Abstract—Modern build systems help increase developer productivity by performing incremental building and testing. These build systems view a software project as a group of interdependent modules and perform regression test selection at the module level. However, many large software projects have imprecise dependency graphs that lead to wasteful test executions. If a test belongs to a module that has more dependencies than the actual dependencies of the test, then it is executed unnecessarily whenever a code change impacts those additional dependencies.

In this paper, we formulate the problem of wasteful test executions due to suboptimal placement of tests in modules. We propose a greedy algorithm to reduce the number of test executions by suggesting test movements while considering historical build information and actual dependencies of tests. We have implemented our technique, called TestOptimizer, on top of CloudBuild, the build system developed within Microsoft over the last few years. We have evaluated the technique on five large proprietary projects. Our results show that the suggested test movements can lead to a reduction of 21.66 million test executions (17.09%) across all our subject projects. We received encouraging feedback from the developers of these projects; they accepted and intend to implement ≈80% of our reported suggestions.

I. INTRODUCTION

Large-scale software development projects use build systems to manage the process of building source code, applying static analyzers, and executing tests. Any inefficiencies in the underlying build system directly impact developer productivity [5]. Given the significance of build systems, major companies, such as Microsoft and Google, have made huge investments in developing efficient, incremental, parallel, and distributed build systems. Example build systems include CloudBuild [8], [18], Bazel [1], and FASTBuild [2].

These build systems view a software project as a group of inter-dependent modules and inherently perform (safe) regression test selection [9], [19], [24] at the module level. Given a change, they leverage the build dependency graph to identify modules that are impacted by the change and perform activities (such as building or applying static analyzers) only on those modules. More specifically, whenever any dependency of a test module is impacted by the given change, all tests in that module are executed; otherwise, the module is skipped and no tests in the module are executed. The major advantage of module-level test selection is that it does not require any additional metadata (such as fine-grained dependencies like exercised statements for each test) beyond what is available in the build specification. Especially in the case of large software projects that execute millions of tests each day, storage and maintenance of this additional metadata adds non-trivial overhead. Therefore, module-level test selection is the most practical option for performing test selection.

Despite the increasing sophistication of build systems, large software projects with thousands of modules often have dependency graphs that make inefficient use of these build systems. Such dependency graphs not only increase the build-activity time, but also make module-level test selection less efficient by executing tests that are not affected by the given change. Vakilian et al. [22] studied the impact of monolithic build modules on the performance of distributed builds. Their work focuses on underutilized modules that include files not needed by some of its dependents and attempts to split them into smaller modules. Our work highlights another source of inefficiency in the form of wasteful test executions due to test placement in test modules that have more dependencies than the tests actually need. Therefore, many irrelevant tests that are not affected by a change often get executed due to changes in developer-specified dependencies of the module, and such changes cannot alter the behavior of these tests. Execution of irrelevant tests can not only waste machine resources but can also severely affect developer productivity if those irrelevant tests are flaky [13]. Flaky tests are tests that can pass or fail even without any changes to code. In practice, each test failure requires developers to manually triage the failures and identify the root cause. Therefore, when an irrelevant flaky test fails, developers end up spending unnecessary effort debugging the failure (which has nothing to do with their change) only to identify that the failure is due to a flaky test.

From our experience with CloudBuild, the reasons for such incorrect placement of tests include a lack of comprehensive knowledge of all test modules in the project and developers making large refactorings to the code base (more details in Section V-D). The goal of our work is to provide a practical solution to reduce the number of wasteful test executions under the constraints imposed by the underlying build systems. Our solution for finding better placement for tests is applicable beyond just the CloudBuild build system, as it can be applied to any build system that builds at the level of modules, such as the build system that is used at Google (Bazel) [1].
A. Running Example

To illustrate how a build system performs regression test selection at the module level and the problem we address in this paper, consider an example dependency graph shown in Figure 1 for a hypothetical project. The example project includes four application modules (A, B, C, and D), and three test modules (X, Y, and Z). In the rest of this paper, we use the notation build node to represent an application module and test node to represent a test module. When a change happens to the code in a build node, the build node is built, and all build nodes and test nodes transitively dependent on that build node are built as well. Whenever a test node is built, all the tests inside it are also executed. For example, when test node Z is built, tests t8 and t9 are executed. The directed edge from C to A indicates that C is dependent on A.

Given this background, we next explain how this dependency graph can lead to wasteful test executions. Suppose that a developer makes a change to code in build node D. As such, D is built, and test node Y, which depends on D, is built as well, and all the tests in Y are executed. However, as shown in Figure 1, tests t5 and t7 do not actually depend on D, and they need not be executed when D changes. These two tests are executed because they happen to be placed in Y. This inefficiency is even worse if the dependencies change more frequently. The table “Build Count” in Figure 1 shows the number of times a set of build nodes are built together, e.g., the set of build nodes \{A,B,C\} are built 10 times together. We see that, in this example, build node D by itself is built 1,000 times. As Y depends on D, it is built at least 1,000 times, hence all tests in test node Y are executed at least 1,000 times. To be more precise, the tests are executed 1,120 times, because these tests also need to be executed when D is built in combination with other build nodes and when B is built as well, resulting in an additional 120 times (when sets \{A,B,C\}, \{B,C\}, \{B,D\}, and \{B\} are built).

