

AI-powered test automation tools: A systematic review and empirical evaluation

Vahid Garousi
Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, UK
Testinium A.Ş., İstanbul, Türkiye
ProSys MMC, Baku, Azerbaijan
v.garousi@qub.ac.uk
vahid.garousi@testinium.com

Nithin Joy
Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, UK
njoy01@qub.ac.uk

Alper Buğra Keleş
Testinium A.Ş., İstanbul, Türkiye
alper.keles@testinium.com

Abstract—Context: Test engineers are looking at more ways to test system more effectively and efficiently. Automated Software testing facilitated a significant advancement in accelerating test processes compared to manual methods. With recent advances in the field of AI (Artificial Intelligence), a large number of AI-powered test automation tools have emerged, which can help make testing more effective and efficient. **Objective:** This article aims to investigate the features provided by existing AI-based test automation tools. We also empirically evaluate the performance of two AI-based testing tools by applying them on two selected open-source Software Under Test (SUT). We empirically evaluate how the AI features can be helpful for effectiveness and efficiency of testing. We also study the limitations of the AI features in AI-based test tools, by identifying the tasks that remain beyond their current capabilities. As part of this research. **Method:** To accomplish the objective, a Multivocal Literature Review (MLR) study was conducted to investigate the landscape of the AI-based test automation tools in the industry. Moreover, an empirical assessment is also conducted to empirically analyse two AI-based test automation tools by using it on two open-source projects. To determine the need of AI for selected feature, the same feature was created without the use of ML to explore its limitations which can be avoided using AI. **Results:** Our results are based on 55 AI based test automation tools. Furthermore, an empirical assessment was performed by selecting two of the 55 tools analysed as part of the MLR. Feature selected from empirical assessment was analysed and a similar feature was developed without the use of ML. **Conclusion:** This paper explores the potential benefits and limitations of AI-based test automation tools for both companies and developers involved in software engineering. The limitations explored can be used as inspiration to build significantly more robust and complete systems. The main result of this study is the analysis of the existing AI-based test automation tools through the MLR accompanied by an empirical assessment of two selected tools.

Index Terms: Artificial Intelligence, Automated Software Testing Tools, Multivocal Literature Review

1. INTRODUCTION

Software testing is an ever-evolving activity of software engineering. Initially starting off as fixing small bugs in the 1950s, then developing manual testing which kicked off in between 1980-1990. In the early 2000s we see the agile approach to development, where more robust tools are present for testing. Continuous testing and Dev-Ops emerged in 2010s which is a major revolution in testing as this is a way to perform testing throughout the development process. Now we are in the era of automated software testing. Automating software testing can significantly reduce the effort required for adequate testing, or significantly increase the testing which can be done in limited time. Tests can be run in minutes that would take hours to run manually [1]. Methods such as continuous integration [2] test-driven development, and automated acceptance testing makes test

automation an everyday activity in an agile organization [3]. This article focuses on Artificial Intelligence based Automation testing; throughout the article we will explore the current implementations of this form of testing available in the market. AI Automation has been widely adopted by companies and organizations for software testing and development thus making using AI in testing one of the fast-evolving fields of AI Automation [4].

In this paper we are looking to explore the wide variety of AI-based test automation tools in the software industry currently. This is important as by understanding the features, benefits (effectiveness/efficiency), and limitations of these tools, it enables organizations to make informed decisions about adopting such technologies.

The aim of our research is to provide a thorough review and analysis of the AI based test automation software in the industry, by conducting an empirical assessment and comparison of existing software tools. This is initiated by performing an MLR (Multivocal Literature Review), and then I select two tools derived from the MLR and perform a thorough comparison under two SUTs.

MLRs are emerging in software engineering, exemplified by recent applications in technical debt [5] and test automation [6]. Moreover, there is a rising need for more MLRs in software engineering as evidenced by recent empirical investigations [7], with a particular focus on test process improvement which is an area of interest for both research and practical application.

In terms of results, we expect to see a similarity between all the AI-based test automation tools. In the process of conducting the MLR we should find that many tools should share the same features or their version of a general feature. We believe that there are two main reasons why we would expect to see a similarity between the AI-based testing tools:

Common Goals: AI-based test automation tools are created to tackle similar challenges in software testing, such as reducing manual effort, increasing test coverage, enhancing efficiency etc. Therefore, we can expect that companies will incorporate similar features to achieve such objectives.

Constraints of Artificial Intelligence: AI currently can only do so much; we will delve into the limitations of these features into more detail later in the article. Due to these limitations, functionality of such AI features is limited therefore we can expect tools using similar algorithms and methodologies to develop these features, maximising the current ability of AI.

TABLE 1
SECONDARY STUDIES RELATED TO OUR AREA OF STUDY.

Reference	Year	Title	Number of Papers Reviewed in Study	Number of Tools mentioned	Main Contents of Article and Other Contributions
[57]	2021	AI-based Test Automation: A Grey Literature Analysis	40	6	Mentions the features the tools offer and how they solve certain problems in test automation. Real focus on problems faced by practitioners in Test Automation.
[58]	2023	A Review of AI-Augmented End-to-End Test Automation Tools	18	8	Identifies primary AI techniques used in each testing activity.
[4]	2017	AI Automation and it's Future in the United States	22	3	Focus is on the role of AI Automation in the United States. Reviews effects of AI automation in general. AI automation in Software testing is only a slight part of the article.
[59]	2021	A Cognitive Approach in Software Automation Testing	13	1	Mentions high level algorithms used in AI features provided by testing tool, algorithm used for self-healing tests.

In the overall concept of things, the rationale behind implementing these tools primarily revolves around the objectives of time efficiency, cost reduction, and minimising software defects. The MLR performed should retrieve AI features which satisfy the objectives mentioned. The empirical assessment should give us a more detailed understanding of how exactly the AI features of each tool work in the real world. The empirical assessment will allow us to highlight which areas of an AI based test automation tool will need more advancements in the future and which features are performing the best.

2. BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORK

This section gives a brief overview of what AI based test automation is and the current comparisons found, written by professionals in the field. In this section you can also find a brief explanation on what exactly an MLR is, what is the need for it and the use of MLRs in the Software Engineering field. The section is then finished by providing any secondary studies found in the scope of AI based test automation.

2.1 Brief overview of AI based test automation and current comparisons

Artificial Intelligence can be used to help reduce tediousness and automate tasks in software testing. Testing can be made more efficient and smarter with the help of AI. Researchers recognize the potential of AI to bridge the gap between human and machine-driven testing capabilities [8]. The main use of test automation is that it allows developers/testers to run multiple tests at the same time. Automation testing also involves the generation of the test scripts and running them at the same time. Artificial Intelligence has experienced significant growth in the last 3 years, and it is making its way into every aspect of software development. The AI based test automation tools I review in this paper are tools which use machine learning algorithms, natural language processing and computer vision to interact with elements part of your system automatically. Certain features that can be found within AI based test automation tools includes features such as self-healing tests, visual testing, test case and script generation etc. The general advantages of using AI in automated software testing include faster generation of tests, faster releases for products, cost effectiveness and an increase in productivity. Generally speaking, AI allows companies to release products faster with a focus on developing software with as little issues as possible.

