*} (P(H_i|u_i))$. However, in the course of further investigation about the program, the engineer will discover new facts, symbolized ϕ (for some $\phi \in L$). To find faults, the engineer will then want to find the causal likelihood of different units *given* those facts. Accordingly, the unit the engineer should investigate next should be given by the following formula:

$$\max_{u_i \in U^*} (P(H_i|u_i \wedge \phi)) \quad (13)$$

The above motivates our second method, which is described as follows. First, ϕ is set to a tautology, and the value of Eq. 13 is computed. Suppose the unit returned by Eq. 13 is u_j . Then, if u_j is inspected by the engineer, and if found to be faulty, the search terminates. If not, we assume $\neg h_j$ and compute the value of Eq. 13 letting $\phi = \neg h_j$. Suppose the unit returned is u_k . The process is similar to before – if u_j is faulty, the search terminates. If not, we assume $\neg h_k$ and compute the value of Eq. 13 letting $\phi = \neg h_j \wedge \neg h_k$. The search continues in this way until a fault is found. We call this procedure CL_u ("causal likelihood with upsdating"). Characteristic of CL_u is that clues discovered throughout the investigation can be used to give us new probabilities.

We now discuss implementation details of the second method. In a practical implementation, we can use Equation 7 in the following way. Let $F \subseteq H$ be the set of indices to causal hypotheses known to be false. Then we can compute Eq. 13 by redefining ρ_k as $\sum_{u_j \in U} c_{j,k} - \sum_{h_n \in F} c_{n,k}$, and use the expression on the *rhs* of Eq. 7 to find the value of the argument of Eq. 13. Proof of this is included in an extended version of this paper. Secondly, in a practical implementation, we also allowed ourselves to limit the size of F (called an update bound), which represents the number of updates an engineer is willing to make. If an update bound is set and reached, then CL_u procedure continues without any further updates.

We now discuss valuable formal properties pertaining to the second method. We observe that the process of fault localisation is much like a game of hide and seek – insofar as when an engineer inspects one location for a fault and it is not there, then our estimations for the likelihood it is elsewhere should increase. We think it is desirable for a fault localisation method to satisfy a similar property. Accordingly, in this section we show that conditioning on causal likelihood (as per the method of CL_u) satisfies a similar property, as follows:

PROPOSITION 3.12. Let c be a coverage matrix where $c_{i,k} = c_{j,k} = 1$ for some $t_k \in T$. Then $P(H_i|u_i) < P(H_i|u_i \wedge \neg h_j)$.

PROOF. See Appendix. \square

In the remainder of this section, we compare our new methods with SBFL in light of two new fundamental fault scenarios which, we argue, any statistical fault localisation method should analyze correctly.

$$\begin{matrix} & u_1 & u_2 & u_3 & e \\ \begin{matrix} t_1 \\ t_2 \end{matrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

Consider the coverage matrix above. We argue that for any SBH s to be adequate for fault localisation it should satisfy the property that $s(u_3) > s(u_2)$. Our reasoning follows from the assumption that, when an error occurs, there is some executed UUT that was a cause of it. Accordingly, we can be certain that u_3 is a fault — nothing else could have caused the error in the second test case. However, we are *not* certain that u_2 is a fault (as far as we know u_1 could have caused the error instead in the first test case). However, it is impossible for any SBH to satisfy $s(u_3) > s(u_2)$, because spectrum for u_3 and u_2 is the same (i.e. $\langle c_{ef}^2, c_{nf}^2, c_{ep}^2, c_{np}^2 \rangle = \langle c_{ef}^3, c_{nf}^3, c_{ep}^3, c_{np}^3 \rangle = \langle 1, 1, 0, 0 \rangle$ — see the definition of a spectrum in def. 2.5). Thus, their suspiciousness is the same. Subsequently, SBHs cannot handle this fundamental case. In contrast, the measure of causal likelihood gets the answer right, as $P(H_3|u_3) = 1$ and $P(H_2|u_2) = 1/3$.

$$\begin{matrix} & u_1 & u_2 & u_3 & u_4 & e \\ \begin{matrix} t_1 \\ t_2 \end{matrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

Now consider the coverage matrix above. Suppose we begin the fault localisation process, without any prior knowledge about which units are faulty or non-faulty. Now, according to spectrum-based functions, each unit is equally suspicious (as the spectrum for each unit is the same = $\langle 1, 1, 0, 0 \rangle$). Suppose, following the SBFL method, we choose to investigate u_1 , and discover it not to be faulty. Accordingly, on the assumption that in every failing test case some executed unit is a cause of the error, we can now be certain that u_2 is a fault given this new information. However, we cannot be so certain that either u_3 or u_4 is a fault (as it might be the case it isn't but the other is). Thus upon learning u_1 isn't a fault, degrees of suspiciousness should be updated to make u_2 more suspiciousness than u_3 and u_4 . However, SBFL is inadequate for fault localisation because it has no facility for updates of this sort. In contrast, as a consequence of Proposition 3.12 the CL_u method gets it right. At step one, for all $u_i \in U$, $P(H_i|u_i) = 1/3$. Suppose the engineer learns u_1 is not faulty. Thus, the engineer evaluates all $u_i \in U - \{u_1\}$ next. $P(H_2|u_2 \wedge \neg h_1) = 1$, and remain $P(H_3|u_3 \wedge \neg h_1) = P(H_3|u_3 \wedge \neg h_1) = 1/3$.

4 EMPIRICAL EVALUATION

In this section, we compare the performance of our new methods with all known 127 SBHs on large faulty programs. The goal of the experiment is to establish whether CL_n and CL_u are effective at fault localisation than SBHs.