B. Overview of Our Technique

In this paper, we focus on reducing wasteful test executions due to incorrect placement of tests within test nodes. An ideal placement of tests to avoid wasteful test executions is to place each test in a test node that shares exactly the same set of dependencies that are exercised by the test during its execution. This placement ensures that only relevant tests get executed for a given change. However, in large projects, moving thousands of tests to achieve the ideal placement requires huge effort. Given that developers are always under pressure to meet customer requirements, they often have limited time to perform these activities. Therefore, it is not practical to invest huge effort (although one-time) in achieving the ideal placement. Furthermore, introducing a large number of modules can significantly increase the time to build all modules in the project. Our technique addresses these issues by suggesting movements that reduce the number of test executions while minimizing the number of suggestions to give to developers.

Our technique, called TestOptimizer, accepts the following inputs: dependency graph, actual dependencies for tests, and number of times build nodes have been built over a given range of time. TestOptimizer formulates the problem as a decision problem, asking if there is a way to split test nodes to reduce the overall number of wasteful test executions. TestOptimizer uses a heuristic, called affinity, which is the set of dependencies the tests in a test node should be testing (Section IV-B). Affinity helps determine the tests that need not be moved, i.e., tests that execute the affinity of its test node are not amenable to movement. TestOptimizer uses a greedy algorithm to iteratively suggest test movements that lead to reductions in number of test executions. These suggestions involve moving tests into a newly created test node or to an existing test node that shares the exact same dependencies as the tests. Furthermore, TestOptimizer suggests the test movements ranked in the order of highest reduction in the number of test executions first. We envision that developers can use TestOptimizer once to get the correct placement of all tests. Once the recommendations are incorporated, TestOptimizer need to be executed only on added or modified tests.

For the example shown in Figure 1, TestOptimizer produces two suggestions (moving tests t5 into a new test node and moving tests t7 and t9 into a new test node). These suggestions reduce the number of test executions by 2,230 test executions, a 42% reduction (more details in Section III) for this example.

C. Contributions

This paper makes the following contributions:

- We formalize the problem of wasteful test executions due to incorrect placement of tests in test nodes.
- We define a cost metric that models the expected number of test executions in a given range of time based on historical build count.
- We propose a technique, called TestOptimizer, that uses a greedy algorithm to suggest test movements between test nodes. Our technique produces a ranked list of
suggestions, prioritizing the ones that give the highest reductions in the expected number of test executions.

- We implement TestOptimizer in a tool on top of CloudBuild, a widely used build system at Microsoft.
- To evaluate our tool, we apply it on five large proprietary projects. Our results show that the suggested movements can result in a reduction of 21.66 million test executions (17.09%) across all our subjects. We received positive feedback from the developers, who also accepted and intend to implement ≈80% of our suggestions.

II. Problem Statement

Let \( B \) be the set of all build nodes for the project. Let \( N \) be the set of all test nodes for the project. Let \( T \) be the set of all the tests for the project, contained in the set of test nodes. Let \( \Pi \) be a partitioning of \( T \), and for a test node \( n \), let \( \Pi(n) \subseteq T \) be the set of tests contained in \( n \). Given that \( \Pi \) is a partitioning of \( T \), \( \Pi(n_1) \cap \Pi(n_2) = \emptyset \) for distinct test nodes \( n_1 \) and \( n_2 \). For each test \( t \), let \( TDep(t) \subseteq B \) be all the build nodes that \( t \) depends on – these are the build nodes \( t \) needs to both compile and to execute. For the purpose of this paper, we require that build nodes do not depend on test nodes. Further, whenever a test node \( n \) is built, all the tests in \( \Pi(n) \) are executed.

Consider a sequence of builds during a given range of time \( R \) (say, over a six-month period). There are two factors that influence the total number of test executions for a project during \( R \): (i) the count of the number of times test nodes are built over \( R \) (given the incremental nature of a build, not every test node in a project is built in a given build), and (ii) the number of times each test node is built. Our solution changes the partitioning \( \Pi \) of tests by moving tests from existing test nodes to other (possibly new) test nodes. To compute the reduction in the number of test executions, we first need to compute the number of times test nodes are built (the test nodes’ build counts) after a change in partitioning \( \Pi \) without actually replaying the builds during \( R \).

A. Computing Build Count for a Test Node

Let us assume we have collected the build count for all the build nodes and test nodes during a past range of time \( R \). To determine the build count of a test node \( n \) after moving tests across test nodes, one possibility is to simply reuse the build count of \( n \) collected in that range of time \( R \). However, simply reusing the build count is inaccurate for two main reasons. First, after moving tests between test nodes, there can be changes to the dependencies of each existing test node. Second, new test nodes can be added, which do not have any existing build count information. Recall the example in Figure 1. If test \( t_4 \) is moved out of \( Z \), that movement removes the dependency that test node \( Z \) has on \( C \). This modified test node cannot be expected to have the same build count as before. Similarly, if \( t_7 \) is moved out of \( Y \) and into a brand new test node that depends only on \( A \), we would not have any collected build count for this new test node.