2.2 Multivocal Literature Reviews

A Multivocal Literature Review is a form of Systematic Literature Review, while SLRs and Systematic Mapping (SM) studies are valuable, researchers have reported that “the results of a SLR or a SM study could provide an established body of knowledge, focusing only on research contributions” [9]. The main idea of using MLRs is to enhance the voice of a practitioner in software development. Yes, there are plenty of papers related to software development/testing which is scientific based, which focus on the ideas and thoughts of researchers, many of which will have minimal experience of actual software used in industry. Practitioners have more experience dealing with real world problems; therefore, their opinions are just as important. The lack of grey literature in scientific research articles will result in a lack of input from real world scenarios which are provided by the practitioners.

2.3 MLRs in Software Engineering

MLRs in software engineering are not very common. The terminology ‘multivocal’ only started appearing in Systematic Literature Reviews in software engineering in the early 2010s. Returning to the previously outlined points, the incorporation of MLRs presents an opportunity to integrate practitioners’ perspectives into research articles, thereby providing a greater incorporation of real-world scenarios in the article. A prior study has been conducted to extend on the need to why there should be more MLRs in software engineering, this study primarily focuses on the types of knowledge which is missed on Systematic Literature Reviews which typically exclude grey literature, while also highlighting the benefits to the software engineering community when Multivocal Literature Reviews are conducted [7]. Therefore, there is a need to bring more MLRs in the SE field as they are essential to gather and synthesize the diverse perspectives and findings in each area thus enriching the discourse within the field.

2.4 Related Works: other secondary studies in the scope of AI based test automation

Through conducting a thorough literature review, I identified several secondary studies specifically centred on AI-driven test automation tools. I found five articles, which talk about AI-based test automation and the appropriate tools used in industry, this can be seen on *TABLE 1*. The table shows a brief analysis of each article, the number of AI based testing tools mentioned in the article and what the main contents of the article are. These are only

some studies that are in line with the area of interest for conducting the MLR, it is not something that will be used directly in this MLR. MLR being conducted is only based on AI based test automation tools. This table is only to highlight areas of research which are in the same scope as our study.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

A specific guide detailing the procedure for conducting an MLR in software engineering is proposed by Garousi, Felderer and Mäntylä [10] and adhering to this guide will result in achieving the most optimal outcome. The guide does take a lot of inspiration from SLR guidelines proposed by Kitchenham and Charters [11] and SM guidelines by Petersen [12]. Other fields we can take inspiration from when conducting an MLR is the medicine [13] and education sciences [14] as these are fields which also have guidelines on how to conduct an MRL in their respective fields. MLR planning and design phase (its goal and RQs) is discussed in the next section. The subsequent sections address the processes of Searching for and Selection of Sources, Development of the Systematic Map, and data extraction plan. The structure closely follows the SLR layout with the primary distinction lying in the incorporation of grey literature.

3.1 Goals and Review Questions

The goal of this study is to systematically categorize and assess all existing AI based test automation tools aiming to offer a comprehensive view of the current market. Based on this goal I have devised the following Review Questions (RQs):

RQ1: What features are offered by the existing AI-based test automation tools? – Features recorded are AI specific.

RQ2: How can those features be helpful for effectiveness/efficiency of testing? – How can features specifically based off Artificial Intelligence be effective and efficient in testing?

RQ3: What are the limitations of the existing AI-based test automation tools? – The specific functionalities that are beyond the capabilities of these tools.

4. SEARCHING FOR AND SELECTION OF SOURCES

For this phase in our study, by analysing the “Planning a MLR” process on the article [10] the following steps were performed in the current order:

- Source Selection, search keywords and search approach.
- Application of Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria
- Finalizing pool of articles and online repository

4.1 Source Selection, Search Keywords and Search Approach

To search for scientific literature, I used Google Scholar, and to search for grey literature I used the regular Google search engine. The search strings I used on both searches is:

- AI based test automation tools.
- Comparison of AI based test automation tools.
- AI based test automation.
- AI Unit test generation

Given our focus is on identifying tools currently used in the industry today, the pool for scientific papers available for

reference is limited. Majority of existing literature mostly discusses the use of Artificial Intelligence in Software Testing and its contributions to test automation. There were no papers specifically mentioning a single product. *TABLE 1* refers to certain studies which does mention multiple AI based test automation tools, but all the mentioned tools were already discovered through the regular Google search. The studies discovered is useful for achieving a comprehensive understanding of AI-based automation testing. However, the MLR being conducted exclusively concentrates on tools used for AI based test automation, excluding focus on research papers, new ideas as implementations.

A key point we need to take into consideration is that from looking at the MLR process proposed in this article [7], factors such as snowballing was not able to come into play due to the lack of scientific papers available talking about products. As a result, 55 AI based test automation tools were discovered, all though using standard Google search.

4.2 Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria and Voting

To ensure all the resources/tools I gathered are relevant, I defined a set of inclusion and exclusion criteria. The criteria are as follows:

Criterion 1: Is the source relevant to our scope? (AI based test automation tools)

Criterion 2: Does the source include a relatively sound validation?

Criterion 2 is a quality assessment criterion used frequently in SM and SLR studies, but at the same time it is also an inclusion/exclusion criterion for our study as well. In the MLR spreadsheet used for analysis, the answer will be 1 if the criterion is satisfied and 0 if it is not satisfied. If both criteria are met, then the resource (tool) will be involved in the study.

4.3 Final Pool of Sources and the Online Repository

From the initial pool of 65 sources, 10 sources were removed as part of the inclusion/exclusion criteria. All our sources were grey literature, as they mostly consisted of product pages which consisted of some blogs relating to the product written by practitioners. The final pool of sources can be found in this study’s online Google spreadsheet [15], where it is shown how inclusion/exclusion was performed thus resulting to the last set of resources (55 Tools).

5. DEVELOPMENT OF THE SYSTEMATIC MAP AND DATA-EXTRACTION PLAN

To develop our systematic map as shown in *Error! Reference source not found.*, tools present in the pool were analysed and an initial list of attributes were identified. Attribute generalization and iterative refinement were used to derive the final map. To facilitate analysis all AI based test automation tools were documented in a spreadsheet. In the systematic map we can see that the first and second column represents the attribute/aspect that we are exploring which is based on the RQs. Column 3 states all possible values of the attribute/aspect, in our case it is consistently conveyed through concise textual explanation. The final column denotes the analysis approach employed, which in this study involved qualitative coding. This systematic map was utilized to develop the Google spreadsheet, to generate the appropriate headings.

5.1 Data Extraction and Synthesis

The data extraction and synthesis can be clearly seen on our Google spreadsheet. Key components of the spreadsheet include the inclusion/exclusion criteria and review questions. Following the completion of inclusion/exclusion criteria, each tool was analysed with respect to each review question. This is where the Systematic Map proved pivotal. Each review question was evaluated, and a concise statement was given on how the AI based test automation tool satisfies each review question.

6. RESULTS FROM MLR

6.1 RQ1 – AI Features of Tools

TABLE 2 shows a snippet of the MLR spreadsheet and displays several AI features provided by the tools to aid in test automation. This section covers each how common each feature is in the industry, different tools/companies which offer such features and a brief description of the features.

6.1.1 Visual Testing Using AI

From performing data extraction, it was discovered that only 13 out of the 55 tools offer visual testing using AI. *Applitools* [16] is testing software which offers a tool known as “Eyes” which utilises their ML model “Visual AI”, to leverage computer vision technology. This provides automated detection of visual and functional regressions through comparisons with baseline images.

6.1.2 Self-Healing Tests

From performing data extraction, it is apparent that 33 out of 55 tools analysed offer the self-healing test feature making it the most popular feature offered by AI based test automation tools. *testSigma* [17] is a tool which provides this feature, and it uses AI to automatically adapt and correct test scripts in responses to changes in the system under test. This is possible by leveraging ML algorithms which allows the tool to analyse the system’s behaviour, detect when a change is made to the system, find the test scripts affected by the change and then make appropriate changes, to ensure test scripts now align with the alterations made.