Program	V	LOC	U	F	P	B
Chart	24/26	50k	680	3.75	190.21	1.92
Closure	77/133	83k	3,432	2.88	3,367.40	2.52
Math	91/106	19k	346	1.74	168.80	3.10
Time	20/27	53k	1,204	2.20	2,542.85	4.10
Lang	50/65	6k	96	2.16	98.26	2.62
Mockito	27/38	-	574	3.78	744.96	2.59

Table 2: Statistics about Defects4j Benchmarks

Program	V	M	U	F	P
AC_Codec_1.3	543	265	188	5.35	16.04
AC_Lang_3.0	599	5373	1,666	4.22	44.84
Daikon_4.6.4	352	14387	157	1.66	30.06
Draw2d_3.4.2	570	3231	89	6.71	60.73
Eventbus_1.4	577	859	91	8.19	75.70
Htmlparser_1.6	599	3231	600	41.70	379.17
Jaxen_1.1.5	600	1689	695	70.29	581.25
Jester_1.37b	411	378	64	5.09	22.94
Jexel_1.0.0b13	537	242	335	23.15	261.39
Jparsec_2.0	598	1011	510	13.14	293.59

Table 3: Statistics about Steimann's Benchmarks.

4.1 Setup

We first present the benchmarks used in our experiment, then describe the methods compared in the experiment, the methods we used to evaluate the performance of the different methods. Finally, we present some research questions for our experiment to answer.

We first describe the benchmarks used in our experiments. We use two sets of Java benchmarks, Defects4j and Steimann's. Each set of benchmarks contains different programs, each program is associated with different initial faulty versions, and each faulty version is associated with a test suite (which includes some failing test cases) and a method for identifying the faulty UUTs. Statistics for the two sets of benchmarks are presented in Tables 2 and 3 respectively. The first column gives the name of the program, the second the number of initial faulty versions (V), the third the number of tested units (lines of code (LOC) for Defects4j, methods (M) for Steimann). The fourth gives the (rounded) average number of units represented in a coverage matrix for the initial faulty versions (U). The number of units represented in the matrix is always smaller than the number of tested units, as columns in the coverage matrix were removed in our experiments if the corresponding unit was not executed by a failing test case (such units are assumed non-faulty). The fifth and sixth columns give the average number of failing (F) and passing (P) test cases represented in a coverage matrix for each initial faulty version. In Table 2, The last column gives the average number of faulty units represented in each coverage matrix for each initial faulty version (B). In the case of Steimann's each initial version always had one injected fault, so we have not included that column for its corresponding table. Finally, we could not find a reliable source for the number of lines of code for Mockito. We now discuss particular details about the two sets of benchmarks.

The first set of benchmarks are taken from the Defects4J repository. This is a database consisting of Java program versions with real bugs fixed by developers, and are described in detail by René *et al.* [23]. As the authors confirm, not all of the versions were usable

with software fault localisation methods. A version was unusable if it had a list of faults which did not correspond to an executed line of code (and thus the techniques considered in this paper would not be able to find them). This was because the faults in these versions include omissions of code. Thus, the proportion of usable versions are reported in the Vs column of Table 2 (for instance 24/26 versions were usable for Chart). To generate coverage matrices, we used pre-existent code from the Defects4J repository.²

The second set are the Steimann benchmarks. This is a database of large Java programs with injected faults introduced via mutation testing, and are described in detail by Steimann *et al.* [45]. The benchmarks are described in Table 2. To generate multiple fault versions, the authors also created one thousand 2,4,8,16, and 32 fault versions, which were created by combining fault injections from the original 1-fault versions. This meant there were a total of 50K+ program versions associated with our second set of benchmarks. We used pre-existent code to generate coverage matrices for us, provided to use by the compilers of the benchmarks [45].

We now discuss the methods we compare in our experiments. We wish to compare SBFL methods with the methods developed in this paper. We describe these in turn. We include in our comparison 127 different SBFLs. These measures are described in Landsberg [26], and is an attempt at an exhaustive list of SBFLs available in the literature³. As a baseline for our comparison, we also compared the constant measure (which returns a constant value). We also compare CL_u (with an update bound of 20). Finally, we also compare CL_n when used as a substitute SBFL measure for the SBFL procedure discussed in Section 2. This allowed us to compare the benefits of updating.

We now discuss our methods of evaluation. The methods we compare all follow the same format insofar as one inspects more suspicious units first, with units which feature higher up in the code inspected first in the case of ties. We wish to evaluate a method in terms of how quickly a fault would be found using this approach. Accordingly, First, for each coverage matrix, a method's *accuracy* is defined as the number of non-faulty units investigated using the technique until a fault is found. A method's accuracy for a given set of coverage matrices associated with that benchmark is defined as the average accuracy for that set. For a given set of coverage matrices, the most accurate method is the one with the lowest accuracy score.

The second method of evaluation is as follows. For a given cut-off of n and a given set of coverage matrices, a method's *n-score* is the percentage of times a fault is found by investigating n non-faulty units using the method. For a set of coverage matrices and given n , the method with the best *n-score* is the one with the highest *n-score*. We provide values of n in the range $[0,10]$. Following the suggestions of Parnin and Orso [39], we provide this range as we think 10 units is a realistic upper bound on the number of units an engineer will investigate using a given method. Accuracy and *n-scores* off score are both called a method's *scores* in general. For each of our sets of benchmarks, the *overall* accuracy score was the average accuracy over all coverage matrices in that set of benchmarks.

²<https://github.com/rjust/defects4j>

³Following established conventions on avoiding divisions by zero with the SBFLs, we added 0.5 to each of the elements of a spectrum [28, 36]




Figure 5: Performance of CL_n on Steimann's benchmarks with different numbers of faults.




Figure 6: Performance of some methods on Defects4j benchmarks.

We now discuss our research questions. Accordingly, for each of our benchmarks, our experimental setup is designed to help answer the following research questions:

- (1) Which method is the most accurate?
- (2) Do our new techniques have the best *n-scores* for $n \in [0, 10]$?

Finally, all of our results can be reproduced. The Steimann benchmarks can be downloaded from <http://www.feu.de/ps/prjs/EzUnit/eval/ISSTA13/>. The Defects4J benchmarks can be downloaded from <https://github.com/rjust/defects4j>. All the SBFL's compared are available in [26, 28].