However, in most cases we can accurately compute the build count of a given test node entirely in terms of the build count of the build nodes in \( B \) and the dependencies of the tests within the given test node. We make the following assumptions during the range of time \( R \):

1) The dependencies of individual tests do not change.
2) Tests are changed, added or removed to the test nodes only in conjunction with another change to a dependent build node, i.e., a change does not affect test nodes only.

From our experience with CloudBuild, we believe these assumptions hold for most test nodes. For the first assumption, given that the dependencies in question are modules in the project as opposed to finer-grained dependencies such as lines or files, it is unlikely that there are drastic changes that lead to changes in dependencies at the level of modules. For the second assumption, we find that it is very rare for developers to be only changing test code; they change code in build nodes much more frequently and changes made to test nodes are in response to those build node changes. As we explain below, given these assumptions, we can compute precisely when a test node \( n \) will be built, namely whenever at least one dependency in \( TDep(n) \) is built. Although these assumptions may not hold for a very small fraction of test nodes during the time frame \( R \), their effect is negligible when \( R \) is sufficiently large (e.g., a few months).

We define the dependencies of a test node \( n \) as the union of the dependencies of the tests contained in \( n \) given \( \Pi \).

Definition 1 (\( NDeps(n, \Pi) \)): For a given test node \( n \), the set of build nodes that \( n \) depends on under \( \Pi \) is defined as:

\[ NDeps(n, \Pi) = \{ b \in B \mid \exists t \in \Pi(n) \text{ such that } b \in TDep(t) \} \]

Given our assumptions about test nodes, a test node \( n \) is built if and only if a build node in \( NDeps(n, \Pi) \) is built.

For a subset \( B' \subseteq B \), let \( BC_R(B') \) denote the number of builds where only the build nodes in \( B' \) are built together. The box in Figure 1 titled “Build Count” shows the number of times each subset of build nodes is built, e.g., the exact subset \( \{A, B, C\} \) was built 10 times in the range of time. Given our assumptions of test nodes not changing, a test node \( n \) is built in a build if any of its dependencies is built. We can thus compute the number of times a test node \( n \) is built by summing up the build counts of \( BC_R(B') \) where \( B' \) intersects with \( NDeps(n, \Pi) \).

Definition 2 (\( NodeCount_R(n, \Pi) \)): For a given test node \( n \), the computed number of times it is built during a range of time \( R \) is defined as:

\[ NodeCount_R(n, \Pi) = \sum_{B' \subseteq B \mid \exists t \in \Pi(n) \text{ such that } B' \cap NDeps(n, \Pi) \neq \emptyset} BC_R(B') \]

Since the set of all builds in \( R \) can be partitioned by using the distinct subsets \( B' \) as identifiers, we count each build exactly once in the above equation.
B. Number of Test Executions in a Project

Our metric for the cost of testing is the number of tests that are executed over \( R \). As such, our definition of the testing cost for a test node is related to the number of tests in the test node and the number of times the test node would be executed:

**Definition 3 (NodeCost\(_R\)(n, II)):** The number of test executions for a test node \( n \) within a range of time \( R \) is the product of the number of tests in \( n \) and the build count of \( n \) within \( R \):

\[
\text{NodeCost}_R(n, II) = |\Pi(n)| \times \text{NodeCount}_R(n, II)
\]

The total number of test executions for testing the entire project would then be the sum of the number of test executions for each test node.

**Definition 4 (Cost\(_R\)(\(\mathcal{N}\), II)):** The number of test executions \( \text{Cost}_R(\mathcal{N}, II) \) needed for building all test nodes \( \mathcal{N} \) in a project within a range of time \( R \) is defined as:

\[
\text{Cost}_R(\mathcal{N}, II) = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \text{NodeCost}_R(n, II)
\]

C. Reducing Test Executions

Our goal is to reduce the number of test executions in a project. While we could formulate the problem to allow placement of tests to any test node irrespective of the initial placement \( \Pi \), the resulting ideal placement of tests could be very different from the original placement of tests. Such a placement would then result in too many suggested test movements for the developers to implement, and it is not practical to invest huge effort (although one-time) in achieving this ideal placement of tests.

In this paper, we consider the option of splitting a test node \( n \) into two test nodes \( \{n, n'\} \) (\( n' \notin \mathcal{N} \)) where a subset of tests from \( n \) are moved to \( n' \). As such, we can constrain the number of suggested test movements to report to developers. We define \( \Pi^n \) (over \( \mathcal{N} \cup \{n'\} \)) to be identical to \( \Pi \) at \( \mathcal{N} \setminus \{n, n'\} \), and the disjoint union \( \Pi^n(n) \cup \Pi^n(n') = \Pi(n) \), meaning that \( \Pi^n \) only moves a subset of tests (possibly empty) from \( n \) to \( n' \).