6.1.3 Natural Language Processing

Through data extraction, 15 tools were identified offering NLP. *ACCELO* [18], uses AI to rapidly create test scripts just by using an AI natural language editor. *SauceLabs* [19] is also a tool which uses NLP to let AI automatically generate test cases as well as test scripts through something they call ‘Intelligent Test Management’.

6.1.4 Test Case and Script Generation

These features are closely aligned, and from data extraction, 18 tools were found to offer AI powered test case generation, and 17 tools offered AI powered test script generation. Furthermore, 7 tools were identified to offer both features. Generative AI is utilized by tools such as *Codium* [20] to scan the codebase, understand the functionality of SUT and it uses AI to create a test plan which is suited for the specific code scanned. Codium parallelize and chain multiple prompts to create unique variety of meaningful tests. This tool provides a chat interface where various commands can be used to aid test automation, for example `/test` will generate a test for a given piece of code. To generate more

accurate test cases and script there is functionality in the code to add a sample test which the developer created, this enables *CodiumAI* to familiarize itself with your test case writing style and generate test cases that align with it [21].

6.1.5 Unit Test Generation

This another common feature offered by AI based test automation tools as 17 offering this feature were uncovered from data extraction. Many of the tools are very simple generative AI tools that can be integrated into the IDE. A good example is *GitHub CoPilot* [22] this is a generative AI tool that can be used through the IDE. A generative AI chat is available where prompts such as `/test` will generate a unit test for the selected code.

6.1.6 Other Features

Through research, it was discovered that certain tools offer unique features. These are AI features which are usually specific to the tool. *Appvance* [23] has a system called AI blue printing. This system launches an array of machine-learning powered bots on your application, and they explore every path that can be undertaken within your application, and it creates use cases as it explores. AI Blueprinting covers all possible user flows through your system and each time it’s run, it is exploring new code and functionality, and it also verifies existing paths still perform as expected [24]. The product *Aqua* [25] has a feature which uses AI to prioritize the tests you have. This is to ensure that all the important functionality of the system is tested first such that key

TABLE 2
 SAMPE OF TOOLS EXTRACTED FROM MLR AND THEIR AVAILABLE FEATURES.

#	Tools	Reference	Visual Testing Using AI	Self-Healing Tests	Natural Language Processing	Test Case Generation	Test Script Generation	Unit Test Generation	Other Features
1	<i>ACCELQ</i>	[18]		x	x	x	x	x	x
2	<i>apltools</i>	[16]	x	x		x	x		x
3	<i>mabl</i>	[64]		x					
4	<i>Parasoft Selenic</i>	[48]		x					
5	<i>SauceLabs</i>	[19]		x	x	x	x		
6	<i>Smartbear VisualTest</i>	[49]	x						
7	<i>testRigor</i>	[32]		x	x	x	x		
8	<i>testSigma</i>	[17]	x	x	x				x

problems are identified quicker. Keysight’s testing tool *Eggplant Test* [26] provides a feature called “AI powered automation” which interprets and interacts with the application like a real user without requiring access to the source code, this makes it perfect for testing a system even in the most secure development environments. *Virtuoso* [27] offers a feature called ‘Live Authoring’ which uses AI to automatically validate your tests as you author them, therefore you do not need to author and then test repeatedly until you found the issue.

6.2 RQ2 – How Does These Features Increase Effectiveness/Efficiency of Testing?

This section explores benefits the features can provide for automated testing. Benefits can be described as ways to increase effectiveness of testing and increase efficiency of testing.

6.2.1 Effectiveness

6.2.1.1 Visual Testing Using AI

Visual testing using AI is effective as it automatically detects any visual changes in the system. This could be anything from layout issues to rendering problems. AI based visual testing tool offered by *BrowserStack*, called “Percy” states there is a significant reduction of layout shifts and non-deterministic rendering noises [28], these are changes that can be missed by developers. This feature is usually supported by cross browser/cross device testing as well. *pCloudy* is tool which supports browser/cross device testing also, they state AI based visual testing reduces effort of manually validating web pages and ensures consistent design across various browsers [29]. Therefore, these examples clearly illustrate the effectiveness of using AI in visual testing as it can automatically detect visual regressions and extent its functionality across different browsers and platforms, allowing developers to be more productive when performing test automation.

6.2.1.2 Self-Healing Tests

Self-healing tests is extremely effective in automatically updating the tests whenever a change is detected in the system, this greatly

reduces test maintenance which otherwise would be carried out manually. Tools such as *LoadMill* [30], asserts that AI-assisted maintenance is capable of dynamically editing and refining tests ensuring the test suite evolves with the changing software, which can prove to be very effective for test automation particularly in test maintenance which can be a tedious process.

6.2.1.3 Natural Language Processing

NLP is effective in the sense that it has the potential to improve communication between technical and non-technical team members. The AI based test automation tool *Sofy* [31] utilizes this feature and it states that by having no-code automation it enables more members of the team to be involved in product testing process, thus resulting in faster test automation and increased test coverage, proving it to be a very effective feature.

6.2.1.4 AI generated Test Scripts, Cases and Unit Tests

The next set of features are closely linked to NLP, as this feature is mainly used to automatically generate test cases, test scripts and unit tests. Tools such as *Codium* [21], *SauceLabs* [19], *ACCELQ* [18], *TestRigor* [32] involves the use of generative AI technology which is powered by NLP and ML, to create test cases, test scripts or unit tests. Generative AI models employs methodologies such as deep learning and neural networks to understand the underlying structure and attributes of data they undergo training on [33]. Test generation using generative AI functions by fully analysing the code or codebase which can result in creating a wide range of test scenarios, covering more ground than traditional methods. This ability to comprehensively scan the software helps unearth bugs and vulnerabilities that will go unnoticed, thus increasing the software reliability and robustness. Features such as this contribute to creation of comprehensive test suites ensuring product is developed with minimal to no issues, thus proving its effectiveness in test automation. Often as you can see from *TABLE 2* there are certain tools such as *ACCELQ*, which has both AI driven test case generation as well as test script generation. This allows the automatic generation of test cases and scripts in one

motion, these features complement each other very well, providing optimum efficiency when generating tests, as well as providing maximum test coverage.

6.2.2 Efficiency

This is the main reason for implementing such features to enhance test automation, the AI features mentioned excel in swiftly identifying system errors and accelerating the test creation process.

6.2.2.1 Visual Testing Using AI

Visual testing is efficient as it can reduce test maintenance and spot any regressions in the system quicker; the ML model is able to detect any minute changes made to the system and can pinpoint which part of the UI is affected, allowing engineers to spot errors quicker thus reducing the need for manual checks.

6.2.2.2 Self-Healing Tests

Self-Healing Tests is efficient because the feature can detect whenever a change has been made to your application and it automatically updates the test scripts so that it is now compliant with the updated system. The need for manual intervention is heavily reduced as AI can intelligently adapt the test scripts. *TestCraft* [34] by *Perfecto* states their AI algorithm fixes 97.4% of the changes in the app. No need to sort through false negatives and no need to fix flaky tests. Furthermore, another AI based test automation tool, *Mabl* states their auto-healing feature reduces test maintenance by 95% [35]. Therefore, it is evident that Self-healing tests reduce the time required to change tests as it eliminates the need for testers to manually examine the script and make appropriate changes. Therefore, drastically reducing time needed for test maintenance, making it a very efficient feature.