4.2 Results

We first directly answer our two research questions. First, Which method is the most accurate? For Defects4j CL_n has the best accuracy score (213.6). For Steimann's benchmarks, CL_u has the best accuracy score (4.9) (CL_n came second with 5.02). Second, Do our

new techniques have the best n -scores for any $n \in [0, 10]$? For Defects4j, CL_n had the best 6-score (41.18). For Steimann’s benchmarks, for all $n \in [0, 10]$, CL_u had the best n -scores for each of the sets of 4, 8, 16, 32 faults. CL_n had the second best scores in these cases.

We first discuss the results for Defects4j, and begin with the overall accuracy scores. To show the range, we report the measures which were ranked 1, 2, 10, 50, 90, 100. These were CL_n (213.6), D3 (216.36), Lewis (224.79), AddedValue (232.46), CL_u (241.22) Gower (248.72) respectively. The constant measure was ranked last (643.78). We now summarise the n -scores for each $n \in [0, 10]$. The n -scores for a range of methods are presented in Figure 6. We describe the figure as follows. For each method in the legend, a point was plotted at (x, y) if in $y\%$ of the versions a fault was localized after investigating x non-faulty lines of code. To show the range of performance across methods, the methods in the legend are associated with the aforementioned methods. Of all 127 methods compared, CL_u did not get the best n -score for any of $n \in [0, 10]$, and CL_n tied with the best 6-score (41.18 - tied with Dennis, Ochiai, and f9830).

We now discuss the results for Steimann’s benchmarks. We first summarise the overall accuracy scores. To show the range of scores, we report the methods which were ranked 1, 2, 3, 10, 20, 50, 100. These were CL_u (4.9), CL_n (5.02), Klosgen (9.02), SokalSneath4 (9.51), calf, (9.77), Tarantula (10.54), GP23 (15.68). The constant measure came last (38.69). We now summarise accuracy scores on sets of 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32 fault programs. On 1-fault programs, Naish received the best accuracy score (9.81). CL_u came 72nd (14.5) and CL_n came 74th (14.69). On each of the sets of versions with multiple faults, CL_u and CL_n came 1st and 2nd respectively, as follows: On 2-fault programs, the top 3 were CL_u (9.87) CL_n and (10.04) and D3 (13.1). On 4-fault programs, the top 3 were CL_u (5.14) CL_n and (5.3) and GeometricMean (10.34). On 8-fault programs, the top 3 were CL_u (2.79) CL_n and (2.94) and Klosgen (7.57). On 16-fault programs, the top 3 were CL_u (1.16) CL_n and (1.24) and AddedValue (6.04). On 32-fault programs, the top 3 were CL_u (0.4) CL_n and (0.44) and Certainty (4.87).

We now summarise the n -scores. For each $n \in [0, 10]$, and for the set of 1-fault programs, Naish outperformed CL_u or CL_n at every value n . For each $n \in [0, 10]$, and for the set of 2-fault programs, D3 outperformed CL_u or CL_n at every value of n . For each $n \in [0, 10]$, and for each of the sets of 4, 8, 16, 32 fault programs, CL_u or CL_n outperformed all SBFL methods at every value of n . CL_u and CL_n n -scores were always similar (± 2 percent of one another), thus to give an indication of how they perform as the number of faults grows in a program, we present Figure 6. Here, for each of the 1, ..., 32 fault programs, a point was plotted on (x, y) if in $y\%$ of the versions a fault was localized after investigating x non-faulty lines of code.

In the remainder of this section, we discuss our results. We first discuss differences in value between our evaluative methods (accuracy and n -scores). In general, n -scores are more important than accuracy from the point of view of an engineer looking for a technique to use in practice. As has been demonstrated in a study by Parnin and Orso, "programmers will stop inspecting statements, and transition to traditional debugging, if they do not get promising results within the first few statements they inspect" [39]. n -scores are more important from this perspective.

We now discuss the difference in quality between accuracy and n -scores. In general, the accuracy scores for all techniques on Defects4j are poor. For instance, using the most accurate method CL_n , one would expect to investigate 213.6 lines of code on average. In contrast, if one limited oneself to investigating fewer than 10 non-faulty lines of code, then one would expect to find a fault almost half the time. For instance, using CL_n we can expect to find a fault 41.68% of the time if one limited oneself to investigating 6 non-faulty lines of code (here, nothing did better than CL_n). This suggests that accuracy scores were affected by outliers in which the technique only located a fault after investigating many lines of code (we discuss two such outliers below).

We now discuss why methods performed differently on Defects4j as opposed to Steimann. First, in the useable Defects4j versions, the average number of failing test cases was very small, as detailed by Table 2. In contrast, the number of failing test cases in Steimann benchmarks was much larger. We think this improved the performance of different methods, as more failing tests provide more information about the behavior of the fault. Secondly, in the useable Defects4j versions, 38.4% had only a single failing test case. Accordingly, CL_u , CL_n and most SBFL’s performed equivalently on these benchmarks in terms of which units get ranked higher/lower, this meant that the performance of high performing methods tended to converge. Thirdly, we emphasize that the units in Steimann’s benchmarks were calls to subclasses, which are often larger than lines of code (the units for Defects4j), and thus the scores look better for Steimann’s benchmarks. Fourthly, for Steimann’s benchmarks many of the failing test cases only executed a small part of the overall program. This advantaged our new methods CL_u and CL_n , which take advantage of short failing executions to increase their causal likelihood.

We now discuss the difference in accuracy between CL_u and CL_n . As described earlier, the performance of CL_u is slightly worse than CL_n on Defects4j, where the opposite is observed on Steimann’s benchmarks. We investigated reasons why for this, and after investigating the cases where CL_n outperforms CL_u in terms of accuracy on Defects4j, we discovered there were two major outliers that made CL_u ’s overall accuracy score lower (in Chart-5 CL_u had to investigate 3177 more lines of code, and Math-6 CL_u had to investigate Math-6 1585 more lines of code). For Defects4j, CL_u outperformed CL_n in only two cases, whereas CL_n outperformed CL_u in 50. These results (tentatively) suggest the conclusion that CL_n is better to use in practice when the program and test suite resemble the benchmarks in Defects4j, and CL_u when the program and test suite resemble the benchmarks in Steimann’s benchmarks.