Our test placement problem can now be restated as the following decision problem:

Does there exist a \( n \in \mathcal{N} \) such that \( \text{Cost}_R(\mathcal{N}, II) > \text{Cost}_R(\mathcal{N} \cup \{n'\}, \Pi^n) + c \)?

where \( c \) is a constant value representing a threshold for reducing at least a certain number of test executions.

The threshold \( c \) acts as a knob for controlling suggestions, where a split is suggested only when the reduction in number of test executions is worth the overhead of the developer implementing the suggestion. Essentially, \( c \) represents the minimal return-on-investment that can be expected by a developer to implement the suggested split. With multiple such \( n \) that reduce the number of test executions by at least \( c \), the one that provides the highest reduction can be chosen first.

III. TestOptimizer

Our technique, called TestOptimizer, provides a practical solution to reduce the number of wasteful test executions. More specifically, TestOptimizer produces a ranked list of suggestions that help reduce a large number of wasteful test executions with minimal test movements. Our technique also allows developers to specify threshold \( c \) in terms of the number of test executions that should be reduced for a suggestion. The suggestions also include additional recommendations where tests can be moved into existing test nodes, in case such test nodes already exist in the dependency graph. We first present how TestOptimizer splits a single test node into two test nodes and then explain how to use the single-split algorithm to deal with all test nodes in a given project.

A. Splitting a Test Node

Given a test node, we seek to find a subset of tests that can be moved to a new test node, resulting in the highest reduction in number of test executions. We use an iterative greedy algorithm to find such subset of tests that can be moved from the given test node.

Algorithm 1 shows the individual steps. Given a test node \( n \), the loop in lines 3 to 9 iterates over the individual tests in that test node. For each test \( t \), our algorithm gets the build nodes the test depends on using \( TDep(t) \). If an existing
group of tests already shares the same set of build nodes as dependencies, the test is added to that group; otherwise, a new group is created.

Next, the algorithm simulates moving groups of tests into another (initially empty) test node so as to identify the group that results in the highest reduction. At line 10, the algorithm makes a new test node \( n' \), and at line 11, the algorithm makes a new partitioning \( \Pi' \) that includes \( n' \). The loop 15 to 24 iterates through the groups and simulates moving each group of tests from \( n \) to \( n' \). The simulation is done by using a temporary partitioning \( \Pi' \) that starts as \( \Pi' \) but is modified by using \textit{RemoveTests} to remove a group of tests from \( n \) and then using \textit{AddTests} to add the same group of tests to \( n' \). The algorithm chooses the group of tests whose movement results in the highest reduction in number of test executions. The outer loop (lines 12 to 29) greedily chooses to move that group of tests from \( n \) into \( n' \) (lines 25 to 28) by modifying that new partitioning \( \Pi' \). The outer loop iterates until there are no groups that help reduce the number of test executions. When the loop terminates, the algorithm returns the new partitioning \( \Pi' \) and the new test node \( n' \). In case \( n \) cannot be split, \( \Pi' \) will map \( n' \) to an empty set. Our algorithm moves groups of tests instead of individual tests in each iteration due to two reasons. First, moving groups of tests instead of individual tests can make the search faster. Second, since the group of tests share the same dependencies, the tests are likely related to each other and should be placed in the same test node.

In the example dependency graph shown in Figure 1, consider the given test node \( n \) as \( Y \). Table I shows the result after each iteration of the outer loop (lines 12 to 29). Initially, Loop 3 to 9 identifies four groups of tests, shown as \( g_1 \) to \( g_4 \). The initial number of test executions computed is 4,480. At the end of the first iteration of the outer loop, group \( g_1 \) is selected as the group that results in the highest reduction in the number of test executions, resulting in 3,370 test executions. Note that \( g_4 \) includes the test \( t_7 \) that depends only on \( A \), which is the root node of the dependency graph. Therefore, it is clearly evident that a large number of wasteful test executions is due to the test \( t_7 \). After one more iteration, the algorithm returns the partitioning that maps test node \( n \) to tests in groups \( g_1 \) and \( g_3 \) and maps new test node \( n' \) to tests in groups \( g_2 \) and \( g_4 \); this results in a final 2,480 test executions.

### B. Handling all Test Nodes

We next explain how we use the previous algorithm to deal with all test nodes in the given project. Given a set of test nodes, TestOptimizer applies Algorithm 1 to each test node to find a split that results in the highest reduction. In case the algorithm returns a partitioning where the new test node is mapped to no tests, TestOptimizer considers that the test node under analysis cannot be split further. In each iteration, TestOptimizer finds the test node that has the best split, i.e., producing the highest reduction in the number of test executions. TestOptimizer then updates the overall partitioning with the returned partitioning for that best split and adds the new test node into the set of all test nodes. TestOptimizer repeats these steps until there exist no test node that can be split any further. At the end, TestOptimizer returns all suggestions ranked in descending order based on their reductions in number of test executions. If there are any new test nodes that share the exact same dependencies as another test node (new or existing), TestOptimizer also makes the suggestion to combine the two test nodes into one.