6.2.2.3 Natural Language Processing – Used for rapid generation of Test Cases, Scripts and Unit Tests

These features are mentioned together, as using Natural Language Processing for test case and script generation is a set of features that can substantially accelerate test creation. These are features which work in unison to maximise efficiency. From data extraction [15] performed, 11 tools were found which uses NLP for creating test cases, test scripts and unit tests. This can facilitate towards test suite maintenance as in a dynamic development environment where requirements are constantly changing, these features ensure all newly added functionality is tested quickly allowing updates to be delivered quickly. *Aqua* states that their AI powered test case generation feature, *Aqua AI CoPilot* saves 12.8 hours per week for user testing and 42% of test cases require no extra human input [36]. NLP can be especially efficient for those who are not experienced in coding as it will prevent the need for the tester to research about how to write certain test scripts, thus reducing the development time, and allowing features of the application can be tested quicker. *ACCELQ* states their features which involves NLP and automated test creation results in 7.5% faster automation [18].

In general, all the AI features mentioned work in unison to reduce the time required to create and maintain tests, a lot of repetitive tasks are taken care of automatically, as well as some non-repetitive tasks such as the generation of test cases. This ultimately

means developers have more time to focus on greater issues, allowing them to produce a higher-quality product. *TestGrid* states their AI related automation products can reduce the testing time by 60%, which results in products being released 45% faster [37].

The set of AI features the tools provide greatly reduces test maintenance, and ensures the pace of development is increased, which then in turn proves that these features greatly increase the efficiency of automation testing.

6.3 RQ3 – Limitations of Features

Although the AI features mentioned result in a lot of benefits they also result in several limitations. The following limitations mentioned in this section are mainly derived from user reviews, thus reflecting genuine perspectives from practitioners.

6.3.1 Visual Testing Using AI

User who used AI based visual testing from *Applitools* [16] states that there are some false positives [38] when using visual regression testing. Therefore, indicating that such tools is not fully accurate in detecting an actual change made to the system. Some tools which provide this feature is not yet capable of analysing all different types of content that can be present in a web page, for example, a user stated that *Autify* [39] has very limited functionality as it does not support dynamic elements [40]. Furthermore, this feature is limited on contextual understanding, tools in the industry today will flag any change in the UI, but it cannot distinguish between intentional changes and genuine errors [41].

6.3.2 Self-Healing Tests

Similarly to AI based visual testing, the lack of contextual understanding to handle all scenarios accurately is an issue with this AI feature. While they can identify and update elements that have changed, they may not always determine the correct action to take [42]. A user which used the self-healing feature on *Mabl* [35] indicated, the tool will try to heal a test when it's not meant to heal the test, resulting in false positives [43]. This issue is due to the quality of model training and testing, indicating AI still has areas to improve on. In this situation it was a false positive but in cases of false negatives it can result in regressions left not found in the system after a change has been made.

6.3.3 Natural Language Processing

The lack of flexibility is the main limitation of NLP. For example, a user which the low/no code feature provided by the tool *Functionize* [44], stated that more attention is needed on low/no code feature such that more non-technical users can be involved. This review indicates that this AI feature is not yet capable of providing accurate tests with NLP. Another user which utilised the no-code functionality of *Sofy* [31] affirmed no-code automation is not yet capable to handle some of the corner cases, which otherwise can be handled in regular automation by tweaking the code [45]. Although this feature allows more members of the team to test the product, for systems which are high in complexity and have intricate levels of development, a more flexible solution is required. As the reviews stated it is not yet capable of delivering the flexibility required to test all intricate functionalities of the SUT.

6.3.4 Test Case, Test Script and Unit Test Generation

I place these features together as they have the same limitations. These features are heavily dependent on the training data given to the ML model, which in turn means there is often limitations on domain knowledge. A developer which has been involved in building the system will have more domain knowledge, thus AI is not yet capable of generating accurate test scripts or handle specific industry-related intricacies [46]. A user which utilized the automated test creation feature offered by Codium [21] stated the AI can suggest too many tests, which takes time to go through and filter out the relevant tests [47]. This review indicates that the ML models used to generate such tests are not refined enough to create relevant tests.

In conclusion there are several limitations for these AI powered features, mainly involving lack of domain knowledge as opposed to a seasoned developer. This limitation originates from using ML models for such features which is not yet refined enough to tackle all scenarios which is exposed to the features.

7. EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT OF TWO AI-BASED TEST AUTOMATION TOOL

This section covers the next phase of this research article. Out of the tools that has been researched and analysed in the MLR, two tools are selected to be used on two different open-source projects to analyse the AI features each tool offers.

7.1-Methodology

AI based test automation tools selected for empirical assessment:

1. Parasoft Selenic [48]
2. Smartbear VisualTest [49]

The AI features which will be used are Self-healing tests which is provided by Parasoft Selenic and AI based Visual Testing which is a feature provided by SmartBear VisualTest. The two open-source projects used for empirical assessment is:

1. Spring-petclinic [50]: Spring boot application which emulates software used to manage a pet clinic.
2. Java-blog-aggregatory-boot [51]: Spring boot application which is an application used to access, create, and manage blogs.

Two different Selenium test suites using Page Object Model design, were created for each of the open-source projects, with several automated test scripts testing a variety of user flows. Appropriate mutation testing was performed on each of the projects to analyse its effect on the test suite and how the features handled the changes. Each feature was tested on 20 changes 10 on each open-source project. Resulting in 40 mutation tests in total.

7.2-Tools under assessment

7.2.1-Parasoft Selenic – Self Healing Tests

As mentioned earlier this feature is used to automatically heal tests when there has been changes made. This tool focuses on healing failed locators, which are used to identify web elements on a page. This tool heals selenium tests by altering the locators which may be changed.

Mutation testing was performed where several different types of locators were altered to see if the changes is identified, and a suitable replacement was recommended by the feature. From *TABLE 4* in the appendix, you can see a sample of the changes that were made to both systems under test. All types of locator strategies that can be used with the SUT has been used in the empirical assessment.

Explanation of feature functionality

After a change has been made to the SUT and the tests are run, when a test which is affected by the change is encountered, the test run pauses momentarily until a suitable locator replacement is found, and the test runs. At the end of the test execution, a HTML report is created to display the test affected by the changes, and the recommended locators that can be used to heal the test, the tool also presents the actual locator that was used to heal the test.

Once tool detects that an element is inaccessible, recommended locators are generated by performing a retrospective assessment undertaken by using AI. This assessment involves the simulation of various executions against the application and a set of locators will be created, all of which have successfully identified the element.

To determine which of the locators is most suitable, a series of attributes is assigned to the locator, this includes a confidence factor, weight, and stability. Weight and stability metrics is generated from historical data, and it is used to calculate the confidence factor. Selenic states that the weight is used to reduce the confidence of certain locator recommendations even if the stability is high [52]. Positional bases locators have high stability but will have a low confidence due to it be more fragile than other locators, during empirical assessment this was noted as locational based locators using CSS or XPath would tend to fail when changing text on button, as size of button is changed, so locator fails even though button has not been moved. A file called “locator_weights.properties” file is in the package when you install Parasoft Selenic and it contains the weight for each type of locator. The value of the weight is between 1 and 0, where a value of 1 means the recommended locator will have a confidence factor same as the stability and weight of 0 will prevent locators of a particular type ever being used [52]. The locator with the highest confidence factor is used to heal the test.