Finally, we think the scores of our new techniques demonstrate they are a strong contender to SBFL heuristics when integrated into a practical fault localisation approach.

4.3 Threats to Validity

Our threats are informed by the recent work of [23], who perform a similar test on the Defects4j benchmarks, and by Steimann *et al.*, who perform similar experiments on the Steimann benchmarks [45].

The main threat is wrt how well our results generalize to practical instances of fault localisation. Given the variety of programs, faults, test suites, and development styles in "the wild" it has not yet

been shown whether studies of this sort generalize well. Wrt the Steimann benchmarks, there is the additional threat that artificial faults are not good proxies for real faults. Problems of this sort confront many software fault localisation studies [45]. To anticipate these problems, we have tried to improve the degree to which our results can generalise by ensuring our experiment was large. To our knowledge our experiment is currently the largest in the literature in terms of three different dimensions: number of methods compared (127+), range of faults studied (1-32), and number of program versions used (50k+).

5 RELATED WORK

The recent survey of Wong *et al.* [52] identifies the most prominent fault localisation methods to be spectrum based [4, 13, 24, 28, 32, 36, 42, 47, 59], slice based [6, 29, 46, 53, 61], model based [33, 55, 58], and mutation-based [34, 38]. For reasons of space, we discuss closely related statistical approaches.

We first discuss SBH, which is one of the most lightweight methods. In general, SBH's designed to solve the general problem of fault localisation (for programs with any number of faults) are heuristics which estimate how "suspicious" a given unit is. However, what "suspicious" means is (to our knowledge) never fully defined. In the absence of an approach which tells us this, research is driven by the development of new measures with improved experimental performance [4, 13, 24, 28, 32, 36, 42, 47, 59]. Many of these top-performing measures are presented in Table 1: D3 was developed by raising the numerator of a previously used measure to the power of 3 [49]. Zoltar was developed by adding $10000 \frac{nfep}{ef}$ to the denominator of a previously used measure [18]. GP05 was found using genetic programming [59]. Ochiai was originally designed for Japanese fish classification [4, 37]. In this paper, we have tried to improve upon the theoretical connection between developed measures and the fault localisation problem.

We now discuss theoretical results for SBFL. Theoretical results include proving potentially desirable formal properties of measures and finding equivalence proofs for classes of measures [11, 28, 35, 36, 56]. Yoo *et al.* have established theoretical results that show that a "best" performing suspicious measure for SBFL does not exist [60], arguing there is "no pot of gold at the end of the program spectrum rainbow" in theory. With this result, there remains the problem of providing better formal foundations, and deriving improved measures shown to satisfy more formal properties. Our work in this paper is designed to address this.

Two more heavyweight approaches to multiple fault localisation are as follows. Both of these approaches use fault models in their analysis. Here, a fault model is a set of units with the property that each failing trace executes at least one of them. The first is the simple classical approach of Steimann *et al.* [43], where the probability of a unit being faulty is the proportion of fault models it is a member of. A second method is Barinel [5], which uses Bayesian analysis and heuristic policies to estimate the health of UUTs, and uses a tool Staccato [2] to generate large sets of fault models. The main issue confronting these approaches is scalability, given the requirement of generating large sets of fault models. Additionally, in one study the implementation of Barinel was unable to scale to the Steimann benchmarks [27]. We have purposely designed our

approach to avoid this issue by having a different definition of a model which facilitates tractable fault localisation methods.

We discuss miscellaneous statistical approaches here. One type of approach uses machine learning, including support vector machines and neural network approaches, to perform fault localisation [7, 48]. However, these approaches do not make the case that a recourse to machine learning methods is necessary and that a principled approach is impossible. Other approaches include the crosstab-based method of Wong [50], the hypothesis testing approach of Liu [31], and the probabilistic program dependence graph approach of Baah [8]. Landsberg *et al.* provide an axiomatic setup which uses SBHS in a probabilistic framework, but does not use models [27].

We now discuss how lightweight statistical methods have been used in the following applications. Firstly, in semi-automated fault localisation in which users inspect code in descending order of suspiciousness [39]. Secondly, in fully-automated fault localisation subroutines within algorithms which inductively synthesize (such as CEGIS [20]) or repair programs (such as GENProg [14]). Thirdly, as a technique combined with other methods [9, 22, 24, 57]. Finally, as a potential substitute for heavyweight methods which cannot scale to large programs. Thus, there is a large field of application for the techniques discussed in this paper.

Finally, for the approach of classical probability, the overview of James [19], the introduction of Tijms [17], and the measure-theoretic foundations of Kolmogorov [25] all provided bases upon which to develop our approach.

6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have demonstrated there is a principled formal foundation (Doric) available for statistical fault localisation that does not require recourse to spectrum-based heuristics. In general, Doric opens up a world of different meaningful probabilities which can be reported to the engineer to aid in understanding a faulty program. To illustrate the utility of Doric, we developed two lightweight measures of fault and causal likelihood and integrated the latter into our fault localisation method CL_n . In large-scale experimentation, CL_n was demonstrated to be more accurate when compared with all known 127 SBHS. In particular, on the Steimann benchmarks CL_n was almost twice as accurate as the best performing SBH — you'd expect to find a fault by examining 5.02 methods as opposed to 9.02. CL_n also demonstrated to have the highest 6-score on Defects4j. We think the combined effort demonstrates that our measure of causal likelihood is lightweight, effective and maintains a meaningful connection to fault localisation.

We now discuss directions for future work. First, a major step in our work is to experiment with different weight functions (w). There are many ways to do this, so it is our hope there will be as much experimentation over different weights as there has been comparing SBHS. A natural place to start is to define the relative likelihood of a model as a function of the number of faults in that model in conjunction with some given cumulative distribution function. Following work on fault distributions in software [15], we wish to weigh models with a small number of faults to have a higher relative likelihood. The formal development in this paper lays much of the foundations critical for this step.