TestOptimizer also allows developers to specify thresholds for a split. From Section II-C, this is the threshold value \( c \), representing the minimal number of test executions a split must reduce by. The threshold is implemented by adding an additional condition to line 20 in Algorithm 1. These criteria can help eliminate trivial suggestions that may not be worthwhile of the effort required to implement the suggestion.

Returning to our running example, consider the threshold \( c \) as 100 test executions. Our technique first splits \( Y \), creating new test node \( Y_1 \), as shown in Table I. It next splits \( Z \), creating new test node \( Z_1 \), where \( Z \) now only includes \( t_8 \) and \( Z_1 \) includes \( t_9 \). Our technique finally splits \( Y_1 \), creating new test node \( Y_2 \); \( Y_1 \) now includes \( t_5 \) and \( Y_2 \) includes \( t_7 \). TestOptimizer terminates since no further split can achieve the given criterion. TestOptimizer also suggests the two test nodes \( Y_2 \) and \( Z_4 \) including tests \( t_7 \) and \( t_9 \), respectively, can be combined into one test node \( A_1 \), since both the tests share exactly the same dependency. Figure 2 shows the final dependency graph after applying our suggestions. Overall, for this example, our technique reduces the number of test executions by 2,230.

### C. Properties of TestOptimizer

Using our technique, we can guarantee that every suggestion does indeed ensure a reduction in number of test executions. However, our technique may fail to find a split that reduces the cost, even if there exists one. This is due to the greedy nature of the algorithm that only moves one group of tests
(that share the same dependency) from \( n \) to the split node \( n' \) (one that provides the maximum reduction in number of test executions). For lack of space, we omit such an example (there exists one) that shows the limitation of our algorithm.

IV. Implementation

We implemented TestOptimizer as a prototype on top of CloudBuild [8], a widely used build system at Microsoft. Currently, CloudBuild handles thousands of builds and executes millions of tests each day.

A. Code Coverage

For our implementation, we targeted the tests written using the Visual Studio Team Test (VsTest) framework [4], as the majority of tests in CloudBuild are executed using VsTest. Since TestOptimizer requires actual dependencies of each individual test, we use the Magellan code coverage tool [3] to collect those dependencies. In particular, we first instrument the binaries in a project, where a binary corresponds to a build node, using Magellan. We then execute the tests on the instrumented binaries and save a coverage trace for each test. The coverage trace includes all blocks that are executed by the test. We map these blocks to the build nodes to construct the set of actual dependencies for each test. Our implementation also handles the special constructs such as \texttt{AssemblyInitialize} and \texttt{ClassInitialize} that have specific semantics in VsTest. For example, \texttt{AssemblyInitialize} is executed only once when running all the tests in a test node, but the binaries exercised should be dependencies to all the tests in that test node.

B. Test Node Affinity

We use affinity to refer to the set of build nodes that are intended to be tested by a test node. Affinity helps avoid suggesting moving tests that are already in the right test node and also helps improve the scalability of our technique. Ideally, one would ask the developers to provide the set of build nodes each test node is intended to test. However, as it is infeasible to ask the developers to spend time labelling every single test node, we instead develop a heuristic to automatically compute the affinity for any given test node \( n \).

First, we compute the dependencies \( NDeps(n, \Pi) \) of the test node. Next, we compute \( \Gamma(b, n) \) of each \( b \in NDeps(n, \Pi) \) as the number of tests in \( n \) that covers \( b \) during their execution.

\[
\Gamma(b, n) = |\{t \in \mathcal{N}| b \in TDep(t)\}|
\]

Finally, let \( \Gamma^{Max}(n) = \max_{b \in NDeps(n, \Pi)} \Gamma(b', n) \), the maximum \( \Gamma \) value among all build nodes in \( n \). We compute the affinity as:

\[
\text{Affinity}(n) = \{b \in NDeps(n, \Pi)|\Gamma(b, n) = \Gamma^{Max}(n)\}
\]

Once the affinity is computed, any test that does not exercise all dependencies in \( \text{Affinity}(n) \) is considered to be amenable for movement, called an amenable test. In the context of Algorithm 1, affinity can be implemented by modifying line 3 to skip tests that exercise all dependencies in \( \text{Affinity}(n) \). Our experimental results show that affinity helped exclude a large number of tests from our analysis, and it also provided more logical suggestions. Furthermore, we found that developers tend to agree with the affinity computed for each test node (Section V-D). As per the developer feedback, our technique is able to identify the affinity correctly for 99% of the test nodes in our subjects.

C. Output

TestOptimizer generates an HTML report with all suggestions that can help reduce the number of test executions. The report displays metrics concerning the number of test executions with the current placement of tests and the build count for the current test nodes. For each test node with tests amenable for movement, the report suggests how to split the test node to reduce the number of test executions. Furthermore, the report also suggests any existing test nodes where the tests can be moved into instead of making a new test node. Existing test nodes are suggested only when the test node shares the exact same dependencies as the tests to be moved. The suggestions are shown in a ranked order starting with the test nodes that achieve the highest reductions. This ranked list can help developers in prioritizing their effort. For completeness, the report also includes the test nodes that were found to not contain any tests amenable for movements as to give the developer a more complete picture.