7.2.2-SmartBear Visual Test – AI based visual testing

This feature used Computer Vision to identify UI changes made. Like before a form of mutation testing was performed where several UI changes were made to see if artificial intelligence was able to detect the changes. A variety of different UI changes were made to test this, which involved CSS styling changes, addition of new web elements, dynamic element testing and moving content testing. This can be seen from *TABLE 5* in the appendix. Which shows a sample of the mutation testing that was performed.

Explanation of feature functionality

Smartbear VisualTest is an SDK based tool, for the empirical assessment, the Selenium Java SDK was used. This feature works by taking a baseline screenshot of the UI at specific points, which you specify in the test. In later runs of the same test or regressions,

VisualTest validates the appearance of the SUT by comparing the updated and baseline screenshots for any alterations. By using computer vision and by processing pixel and DOM information Smartbear VisualTest can determine changes to the UI of SUT. There is a comparison criterion which is followed by VisualTest. A baseline for testing is created by taking initial screenshots and it then finds and compares like-for-like images in subsequent test runs, based on the following criteria [53]:

- Image name
- Image type (fullpage, viewport, or element)
- Operating System
- Browser type
- Screen resolution.

At each point of your test, you can capture an image for regression testing, where you can capture a full-page screenshot, viewport screenshot and an element screenshot [54]. Furthermore, Smartbear states that advanced visual AI tracks critical changes in the GUI while simultaneously ignoring false positives [49].

7.3-Findings of the empirical study

7.3.1-RQ1: How does the features increase effectiveness and efficiency in testing?

Parasoft Selenic – self healing tests

Effectiveness: The self-healing feature of Parasoft Selenic is highly effective as their approach of using the combined metrics of stability and weights ensure that the locator with the highest confidence factor is the perfect replacement for the broken locator, this can be seen on *TABLE 3* (Replica of what the tool presents

TABLE 3

TABLE SHOWING CONFIDENCE FACTOR, WEIGHT, AND STABILITY OF RECOMMENDED LOCATORS

Locator	Confidence Factor	Weight	Stability
@FindBy(Xpath = ...)	98%	0.98	1.0
@FindBy(Xpath = ...)	93%	0.98	0.94
@FindBy(css = ...)	50%	0.5	1.0
@FindBy(css= ...)	50%	0.5	1.0

when it has generated recommended locators) which shows the XPath locator was used to heal the test due it having the highest confidence factor which resulted from a weight of 0.98 and stability of 1. This reasoning for choosing the healed locator is very logical and systematic, which gives developer great confidence to use the recommended locator to heal the test. This prevents user from selecting a weak locator that can result in flaky tests, thus making the feature very effective.

Efficiency: The use of self-healing test feature proves to be very efficient. This due to its process of changing the affected locators is as it can be done through the IDE. For instance, if you are using a Page Object Model style of selenium test suite, it can tend to be very tedious to find where exactly to change the locators. However, with Parasoft Selenic, changing affected locators becomes a streamlined process. Through the empirical analysis, this tool was able to fully heal all locator failures on spring-

petclinic project and most of the changes in the java-blog-aggregator project.

SmartBear VisualTest

Effectiveness: From performing the empirical assessment, we can derive that AI based visual testing is very effective, as a variety of different scenarios was tested, and the tool was able to detect all changes made, this can be seen on *TABLE 5* which shows a sample of the changes applied to both open-source projects. The tool is effective in handling dynamic content as well, which was an issue for other tools like *Autify* [39], which is mentioned earlier in the MLR results section. VisualTest can ignore dynamic content such that developers can focus on actual changes made to the SUT, the process to test this can be seen from Row *P6* from *TABLE 5*. It is also able to handle moving content as the VisualTest’s SDKs are designed to freeze animated content at the same point in its cycle from capture to capture.

Efficiency: From the empirical assessment Smartbear VisualTest increases the efficiency of test automation, as it clearly points out to the developers which test is affected with the UI change and a link is presented in the console, which directs the user to the SmartBear VisualTest dashboard, where you can review the changes detected as shown in *Figure 1*. If it is a regression, developers can clearly see where the issue is. If all the changes are intentional the developer can accept the changes, and so the baseline image gets updated. If it is a fault in the UI, developer rejects the changes and baseline image is unaltered. This substantially decreases time developers need to spend find regressions in the UI and ensures that no unintended changes will




Figure 1: SmartBear VisualTest highlighting changes detected.

be made to the SUT, which makes the tool very efficient.

7.3.2-RQ2: Limitations of the AI-based test features

Parasoft Selenic – Self Healing Tests

When using the self-healing feature on spring-petclinic project, all the affected locators were changed, but when using this feature on java-blog-aggregator, which has a larger codebase, there were tests which were not able to be healed. From *TABLE 4*, you can see that some of the locator changes was not recognised by Parasoft Selenic to provide a recommended fix. One issue is due to the tool not able to find a replacement when an element was changed from input to a button, and the locator used to identify this element was the tag name locator. As a result, all tests which used this element failed as self-healing feature was not able to provide a suitable replacement. Initial locator: “@FindBy(css =

"input[value='Save']")", change required to be made: "@FindBy(css = "button[value='Save']")".

Another issue which was noted was some of the tests was not healed properly even though the same locator which was used in other tests was healed. I believe this is due to feature not being able to analyse through all the affected pages. This tool is therefore not fully capable of altering all types of locators and it is not yet fully capable of handling a large test suite, as its not able to detect all files.

SmartBear VisualTest

A limitation that was found during empirical assessment was when many UI changes is made on a web page at once, the tool can detect that there has been changes made, however if multiple changes were made in a div element, the whole element gets highlighted and not the changes within the element. Row J4 on TABLE 5 shows the small change that was made, from Figure 2 we can see that entire div is highlighted by the changes within the are not. This is not an issue for major UI changes, such as an addition of an image or layout change. But small changes can easily be missed, which is clear by analysing the snapshot. In snapshot there are changes made to the text of the footer which not highlighted. This mean that developers will be aware that a change has been made in that area of the web page, however if a change is very small, like addition of a character (which was done in the analysis), the developer can easily miss it. In these situations, it can defeat the point of the tool, however this is a minor limitation and can be overcome by having a second set of highlighters which can highlight the changes made in the div itself.




Figure 2: Highlighting lack of detail of Smartbear VisualTest when multiple changes are made.

7.4-Summary of empirical assessment

To see the main points retrieved from the empirical analysis, two tables has been created. TABLE 6 shows the summary of empirical analysis for the effectiveness and efficiency of using such tools, as well as the attributes the features must make them effective and efficient. TABLE 7 presents a summary of the limitations of each feature that were discovered from the empirical assessment. To summarise, it is valid to state that the AI based test automation tools, Parasoft Selenic and SmartBear VisualTest substantially increases the efficiency and effectiveness of test automation. Self-healing feature of Parasoft Selenic greatly reduces the time for test maintenance, while SmartBear Visual Test eliminates redundancies from your system, allowing bugs int the system to

be discovered quicker which in turn means testing can be performed at a faster rate.

8. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORKS

AI based test automation is growing rapidly in the Software Industry, The Market Guide noted that by 2027, 80% of enterprises will have integrated AI-augmented testing tools [55]. This is an immense growth that is projected. Given the importance of this movement, this research article makes three contributions. Firstly, through conducting an MLR, and including mostly grey literature in our study, we were able to highlight practitioners' opinions in this article which gives great practical insight into the tools analysed as part of the study, allowing practitioners and researchers to compare AI based testing tools in a qualitative manner.