REFERENCES

- [1] [n. d.]. MS Windows NT Kernel Description. <https://www.newscientist.com/gallery/software-faults/>. Accessed: 2010-09-30.
- [2] Rui Abreu and Arjan J. C. van Gemund. 2009. A Low-Cost Approximate Minimal Hitting Set Algorithm and its Application to Model-Based Diagnosis. In *Abstraction, Reformulation, and Approximation (SARA)*.
- [3] Rui Abreu, Peter Zoetewij, and Arjan J. C. van Gemund. 2006. An Evaluation of Similarity Coefficients for Software Fault Localization. In *PRDC*. 39–46.
- [4] Rui Abreu, Peter Zoetewij, and Arjan J. C. van Gemund. 2007. On the Accuracy of Spectrum-based Fault Localization. In *TAICPART-MUTATION*. IEEE, 89–98.
- [5] Rui Abreu, Peter Zoetewij, and Arjan J. C. van Gemund. 2009. Spectrum-Based Multiple Fault Localization. In *ASE*. 88–99.
- [6] H. Agrawal, J. R. Horgan, S. London, and W. E. Wong. 1995. Fault localization using execution slices and dataflow tests. *Software Reliability Engineering, 1995. Proceedings., Sixth International Symposium on*, 143–151.
- [7] L. C. Ascari, L. Y. Araki, A. R. T. Pozo, and S. R. Vergilio. 2009. Exploring machine learning techniques for fault localization. In *2009 10th Latin American Test Workshop*. 1–6.
- [8] George K. Baah, Andy Podgurski, and Mary Jean Harrold. 2008. The Probabilistic Program Dependence Graph and Its Application to Fault Diagnosis (*ISSTA '08*). 189–200.
- [9] Benoit Baudry, Franck Fleurey, and Yves Le Traon. 2006. Improving Test Suites for Efficient Fault Localization. In *ICSE*. ACM, 82–91.
- [10] Higor Amario de Souza, Marcos Lordello Chaim, and Fabio Kon. 2016. Spectrum-based Software Fault Localization: A Survey of Techniques, Advances, and Challenges. *CoRR* (2016).
- [11] Vidroha Debroy and W. Eric Wong. 2011. On the equivalence of certain fault localization techniques. In *Proceedings of the 2011 ACM Symposium on Applied Computing (SAC)*. 1457–1463. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1982185.1982498>
- [12] Nicholas DiGiuseppe and James A. Jones. 2011. On the Influence of Multiple Faults on Coverage-based Fault Localization. In *ISSTA*. ACM, 210–220.
- [13] W. Eric Wong, Vidroha Debroy, and Byoungju Choi. 2010. A Family of Code Coverage-based Heuristics for Effective Fault Localization. *JSS* 83, 2 (2010), 188–208.
- [14] Claire Le Goues, ThanhVu Nguyen, Stephanie Forrest, and Westley Weimer. 2012. GenProg: A Generic Method for Automatic Software Repair. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* 38, 1 (2012), 54–72.
- [15] Tihana Galinac Grbac and Darko Huljenic. 2015. On the probability distribution of faults in complex software systems. *Information and Software Technology* 58 (2015), 250–258.
- [16] Alex Groce. 2004. Error Explanation with Distance Metrics. In *TACAS (LNCS)*, Vol. 2988. Springer, 108–122.
- [17] Tijms Henk. 2004. Understanding Probability.
- [18] Tom Janssen, Rui Abreu, and Arjan J. C. van Gemund. 2009. Zoltar: a spectrum-based fault localization tool. In *SINTER*. ACM, 23–30.
- [19] E. T. Jaynes. 2003. *Probability theory: The logic of science*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [20] Susmit Jha and Sanjit A. Seshia. 2014. Are There Good Mistakes? A Theoretical Analysis of CEGIS. In *3rd Workshop on Synthesis (SYNT)*, 84–99.
- [21] James A. Jones, Mary Jean Harrold, and John Stasko. 2002. Visualization of Test Information to Assist Fault Localization. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE '02)*. ACM, 467–477. <https://doi.org/10.1145/581339.581397>
- [22] Xiaolin et al. Ju. [n. d.]. [n. d.]. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2013.11.1109>
- [23] René Just, Darioush Jalali, and Michael D. Ernst. 2014. Defects4J: A Database of Existing Faults to Enable Controlled Testing Studies for Java Programs (*ISSTA 2014*). 437–440.
- [24] Jeongho Kim, Jonghee Park, and Eunseok Lee. 2015. A New Hybrid Algorithm for Software Fault Localization. In *IMCOM*. ACM, 50:1–50:8.
- [25] Andrey N. Kolmogorov. 1960. *Foundations of the Theory of Probability* (2 ed.). Chelsea Pub Co. [http://www.clrc.rhul.ac.uk/resources/fop/Theory%20of%20Probability%20\(small\).pdf](http://www.clrc.rhul.ac.uk/resources/fop/Theory%20of%20Probability%20(small).pdf)
- [26] David Landsberg. 2016. *Methods and Measures for Statistical Fault Localisation (doctoral thesis)*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Oxford.
- [27] David Landsberg, Hana Chockler, and Daniel Kroening. 2016. Probabilistic Fault Localisation. In *Haifa Verification Conference*. 65–81.
- [28] David Landsberg, Hana Chockler, Daniel Kroening, and Matt Lewis. 2015. Evaluation of Measures for Statistical Fault Localisation and an Optimising Scheme. In *FASE*. LNCS, Vol. 9033. Springer, 115–129.
- [29] Yan Lei, Xiaoguang Mao, Ziyang Dai, and Chengsong Wang. 2012. Effective Statistical Fault Localization Using Program Slices.. In *COMPSAC*. IEEE Computer Society, 1–10.
- [30] Ben Liblit, Mayur Naik, Alice X. Zheng, Alex Aiken, and Michael I. Jordan. 2005. Scalable Statistical Bug Isolation. *SIGPLAN Not.* (2005), 15–26.
- [31] Chao Liu, Long Fei, Xifeng Yan, Jiawei Han, and Samuel P. Midkiff. 2006. Statistical Debugging: A Hypothesis Testing-Based Approach. *IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng.* 32, 10 (2006), 831–848.