V. Evaluation

In our evaluation, we address the following three research questions:

- **RQ1.** How many test executions can be saved by applying TestOptimizer suggestions?
- **RQ2.** How scalable is TestOptimizer in handling large real-world projects?
- **RQ3.** What is the developer feedback for the suggestions of TestOptimizer?

A. Experimental Setup

We applied our technique on five medium to large proprietary projects that use CloudBuild as the underlying build system. Table II shows the statistics of our subjects. For confidentiality reasons, we refer to our subjects as ProjA, ProjB, ProjC, ProjD, and ProjE. The row “Overall” is the sum of all the values in each column. The row “Average” is the arithmetic average of all the values in each column. All subjects primarily use C# as the main programming language, but also include some code in other languages such as C++

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>KLOC</th>
<th># Build Nodes</th>
<th># Test Nodes</th>
<th># Tests</th>
<th># Build Count Entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ProjA</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>7,228</td>
<td>297,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProjB</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5,870</td>
<td>127,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProjC</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>7,667</td>
<td>810,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProjD</td>
<td>3,366</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>12,918</td>
<td>6,522,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProjE</td>
<td>29,058</td>
<td>8,540</td>
<td>50,793</td>
<td>62,030</td>
<td>34,486,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>35,255</td>
<td>11,259</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>50,793</td>
<td>42,242,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7,051</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>10,158</td>
<td>8,448,558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE II**

Statistics of subjects used in our evaluation
or Powershell. Column 2 shows the size of C# code in each subject. As shown in the table, our subjects range from medium-scale (468 KLOC) to large-scale projects (29,058 KLOC). Column 3 shows the number of build nodes, and Column 4 shows the number of test nodes. Column 5 shows the number of (manually written) tests in each subject.

For each subject, we collect historical data about the number of times sets of build nodes are built in a previous range of time. CloudBuild maintains this information about each build in a SQL Server database. Using this database, we computed the “Build Count” information for sets of build nodes during the time period of 180 days starting from Feb 1st, 2016. Column 6 shows the number of table entries in the database for each subject, where each entry is a set of build nodes for the subject along with the number of times those build nodes were built together. In our running example from Figure 1, this number would correspond to the number of entries in the box titled “Build Count” for each subject. The historical data is over a period of 180 days for all subjects, except ProjE. We could not collect 180 days worth of historical data for ProjE, our largest subject, due to out-of-memory errors, since our tool performs all in-memory computations. Therefore, for ProjE, we used only 30 days worth of historical data (from the same start date).

The split criterion we used as a configuration option to our technique is to split a test node only if the reduction is at least 2,000 test executions (setting the threshold value \( c \) to be 2,000). We used this criteria based on our discussions with the developers of our subjects. Finally, although we compute the reduction based on the historical data over a range of time \( R \) in the past, we present to developers the results as potential savings for a future range of time \( R \) (as future savings is what matters more to developers), under the assumption that the past is a good indicator for the future.

### B. Results

Regarding RQ1, Table III presents the results showing the reduction in terms of number of test executions after applying TestOptimizer. Column 2 shows the number of test nodes where TestOptimizer found amenable tests, based on affinity (Section IV-B). Test nodes with amenable tests are amenable test nodes. Column 3 shows the number of amenable tests. The percentage of amenable test nodes range from 5.55% (5 / 90 in ProjB) to 17.34% (30 / 173 in ProjE). These results indicate that developers often ensure that tests are placed in the correct test node. However, the fact that there are tests in incorrect test nodes suggests that developers can still make mistakes as to where the tests belong to, especially if they lack a global view of the project, so there is still room for improvement. Up to 3,946 tests across all subjects can be moved as to reduce the number of test executions.

Column 4 shows the number of tests that were actually suggested to be moved by TestOptimizer, meaning their movement can provide a substantial reduction in the number of test executions. Column 5 shows the number of new test nodes that need to be created for the tests to be moved into (not including any existing test nodes that already exactly share the dependencies of the tests to be moved). Column 6 shows the number of test executions (in millions) for the original placement of tests based on historical data. Columns 7-9 show the reductions if developers were to implement the suggestions. Column 7 shows the reduction in terms of number of test executions, while Column 8 shows the percentage of reduction when compared against the original number of test executions (Column 6). However, these columns show the reduction relative to the number of test executions of all test nodes in the project; there are many test nodes that TestOptimizer found as non-amenable. Column 9 also shows percentages but compared against the number of test executions concerning only the amenable test nodes, essentially compared against only the test nodes that TestOptimizer can actually suggest movements from. When considering only the amenable test nodes, we see the percentage of reduction in number of test executions is higher compared with the reductions based on all the test nodes. For the percentages in the table, the row “Overall” is computed as the total reduction in number of test executions across all subjects over the total number of original test executions. “Average” is the arithmetic average of all the percentages. To address RQ1, TestOptimizer can help reduce millions of test executions (up to 2,377,208) among our subjects. By considering only the amenable test nodes, these reductions range from 5.49% to 16.54% among our subjects.