Secondly, a complete Empirical Assessment was performed on two AI based testing tools, which illustrates the effectiveness and efficiency and limitations of the features which is backed by data collected through mutation testing as part of empirical analysis. This provides practitioners and researchers complete insight into the capabilities of the features, what are areas the features, excel in and what are areas which needs more attention. Which is important insight into future development of such tools.

Thirdly, a study was conducted on the need of AI for the construction of a self-healing test tool. A self-healing test software was developed with using ML to highlight the limitations of this approach, which conveys to the need of using AI in developing a self-healing test tool. Furthermore, datasets were created to be used in the making of ML model, and recommended approach is illustrated to build a suitable ML model which can be used to self-heal tests. *Future Work:* Improvements can be made to the MLR, a suggestion is to conduct surveys with practitioners to receive first hand insight into the benefits they are experiencing and limitations they faced from using such tools. This can be more concrete data to use in an MLR rather than online reviews. Furthermore, empirical assessment can be performed on other AI features identified, such as AI based test case and script creation which are the next most popular AI features used in test automation, based on the MLR conducted. Furthermore, a follow up project involving the creation of self-healing test tool using ML can be conducted, using the study performed in further analysis of self-healing test tool section, a suggestion can be the comparing the tool created to Parasoft Selenic, or using strategies used by Parasoft selenic such as weights and stability metrics to further enhance the tool.

To conclude, the research article performed a Multivocal Literature Review on all currently existing AI based test automation tools, highlighting their effectiveness, efficiency, and limitations in testing. Followed by an empirical assessment of two AI based testing tools, highlighting their functionality, effectiveness and efficiency in testing backed by data retrieved from empirical assessments.

9. REFERENCES

- [M. a. G. D. Fewster, Software test automation, Addison-Wesley
1 Reading, 1999.
]
- [S. Stolberg, "Enabling Agile Testing through Continuous
2 Integration," in *2009 Agile Conference*, IEEE, 2009, pp. 369-374.
]
- [S. Chopra, "Implementing Agile in old technology projects," in
3 *Proceedings of 3rd International Conference on Reliability, Infocom*
] *Technologies and Optimization*, IEEE, 2014, pp. 1-4.
- [R. T. Yarlagadda, "AI Automation and it's Future in the United
4 States," *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*
] *(IJCRT)*, ISSN, pp. 2320-2882, 2017.
- [E. T. a. A. A. a. R. Vidgen, "An exploration of technical debt,"
5 *Journal of Systems and Software*, vol. 86, pp. 1498-1516, 2013.
]
- [M. V. M. Vahid Garousi, "When and what to automate in
6 software testing? A multi-vocal literature review," *Information*
] *and Software Technology*, vol. 76, pp. 92-117, 2016.
- [V. a. F. M. a. M. M. V. Garousi, "The Need for Multivocal
7 Literature Reviews in Software Engineering: Complementing
] Systematic Literature Reviews with Grey Literature," 2016.
- [D. N. J. Nilofar Mulla, "Role of Machine Learning & Artificial
8 Intelligence Techniques in Software Testing," 2021.
]
- [A. A. a. A. A. a. A. C. a. P. Avgeriou, "The financial aspect of
9 managing technical debt: A systematic literature review,"
] *Information and Software Technology*, vol. 64, pp. 52-73, 2015.
- [V. G. a. M. F. a. M. V. Mäntylä, "Guidelines for including grey
1 literature and conducting multivocal literature reviews in
0 software engineering," *Information and Software Technology*, vol.
] 106, pp. 101-121, 2019.
- [B. K. a. R. P. a. D. B. a. O. P. B. a. M. T. a. M. N. a. S. Linkman,
1 "Systematic literature reviews in software engineering - A
1 tertiary study," *Information and Software Technology*, vol. 52, pp.
] 792-805, 2010.
- [K. P. a. S. V. a. L. Kuzniarz, "Guidelines for conducting
1 systematic mapping studies in software engineering: An
2 update," *Information and Software Technology*, vol. 64, pp. 1-18,
] 2015.
- [S. M. S. C. M. a. E. M. Hopewell, "Grey literature in meta-
1 analyses of randomized trials of health care interventions,"
3 *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 2007.
]
- [R. T. M. B. Ogawa, *Towards Rigor in Reviews of Multivocal*
1 *Literatures: Applying the Exploratory Case Study Method*, 1991.
4
]
- [N. Joy, "MLR Spreadsheet Used for Data Extraction," 2024.
1 [Online]. Available:
5 <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1uTppMOcUmbvZ>
] [J1rHkFqj0k03b2eQZ4Wl7SCbdzZKwro/edit#gid=0](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1uTppMOcUmbvZ/edit#gid=0).
- [Applitools, "Applitools - Next Generation test automation
1 platform by Visual AI," [Online]. Available:
6 <https://applitools.com/>. [Accessed 3 12 2023].
]
- [testSigma, "AI-Powered Test Automation," [Online]. Available:
1 <https://testsigma.com/ai-driven-test-automation>. [Accessed 3
7 12 2023].
]
- [ACCELQ, "AI-Powered Codeless Test Automation on the
1 Cloud," [Online]. Available: <https://www.accelq.com/>.
8 [Accessed 3 12 2023].
]
- [SauceLabs, "Website and mobile testing at every stage of
1 development," [Online]. Available: <https://saucelabs.com/>.
9 [Accessed 3 12 2023].
]
- [Codium, "Build Fast with Confidence using Codiumate,"
2 [Online]. Available: [https://www.codium.ai/products/ide-
0 plugin/](https://www.codium.ai/products/ide-0-plugin/). [Accessed 11 April 2024].
]
- [Codium, "Generate Tests," [Online]. Available:
2 <https://www.codium.ai/features/test-suite/>. [Accessed 11
1 April 2024].
]
- [GitHub, "The tools you need to build what you want," [Online].
2 Available:
2 [https://github.com/features/?ocid=AIDcmm4lwmjeex_SEM_
\] \[_k_CjwKCAiAuYuvBhApEiwAzq_YiUpMnc33DCxFkPpK20f
Y6tpoNQujQUO8MTov8EwfPxAO7_65HzbZvBoCpywQAvD_
BwE_k_\]\(https://github.com/features/?ocid=AIDcmm4lwmjeex_SEM_\). \[Accessed 11 April 2024\].](https://github.com/features/?ocid=AIDcmm4lwmjeex_SEM_)
- [appvance, "Continuous Automation, Unrivaled Coverage,"
2 [Online]. Available: [https://appvance.ai/product/ai-
3 blueprinting#benefits](https://appvance.ai/product/ai-3-blueprinting#benefits). [Accessed 3 12 2023].
]
- [K. Parker, "Application Blueprinting," Appvance, 31 October
2 2023. [Online]. Available:
4 <https://appvance.ai/blog/application-blueprinting>. [Accessed
] 13 April 2024].

[aqua, "Test Management with AI: Make testing faster than 2 humanly possible," [Online]. Available: <https://aqua-5.cloud.io/>. [Accessed 3 12 2023].

[Keysight, "Eggplant Test," [Online]. Available: <https://www.keysight.com/us/en/product/EG1000A/eggplant-test.html>. [Accessed 3 12 2023].