- [32] Lucia, David Lo, Lingxiao Jiang, Ferdian Thung, and Aditya Budi. 2014. Extended comprehensive study of association measures for fault localization. *Journal of Software: Evolution and Process* 26, 2 (2014), 172–219.
- [33] W. Mayer and M. Stumptner. 2008. Evaluating Models for Model-Based Debugging. In *ASE*. 128–137.
- [34] Seokhyeon Moon, Yunho Kim, Moonzoo Kim, and Shin Yoo. 2014. Ask the Mutants: Mutating Faulty Programs for Fault Localization (*ICST '14*). 153–162.
- [35] Lee Naish and Hua Jie Lee. 2013. Duals in Spectral Fault Localization. In *Australian Conference on Software Engineering (ASWEC)*. IEEE, 51–59.
- [36] Lee Naish, Hua Jie Lee, and Kotagiri Ramamohanarao. 2011. A Model for Spectra-based Software Diagnosis. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.* (2011), 1–11.
- [37] A. Ochiai. 1957. Zoogeographical Studies on the Soleoid Fishes Found in Japan and its Neighboring Regions. *Bull. Jap. Soc. sci. Fish.* (1957), 526–530.
- [38] Mike Papadakis and Yves Le Traon. 2015. Metallaxis-FL: Mutation-based Fault Localization. *Softw. Test. Verif. Reliab.* 25, 5-7 (Aug. 2015), 24.
- [39] Chris Parmin and Alessandro Orso. 2011. Are Automated Debugging Techniques Actually Helping Programmers?. In *International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis (ISSTA)*. 199–209.
- [40] Karl Popper. 2005. *The logic of scientific discovery*. Routledge.
- [41] R. Santelices, J. A. Jones, Yanbing Yu, and M. J. Harrold. 2009. Lightweight fault-localization using multiple coverage types. In *ICSE*. 56–66.
- [42] Raul Santelices, James A. Jones, Yanbing Yu, and Mary Jean Harrold. 2009. Lightweight fault-localization Using Multiple Coverage Types (*ICSE '09*). 11.
- [43] Friedrich Steimann and Mario Bertschler. 2009. A Simple Coverage-Based Locator for Multiple Faults.. In *ICST (2009-12-23)*. IEEE Computer Society, 366–375.
- [44] Friedrich Steimann and Marcus Frenkel. 2012. Improving Coverage-Based Localization of Multiple Faults Using Algorithms from Integer Linear Programming. In *ISSRE November 27-30*. 121–130.
- [45] Friedrich Steimann, Marcus Frenkel, and Rui Abreu. 2013. Threats to the Validity and Value of Empirical Assessments of the Accuracy of Coverage-based Fault Locators. In *ISSTA*. ACM, 314–324.
- [46] Mark Weiser. 1981. Program Slicing. In *ICSE*. IEEE Press, 439–449.
- [47] W.E. Wong, V. Debroy, Ruizhi Gao, and Yihao Li. 2014. The DStar Method for Effective Software Fault Localization. *Reliability, IEEE Transactions on* 63, 1 (2014), 290–308.
- [48] W. E. Wong, V. Debroy, R. Golden, X. Xu, and B. Thuraisingham. 2012. Effective Software Fault Localization Using an RBF Neural Network. *IEEE Transactions on Reliability* 61, 1 (March 2012), 149–169.
- [49] W. E. Wong, V. Debroy, Y. Li, and R. Gao. 2012. Software Fault Localization Using DStar (D*). In *2012 IEEE Sixth International Conference on Software Security and Reliability*. 21–30.
- [50] W. Eric Wong, Vidroha Debroy, and Dianxiang Xu. 2012. Towards Better Fault Localization: A Crosstab-Based Statistical Approach. *IEEE Trans. Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part C* 42, 3 (2012), 378–396. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSMCC.2011.2118751>
- [51] W. E. Wong, R. Gao, Y. Li, R. Abreu, and F. Wotawa. 2016. A Survey on Software Fault Localization. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 99 (2016).
- [52] W. Eric Wong, Ruizhi Gao, Yihao Li, Rui Abreu, and Franz Wotawa. 2016. A Survey on Software Fault Localization. *IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng.* 42, 8 (Aug. 2016), 34.
- [53] W. Eric Wong and Yu Qi. 2006. Effective program debugging based on execution slices and inter-block data dependency. *JSS* (2006), 891–903.
- [54] W. Eric Wong, Yu Qi, Lei Zhao, and Kai-Yuan Cai. 2007. Effective Fault Localization Using Code Coverage. In *COMPSAC*. 449–456.
- [55] Franz Wotawa, Markus Stumptner, and Wolfgang Mayer. 2002. Model-Based Debugging or How to Diagnose Programs Automatically. In *Developments in Applied Artificial Intelligence*. LNCS, Vol. 2358. 746–757.
- [56] Xiaoyuan Xie, Tsong Yueh Chen, Fei-Ching Kuo, and Baowen Xu. 2013. A Theoretical Analysis of the Risk Evaluation Formulas for Spectrum-based Fault Localization. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.* (2013), 31:1–31:40.
- [57] Jifeng Xuan and Martin Monperrus. 2014. Learning to Combine Multiple Ranking Metrics for Fault Localization. In *ICSME*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSME.2014.41>
- [58] Cemal Yilmaz and Clay Williams. 2007. An Automated Model-based Debugging Approach. In *ASE*. ACM, 174–183.
- [59] Shin Yoo. 2012. Evolving Human Competitive Spectra-Based Fault Localisation Techniques. In *SSBSE (LNCS)*, Vol. 7515. 244–258.
- [60] S. Yoo, X. Xiaoyuan, F. Kuo, T. Chen, Y. Tsong Yueh, and M. Harman. 2014. No pot of gold at the end of program spectrum rainbow: Greatest risk evaluation formula does not exist. *Department of Computer Science, University College London* (2014).
- [61] Xiangyu Zhang, Haifeng He, Neelam Gupta, and Rajiv Gupta. 2005. Experimental Evaluation of Using Dynamic Slices for Fault Location (*ADEBUG*). ACM, 33–42.