Regarding RQ2, Column 10 shows the time (in minutes) taken by TestOptimizer to analyze the historical data and to run through its algorithm to suggest movements for each subject. Our results show that the analysis time ranges from 0.44 minutes up to 994.32 minutes (≈16 hours). The time seems to be a factor of the number of build nodes, test nodes, tests, and the amount of historical data available. We find this time can still be reasonable as we envision our technique to be run infrequently. We also envision TestOptimizer can be run incrementally by only analyzing newly added tests as to suggest to developers the best test node to place new tests; TestOptimizer can work quickly when analyzing only a small number of tests. Furthermore, TestOptimizer is still a prototype, and it can be improve by implementing lazy loading of data and caching previous computations to avoid repeated calculations of build count.

### C. Spurious Dependencies

In our experience, we found that some of the test nodes have additional developer-specified dependencies that are not required by any tests inside that test node. We refer to such dependencies as spurious dependencies. The primary reason for spurious dependencies could be the evolution of the application code. More specifically, developers could have originally specified a test node in the build system to have some dependencies, but after code changes the tests were moved around so that the test node no longer depends on some of those developer-specified dependencies. As such, when a spurious dependency is built, the dependent test node is built unnecessarily, causing a number of wasteful test executions.
A spurious dependency can be simply removed and all the tests within the test node will still run properly. Given TestOptimizer, spurious dependencies are the build nodes declared as dependencies in the build specification for a test node but are not covered by the test node’s tests. Table IV shows the number of test nodes that have spurious dependencies in each subject (Column 2) along with the total number of spurious dependencies those test nodes depended on (Column 3). For some subjects, such as ProjB and ProjE, we see that almost 50% of all test nodes have spurious dependencies.

Although detecting spurious dependencies is not a core contribution, it is an additional advantage of our technique. The reduction in number of test executions after both moving tests and removing spurious dependencies is the reduction developers would actually obtain. Table IV shows the effects of having spurious dependencies and the reduction in the number of test executions for each subject. Column 4 shows the number of test executions (in millions) for each subject using developer-specified dependencies for each test node. The number of test nodes that have spurious dependencies in each subject (Column 2) along with the total number of spurious dependencies those test nodes depended on (Column 3). For some subjects, such as ProjB and ProjE, we see that almost 50% of all test nodes have spurious dependencies.

Regarding RQ3, we approached the developers of our subjects to receive their feedback on suggested test movements. We received feedback from the developers of four of our subjects: ProjA, ProjB, ProjC, and ProjD, and yet to receive the feedback for the remaining subject. Table V presents the results for each of these four subjects. Column 2 shows the number of test movement suggestions reported by our tool, which is counted by the number of test nodes where our tool found tests amenable for movement. Column 3 shows the number of suggestions accepted by developers, and they intend to implement the suggestions. Column 4 shows the number of suggestions that the developers considered as valid, but they do not intend to implement the suggestions. Finally, Column 5 shows the number of suggestions that the developers considered as invalid. As shown in our results, 84.44% of the suggestions were indeed accepted by the developers. Furthermore, among the 16 accepted suggestions in ProjA, developers already implemented six of the suggestions.

Overall, we received highly encouraging feedback from the developers. The feedback also helped us understand how code evolution resulted in wasteful test executions. For example, a developer informed us that some application code was moved from one build node to a new one as part of a major refactoring. However, the related test code was not moved into the relevant test node. Since the original test node still had a dependency on the new build node, tests continued to execute properly, but the tests would also execute when any other dependency the original test node had was built. After analyzing our suggestions, the developer felt that our technique could also be quite helpful finding a better organization of the tests. This response is encouraging, since it demonstrates TestOptimizer’s ability in addressing issues beyond wasteful test executions. Another feedback was that developers may not be aware of an existing test node better suited for their
tests, especially with many developers and many nodes in the project. Therefore, developers tend to place tests in some test node they are familiar with; they later add more dependencies to that test node, eventually leading to wasteful test executions. Developers also appreciated the idea that our suggestions can help break edges from test nodes to build nodes in the dependency graph, thereby reducing the build time alone with the test execution time (breaking edges prevents test nodes from being built, which itself takes some time in the build system). The developers we approached also asked that we provide these reports at regular intervals (e.g., once per week), so they can monitor and improve the health of their project.

Accepted: We present the two common scenarios under which developers tend to accept our suggestions (Column 3 in Table V). We use the dependency graph shown in Figure 3 as an illustrative example. In the graph, test node X that is dependent on build nodes B and C. The figure also shows the build counts of B and C, where the build count of C is much greater than the build count of B. The figure shows that the X includes 100 tests, where most of them are dependent on B and only a few (just one in this example) depends on C. The primary issue is that most of the tests in X are wastefully executed due to the high build count of C. In this scenario, our technique typically suggests to move the tests in X into a test node that is dependent only on B. We noticed that developers tend to accept our suggestions in these scenarios, since they help reduce a large number of test executions in test nodes such as X. Another common scenario where developers often accepted our suggestion is when there already exist a test node with the exact same set of dependencies where the tests can be moved. In this scenario, the effort involved in implementing the suggestion is minimal, i.e., developers just need to copy-paste the tests into the existing test node.