[Virtuoso, "An Unrivaled Test Automation Experience," [Online]. Available: https://www.virtuoso.qa/product-features?utm_term=ai%20test%20automation&utm_campaign=Codeless+test+automation+UK&utm_source=adwords&utm_medium=ppc&hsa_acc=2527580923&hsa_cam=18826591842&hsa_grp=145729135640&hsa_ad=633485192591&hsa_src=g&hsa_tgt=kwd-47591. [Accessed 3 12 2023].

[BrowserStack, "Visual testing powered by computer vision," [Online]. Available: https://www.browserstack.com/percy/percy-visual-engine?utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_platform=paidads&utm_content=668729132817&utm_campaign=Search-Brand-EMEA-Product&utm_campaigncode=Percy+1007284&utm_term=e+percy%20browserstack. [Accessed 14 April 2024].

[pCloudy, "Visual Testing Simplified," [Online]. Available: <https://www.pcloudy.com/visual-testing/>. [Accessed 14 April 2024].

[Loadmill, "Automate Multi-System Testing with AI," [Online]. Available: <https://www.loadmill.com/>. [Accessed 14 April 2024].

[Sofy, "Resilient test automation at scale and within minutes. Powered by no-code," [Online]. Available: <https://sofy.ai/testing/automated-testing/>. [Accessed 24 April 2024].

[testRigor, "#1 Generative AI-based Test Automation Tool," [Online]. Available: <https://testrigor.com/>. [Accessed 3 12 2023].

[Katalon, "Benefits of Generative AI in Ensuring Software Quality," [Online]. Available: <https://katalon.com/resources-center/blog/benefits-generative-ai-software-testing>. [Accessed 14 April 2024].

[Perfecto, "Introducing TestCraft for Codeless, Automated Testing," [Online]. Available: <https://www.perfecto.io/blog/introducing-testcraft>. [Accessed 3 12 2023].

[Mabl, "Elevate Software Testing with GenAI and Auto-healing," [Online]. Available: <https://www.mabl.com/auto-healing-tests>. [Accessed 14 April 2024].

[Aqua, "Test management with AI: Make testing faster than 3 humanly possible," [Online]. Available: <https://aqua-6.cloud.io/>. [Accessed 14 April 2024].

[TestGrid, "TestGrid AI Testing," [Online]. Available: <https://testgrid.io/ai-testing>. [Accessed 3 12 2023].

[L. D., "Applitools Reviews & Product Details," G2 - Business Software Reviews, 31 January 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.g2.com/products/applitools/reviews>. [Accessed 14 April 2024].

[Autify, "AI-Powered Test Automation Platform," [Online]. Available: <https://autify.com/>. [Accessed 14 April 2024].

[D. M., "Autify Reviews & Product Details," G2 - Business Software Reviews, 01 May 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.g2.com/products/autify/reviews>. [Accessed 14 April 2024].

[R. Ramesh, "Guide To Understand AI's Transforming Impact on Visual Regression Testing," Headspin, 21 February 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.headspin.io/blog/ai-transforming-visual-regression-testing>. [Accessed 14 April 2024].

[H. R. Chintanippula, "Demystifying Self-Healing Automation: A Game-Changer in Test Script Maintenance," Innominds, 18 July 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.innominds.com/blog/demystifying-self-healing-automation-a-game-changer-in-test-script-maintenance#:~:text=Limited%20Contextual%20Understanding%3A%20Self%2Dhealing,the%20correct%20action%20to%20take..> [Accessed 14 April 2024].

[M. C., "mabl Reviews & Product Details," G2 - Business Software Reviews, 25 August 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.g2.com/products/mabl/reviews>. [Accessed 14 April 2024].

[functionize, "The #1 Gen AI Testing Platform," functionize, 4 April 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.functionize.com/>. [Accessed 14 April 2024].

[B. V., "Sofy.ai Reviews & Product Details," G2 - Business Software Reviews, 01 February 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.g2.com/products/sofy-ai/reviews>. [Accessed 14 April 2024].

[S. Sandilya, "The Pros and Cons of Using AI Tools for Test Scripting," LinkedIn, 1 August 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/pros-cons-using-ai-tools-test-scripting-shradha-sandilya/>. [Accessed 11 April 2024].

[S. K., "CodiumAI Reviews & Product Details," G2 - Business Software Reviews, 06 September 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.g2.com/products/codiumai/reviews#survey-response-8570739>. [Accessed 14 April 2024].

[PARASOFT, "Optimize Selenium Testing With Artificial Intelligence," [Online]. Available: <https://www.parasoft.com/products/parasoft-selenic/>. [Accessed 3 12 2023].

[SMARTBEAR, "Catch visual defects. Automatically," [Online]. Available: <https://smartbear.com/product/visualtest/>. [Accessed 3 12 2023].

[GitHub, "spring-projects/spring-petclinic," [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/spring-projects/spring-petclinic>. [Accessed 11 April 2024].

[jirkapinkas, "jirkapinkas/java-blog-aggregator-boot," [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/jirkapinkas/java-blog-aggregator-boot>. [Accessed 11 April 2024].

[Parasoft, "Viewing Results - About Locator Recommendations," [Online]. Available: <https://docs.parasoft.com/display/SEL20241/Viewing+Results#ViewingResults-AboutLocatorRecommendations>. [Accessed 11 April 2024].

[Smartbear, "Key Advantages of Visual Testing," [Online]. Available: <https://support.smartbear.com/visualtest/docs/en/advantages.html>. [Accessed 11 April 2024].

[Smartbear, "Smartbear Support About VisualTest," [Online]. Available: <https://support.smartbear.com/visualtest/docs/en/about.html>. [Accessed 11 April 2024].

[D. Belcher, "Recognizing 7 Years of AI Innovation in Test Automation," mabl, 14 March 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mabl.com/blog/recognizing-7-years-of-ai-innovation-in-test-automation>. [Accessed 22 April 2024].

[F. a. M. A. a. S. A. Ricca, "AI-based Test Automation: A Grey Literature Analysis," in *2021 IEEE International Conference on*

Software Testing, Verification and Validation Workshops (ICSTW), IEEE, 2021, pp. 263-270.

[P. a. N. V. a. N. T. Pham, "A Review of AI-Augmented End-to-End Test Automation Tools," Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2023.

[M. T. N. M. S. R. S. S. Abdus Samad, "A Cognitive Approach in Software Automation Testing," SSRN, 2021.

[E. a. C. B. Pelivani, "A comparative study of automation testing tools for web applications," in *2021 10th Mediterranean Conference on Embedded Computing (MECO)*, IEEE, 2021, pp. 1-6.

[COPADO, "AI-Powered Test Automation for Every Cloud Under the Sun," [Online]. Available: https://www.copado.com/product-overview/copado-robotic-testing?utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=google_search_emea_en_core_testing_nonbrand&utm_content=Software%20Testing&utm_term=ai%20tools%20for%20software%20testing&gad_source=1&gclid=CjwKC. [Accessed 3 12 2023].

[functionize, "Join the future of testing with Big Data, Deep Learning & Computer Vision," [Online]. Available: <https://www.functionize.com/>. [Accessed 3 12 2023].

[Katalon, "Supercharge testing with AI, write better tests faster," [Online]. Available: <https://katalon.com/ai-powered-testing-2-platform>. [Accessed 3 12 2023].

[mabl, "Low-Code Test Automation that Scales," [Online]. Available: <https://www.mabl.com/>. [Accessed 3 12 2023].

[Tricentis, "Automate web and mobile testing with AI," [Online]. Available: <https://www.testim.io/>. [Accessed 3 12 2023].

[H. Patel, "Feature Engineering Explained," built in, 11 January 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://builtin.com/articles/feature-engineering>. [Accessed 22 April 2024].