A PROOFS

In this appendix, we present the proofs supporting the main text. To simplify, we have put a proof later in our order of presentation if a part of that proof relies on a part of an earlier proof.

To aid in the proofs we introduce some notation. For each $m^j \in M$, $m_{i,k}^j$ is the value at the i th column and k th row. m_k^j is the matrix consisting of the k th row of m^j . For each $t_k \in T$ we let $M_k = \{m_k^j \mid 1 \leq j \leq |M|\}$. Intuitively, this is all different k th rows of all models. We make use of a concatenation operation \cdot such that $x \cdot y$ is the concatenation of two matrices, and extend the definition such that $M_i \cdot M_j = \{x \cdot y \mid x \in M_i \wedge y \in M_j\}$. Accordingly, definition 3 is designed to conform to the following assumption $M = M_1 \cdot M_2 \cdot \dots \cdot M_{|T|}$. It is observed that $|M_k| = 2^{P_k} - 1$ if t_k is failing, and 1 otherwise.

PROPOSITION A.1. *Equation 9 follows using the defs.*

PROOF. We must show $P(H_i \wedge u_i) = P(H_i)$. It is sufficient to show $v_k(H_i \wedge u_i) = v_k(H_i)$. Thus, it is sufficient to show $v_k(H_i \wedge u_i) = v_k(H_i) \cap v_k(u_i)$ (by def. 3.4). Now, $v_k(H_i) \cap v_k(u_i) \subseteq v_k(H_i)$ (as in general $X \cap Y \subseteq X$), thus it remains to show $v_k(H_i) \cap v_k(u_i) \subseteq v_k(H_i)$. It is sufficient to show $v_k(u_i) \subseteq v_k(H_i)$ (as in general $X \subseteq X$). Now, $v_k(H_i) =$ (by the abbreviation for H_i) $v_k(h_1 \wedge \neg h_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \neg h_{|U|-1}) =$ (by def. 3.4) $v_k(h_1) \cap v_k(\neg h_2) \cap \dots \cap \neg v_k(h_{|U|-1}) = \{m^j \mid m_{1,k}^j = 2\} \cap \{m^j \mid m_{1,k}^j \in \{1, 0\}\} \cap \dots$ (by def. 3 and 2). $= \{m^j \mid m_{1,k}^j = 2\} \cap \{m^j \mid m_{1,k}^j \in \{1, 0\}\} \cap \dots = \{m^j \mid m_{1,k}^j = 2 \wedge m_{1,k}^j \in \{1, 0\} \wedge \dots\} = \{m^j \mid m_{1,k}^j \in \{1, 2\} \wedge m_{1,k}^j = 2 \wedge m_{1,k}^j \in \{1, 0\} \wedge \dots\}$. A subset of which is $\{m^j \mid m_{1,k}^j \in \{1, 2\}\}$, which is $v_k(u_i)$ (by def. 3).

PROPOSITION A.2. *Equation 11 follows using the defs.*

We sketch the proof for equation 11. $P_t(H_i)$ is equal to $\frac{|v_t(H_i)|}{|M|}$ (by def. 3.6). We first do the top condition of equation 11. Without loss of generality, let $k = 1$. Assume $c_{i,1} = e_1 = 1$. Now, $M = M_1 \cdot M_2 \cdot \dots \cdot M_{|M|}$ (by A1). Thus, $v_1(H_i) = \{m_1^j \mid m^j \in v_1(H_i)\} \cdot M_2 \cdot \dots \cdot M_n$ (as in general, $v_1(\phi) = \{m_k^j \in M_1 \mid m^j \in v_k(\phi)\} \cdot M_2 \cdot \dots \cdot M_n$). So, $|v_1(H_i)| = |\{m_1^j \mid m^j \in v_1(H_i)\}| \times |M_2| \times \dots \times |M_{|T|}|$. So, $|v_1(H_i)| = 1 \times |M_2| \times \dots \times |M_{|T|}|$ (given if $m^j, m^k \in v_1(H_i)$ then $m_1^j = m_1^k$). Thus, $1 \times |M_2| \times \dots \times |M_{|T|}| / |M_1| \times |M_2| \times \dots \times |M_{|T|}|$. This is equal to $1/|M_1|$ (by cancellation), which is equal to $1/(2^{\rho_1} - 1)$ (given $\rho_1 = \sum_{i < |U|} c_{i,1}$). We now do the bottom condition (when either $c_{i,1}$ or e_1 is 0). Accordingly, there are no models in $v_1(h_i)$ (by def. 4), thus no models in $v_1(H_i)$ (by def. 3.4 and H_i), and so $P_1(H_i) = 0$.

PROPOSITION A.3. *Equation 12 follows using the defs.*

We must show $P(u_i) = \sum_k c_{i,k} / |T|$. $P(u_i)$ is equal to $f(u_i) / |T|$ (by proposition 3.7). The latter is equal to $\sum_k f_k(u_i) / |T|$. It remains to show $f_k(u_i) = c_{i,k}$, for both cases when $c_{i,k}$ is 1 or 0 (given c is a Boolean matrix). Assume $c_{i,k}$ is 1. Then for all $m \in M$, $m_{i,k} = 1$, \bullet (by def. 3.1). Thus, $v_k(u_i) = M$ (by def. 3.4). So, $f_k(u_i) = 1$. Assume $c_{i,k}$ is 0. Then for all $m \in M$, $m_{i,k} = 0$ (by def. 3.1). Thus, $v_k(u_i) = M$ (by def. 3.4). \square

PROPOSITION A.4. *For all $\phi \in L^*$, $P(\phi) = \frac{f(\phi)}{|T|}$*

PROOF. We must show for all $\phi \in L^*$, $P(\phi) = \frac{f(\phi)}{|T|}$. $P(\phi)$ is equal to $\sum_k P_k(\phi) / |T|$ (by def.3.6). The latter is equal to $\sum_k (w(v_k(\phi)))$