10. APPENDIX

Empirical assessment results for Parasoft Selenic

TABLE 4
EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR PARASOFT SELENIC

Change		What kind of Selenium locators are used (Strategies)?	C1: Did any UI test fail on the changed SUT?	C2: If (C1=yes), was it due to real fault in the SUT or test code "breaking" due to UI change?	If (C2=broken test code), was the AI tool able to fix the broken test?	What approach did AI tool took to fix test?	
ID	Before	After					
P1	Add Owner	Add Owner	Locating by CSS	Yes	Broken test code	Yes	Altered locator: link text "Add Owner"
P2	<button type="submit" class="btn btn-primary">Find Owner </button>	<button type="submit" class="btn btn-primary">Search for Owner</button>	Locating by XPath	Yes	Broken test code	Yes	Altered locator: Updated existing XPath
P3	Edit Owner	Edit Owner	Locating by element ID	Yes	Broken test code	Yes	Altered locator: link text "Edit Owner"
P4	<a th:href="@{.....}" class="btn btn-primary">Add New Pet	<a th:href="@{.....}" class="btn btn-primary">Register Pet	Locating by link text	Yes	Broken test code	Yes	Altered locator: Updated link text
P5	<button th:with="text=\${owner['new']} ? 'Add Owner' : 'Update Owner'" class="btn btn-primary" th:text="\${text}">Add Owner</button>	<button th:with="text=\${owner['new']} ? 'Add Owner' : 'Update Owner'" class="carousel-dark" th:text="\${text}">Add Owner</button>	Locating by class name	Yes	Broken test code	Yes	Altered locator: Now using XPath
J1			Locating by link text	Yes	Broken test code	No	Altered locator: Updated link text locator. Some tests were not changed.
J2	<input type="submit" class="btn btn-primary" value="Save" />>	<button type="submit" class="btn btn-primary" value="Save">Save</button>	Locating by tag name, using CSS.	Yes	Broken test code	No	Altered locator: Locating by ID.
J3	<a th:href="{/blog-form?blogId= + blog.id}" class="btn btn-primary">edit	<a th:href="{/blog-form?blogId= + blog.id}" class="btn btn-primary">Edit Blog	Locating by link text	Yes	Broken test code	Yes	Altered locator: Locating by partial link text.

P (#) – Change made in spring-petclinic open-source project

J (#) – Change made in java-blog-aggregator-boot open-source project

SUMMARY OF EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT: EFFECTIVENESS & EFFICIENCY OF AI-BASED TEST AUTOMATION TOOLS

Empirical assessment results for SmartBear VisualTest

TABLE 5
EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR SMARTBEAR VISUALTEST

Change		What kind of visual Change?	C1: Did any UI test fail on the changed SUT?	C2: If (C1=yes), was it due to real fault in the SUT or test code "breaking" due to UI change?	Was test tool able to clearly identify the change?	
ID	Before	After				
P1	<div class="form-group">	<div class="form-group text-center">	Shifted button to the centre of the screen.	Yes	UI Change	Yes
P2	<div class="col-md-12"> </div>	<div class="col-md-12"> <centre></centre> </div>	Shifted image location	Yes	UI Change	Yes
P3	Edit Owner	Edit Owner	Changed styling of button	Yes	UI Change	Yes
P4	th:replace="~{fragments/inputField :: input ('LastName', 'lastName', 'text')}" />	th:replace="~{fragments/inputField :: input ('Surname', 'lastName', 'text')}" />	Changed wording on form section	Yes	UI Change	Yes
P5	N/A	<div id="box">Pet-Clinic</div>	Added an animation	Yes	UI Change	Yes
P6	Testing Dynamic Content: visualTest.capture("WelcomePage");	visualTest.capture("WelcomePage", new HashMap<String, Object>() {{ put("ignoreElements", new String[]{"container", "body > div.container-fluid > div > div.container"}); }});	No such change, but informing the tool to ignore a container which contains dynamic content	No	N/A	Tool was able to successfully ignore this web element.
J1	N/A	<div class="col-md-6"> </div>	Added an image to login page.	Yes	UI Change	Yes
J2	configuration.setBrandName("top java blogs");	configuration.setBrandName("main java blogs");	Changed brand name.	Yes	UI Change	Yes
J3	<li th:class="{current == 'register' ? 'active' : ""}>Register	<li th:class="{current == 'register' ? 'active' : ""}>Make an Account	Changed text of list item.	Yes	UI Change	Yes
J4	<p> Made better & faster using https://www.yourkit.com/ Java Profiler </p>	<p> Made better & faster using https://www.yourkit.com/ Java Profiler. </p>	Added full stop at end of sentence.	Yes	UI Change	Yes – When it is only change made

P (#) – Change made in spring-petclinic open-source project

J (#) – Change made in java-blog-aggregator-boot open-source project

Summary of empirical assessment: effectiveness & efficiency of the two AI-based test automation tools

TABLE 6
SUMMARY OF EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT: EFFECTIVENESS & EFFICIENCY OF AI-BASED TEST AUTOMATION TOOLS

Tool	Feature	Perceived Effectiveness of feature	Effectiveness-enhancing feature attributes	Perceived efficiency of feature	Efficiency enhancing feature attributes
Parasoft Selenic	Self-Healing Tests	Provides list of accurate recommendations to heal broken locator.	Locator used use to heal test is selected based on its confidence factor resulted from use of locator weight and stability metrics.	Easily replace broken locators by choosing desired locator from recommendations and apply it to test suite via IDE.	Parasoft Selenic IDE interface, which clearly shows which locators failed, affected tests and list of recommended locators to fix test. Tool navigates through all Pages in your test suite and fixes all broken locators with a locator user selected from recommendations.
SmartBear VisualTest	AI based Visual Testing	Feature able to work in different scenarios, other detecting basic UI changes such as effectively handling moving content and can ignore dynamic content if need.	Computer vision used to compare screenshot with baseline image. Feature freezes moving content at same point in its cycle from capture to capture to ensure actual changes in SUT is detected. Ignore Element logic provided by SmartBear ensures, dynamic content is ignored.	Test fails if changes in SUT is detected, link to SmartBear dashboard present in console, allows user to quickly view changes.	Dashboard clearly shows, changes in UI through coloured boxes, different ways to view change such as, side by side comparison, drag and compare and onion skin. Changes can be accepted (updates baseline image) or rejected if a fault with UI is found.

Summary of empirical assessment: limitations of the two AI-Based test automation tools

TABLE 7
SUMMARY OF EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT: LIMITATIONS OF AI-BASED TEST AUTOMATION TOOLS

Tool	Feature	Perceived Limitations of feature	Reasoning for Limitation	Improvements for Future
Parasoft Selenic	Self-Healing Tests	Unable to heal tag name locator, and could not heal locators in some pages	Model not advanced enough to always find an alternative to a failed locator, and not yet capable of examining through all pages in a page model design test suite.	Limitations mentioned will certainly improve in the future due to the ML model getting more advanced by being trained on more extensive datasets.
SmartBear VisualTest	AI based Visual Testing	Unable to mark changes individually. Only the area of change is highlighted not the individual changes within the highlighted area	Functionality not added to software. If one change is made at a time, the tool can recognize the change, but when multiple changes are made, it cannot locate each individual change. This proves that it's a functionality that is not yet present in the software, thus not an issue with ML model used.	Add functionality of highlighting each individual change made on UI, as without these certain changes can still be unrecognized to the developer.