$/w(M) / |T|$ (by def.3.6). Now, $\frac{f(\phi)}{|T|} = \sum_k \frac{f_k(\phi)}{|T|}$ (by definition of f). Thus it remains to prove $w(v_k(\phi)) / w(M) = f_k(\phi)$. We have two cases to consider, when $f_k(\phi) = 1$ and when it is 0. We do the former first. Assume $f_k(\phi) = 1$, then $v_k(u_i) = M$ (by definition of f). So $w(v_k(\phi)) / w(M) = w(M) / w(M) = 1$. Assume $f_k(\phi) = 0$, then $v_k(\phi) \neq M$. If the latter, then $v_k(\phi) = \emptyset$ (as $\phi \in L^*$). So $w(v_k(\phi)) / w(M) = w(\emptyset) / w(M) = 0$ (by def. of w). \square

PROPOSITION A.5. *Equation 3 follows given indifference*

PROOF. Let $v_k(\phi) = \{m^i, \dots, m^j\}$ and $M = \{m^1, \dots, m^{|M|}\}$. Then $P_k(\phi) = \sum_{i=1}^j w(\{m^i\}) / \sum_{k=1}^{|M|} w(\{m^k\})$ (by Def. 3.6). Now, $w(\{m^k\}) > 0$ for all $m^k \in M$ (by the conditions on w and indifference). Given indifference, let $w(\{m^k\}) = x \times |\{m^k\}|$. Then $P_k(\phi) = \sum_{i=1}^j x |\{m^i\}| / \sum_{k=1}^{|M|} x |\{m^k\}|$ (by substitution). Thus, $P_k(\phi) = x \sum_{i=1}^j |\{m^i\}| / x \sum_{k=1}^{|M|} |\{m^k\}|$ (by distribution). So, $P_k(\phi) = \sum_{i=1}^j |\{m^i\}| / \sum_{k=1}^{|M|} |\{m^k\}|$ (by cancellation). Equivalently, $P_k(\phi) = |\{m^i, \dots, m^j\}| / |M|$. So, $P_k(\phi) = |v_k(\phi)| / |M|$ (by substitution). \square

PROPOSITION A.6. *Let c be a coverage matrix where $c_{i,k} = c_{j,k} = 1$ for some $t_k \in T$. Then $P(H_i | u_i) < P(H_i | u_i \wedge \neg h_j)$.*

PROOF. We show $P(H_i | u_i) < P(H_i | u_i \wedge \neg h_j)$ given the conditions of the proposition. This is equivalent to $P(H_i \wedge u_i) / P(u_i) < P(H_i \wedge u_i \wedge \neg h_j) / P(u_i \wedge \neg h_j)$ (by |-def.). Equivalently, $P(H_i \wedge u_i) / P(u_i) < P(H_i \wedge u_i) / P(u_i \wedge \neg h_j)$ (given H_i implies $\neg h_j$). Accordingly, it is sufficient to show $1/P(u_i) < 1/P(u_i \wedge \neg h_j)$. It then suffices to show $P(u_i) > P(u_i \wedge \neg h_j)$. Equivalently, $\sum_k P_k(u_i) / |T| > \sum_k P_k(u_i \wedge \neg h_j) / |T|$ (by def. 3.6). Equivalently, $\sum_k P_k(u_i) > \sum_k P_k(u_i \wedge \neg h_j)$ (by cancellation). Equivalently, $\sum_k |v_k(u_i)| / |M| > \sum_k |v_k(u_i \wedge \neg h_j)| / |M|$. Equivalently, $\sum_k |v_k(u_i)| > \sum_k |v_k(u_i \wedge \neg h_j)|$ (by cancellation). Equivalently, $\sum_k |v_k(u_i)| > \sum_k |v_k(u_i) \cap (M - v(h_j))|$ (by def. 3.3). It is sufficient to show $M - v(h_j) \subset v_k(u_i)$. $v_k(u_i) = M$ (given $c_{i,k} = 1$). Thus it suffices to show $M - v(h_j) \subset M$. To prove this, it is sufficient to show $v(h_j) \neq \emptyset$. This holds given $c_{j,k} = 1$ (given the conditions of the proposition and def. 3.1). \square

PROPOSITION A.7. *Equations 4, 5, & 6 follow given indifference.*

PROOF. We sketch the proof here. Equation 4 follows given the definition of f_i in Section 3. Equation 6 is similar to the proof for Equation 11. We do the proof for Equation 5 here. As the general proof for this involves syntactically complex formulae, we sketch the proof for reasons of space, and do the case for when there are two test cases $T = \{t_1, t_2\}$ here. $P(\diamond_1 h_i \vee \diamond_2 h_i) = (1 - P(\diamond_1 h_i)) (P(\diamond_1 h_i) + P(\diamond_2 h_i)) + P(\diamond_2 h_i) (1 - P(\diamond_1 h_i))$. The latter expression is equal to $(P(\diamond_1 h_i) + P(\diamond_2 h_i)) - (P(\diamond_1 h_i) P(\diamond_1 h_i))$. Thus it is sufficient to prove $P(\diamond_1 h_i \vee \diamond_2 h_i)$ is equal to that. Now, in general $P(\phi \vee \psi) = P(\phi) + P(\psi) - P(\phi \wedge \psi)$. Thus it suffices to show $P(\diamond_1 h_i) P(\diamond_1 h_i) = P(\diamond_1 h_i \wedge \diamond_1 h_i)$. It is sufficient to show $|v_1(h_i) \cap v_2(h_i)| / |M| = |v_1(h_i)| / |M| \times |v_2(h_i)| / |M|$. It is sufficient to show $|v_1(h_i) \cap v_2(h_i)| = |v_1(h_i)| |v_2(h_i)|$. Now $M = M_1 \cdot M_2$. Thus, for every $m_1^j \in M_1$ there is a paired $m_2^j \in M_2$. Thus $|v_1(h_i) \cap v_2(h_i)| = |v_1(h_i)| |v_2(h_i)|$. \square