Valid/Rejected: We present the common scenario under which developers considered that the suggestions are valid, but not willing to implement those suggestions (Column 4 of Table V). We use the same dependency graph in Figure 3 as an illustrative example, this time focusing on test node Y instead. In Y, the majority of the tests have a dependency on C instead of B. Although this scenario could result in wasteful test executions with respect to tests such as $t_{100}$, it is not as significant (since only a few tests are impacted) compared to the dependency graph shown in Figure 3. Due to the lower benefit in implementing the suggestion, developers seemed reluctant in moving such tests, especially when there is no existing test node the tests can simply be moved into.

Invalid: Regarding the suggestions that are considered as invalid (Column 5 of Table V), we found that they are primarily due to implementation issues. TestOptimizer relies on code coverage to collect test traces, in this case using Magellan. In case a test exercises a binary via only a constant or refers to a class using constructs such as `typeof`, we noticed that Magellan does not collect the necessary dependency, a limitation in the code coverage tool. Due to such missing dependencies, our tool suggested invalid movements that were rejected by the developers. In the future, we plan to explore further on how to collect dependencies in these scenarios.

Interesting Scenario: We finally present an interesting scenario where our suggestion led to a higher-level refactoring of a build node. Figure 4 shows two major components in the project, where each component contains several build nodes. There are two test nodes X and Y, which are intended to test build nodes in Component1 and Component2, respectively. However, due to the build node B, changes in Component1 can trigger tests in Y, and similarly changes in Component2 can trigger tests in X. In an attempt to implement our suggestion in X, instead of splitting X, the developer split the build node B into two build nodes $B_1$ and $B_2$. The resulting dependency graph is shown in the figure, where the split helped remove dependencies between the build nodes and test nodes. This is very encouraging feedback, since our suggestions can help developers make insightful decisions in removing major unnecessary dependencies in the project. In our future work, we plan to explore how to automatically suggest these higher-level refactorings for build nodes.

E. Verifiability

Due to legal issues, we can neither reveal the names of our subjects nor release the TestOptimizer code. We can share anonymized output of TestOptimizer for each subject\(^1\).

VI. RELATED WORK

Our work is related to existing work on regression test selection [7], [10], [11], [17], [19], [24]. Given a change, these techniques aim to select a subset of affected tests. The key idea of these techniques is to maintain some metadata, such as statements covered by tests on the previous version.

\(^1\)http://mir.cs.illinois.edu/awshi2/testoptimizer
and leverage this metadata to select a subset of tests that are
affected by the change. Recent work by Gligoric et al. [9]
found regression test selection that tracks dependencies at the
coarse granularity level of files to be effective. The build
system our work focus on performs regression test selection
at the even coarser granularity level of modules.

Harrold et al. [10] specify that selection can be based on
coarser-grained entities, such as methods, classes, or modules.
A major advantage of module-level regression test selection
is that it is extremely light-weight and highly scalable, which
is why it is widely used in practice. TestOptimizer improves
this regression test selection that naturally comes with the
build system. In contrast to previous finer-grained regression
test selection techniques, our technique does not require any
additional information beyond what is needed for building the
modules. Although previous techniques can further reduce the
number of test executions by doing the selection on each test
node, we argue that these previous techniques do not help as
much due to the following reasons. First, existing techniques
assume that tests are executed at the end of the build. There-
fore, even if there exists a single test (in a test node) that
is impacted by the change, the entire test node still needs to
be built. In contrast to that, our technique can help skip the
build of that test node as well. Second, existing techniques
require storage and maintenance of metadata, which needs to
be updated along with the changes in the underlying modules.
This aspect adds non-trivial overhead in the case of millions
of test executions. Instead, our technique does not require
any additional information beyond what build system already
saves. Finally, our technique can also be extended to refactor
application code as well to further fine-tune the dependency
graph; we plan to focus on this in our future work.

There has been some previous work on improving regres-
sion testing in the industrial environment. Elbaum et al. [6]
proposed improving regression testing at Google through a
combination of test selection in a pre-submit phase and test
prioritization in a post-submit phase. Instead of collecting
coverage for test selection and prioritization, they considered
historical test failures to determine what tests to run and what
order to run them. Herzig et al. [12] proposed a test-selection
technique based on cost model. Their technique dynamically
skips tests when the expected cost of running a test exceeds
the expected cost of not running the test. All tests are still run
at least once before the code is released, so defect detection
is merely delayed (but can potentially be more costly to
fix). These previous techniques complement our technique. In
contrast to their techniques, we can guarantee that some tests
can be ignored by moving to a different test node since they
are not relevant for the given change. Therefore, we envision
that developers can use our technique to avoid running tests
that are not relevant for a change and then use their techniques
to further reduce the number of test executions.

There exists work on techniques to improve the efficiency
of builds [14], [15], [20]. Telea and Voeina [21] developed a
tool that decomposes header files (in C/C++ code) to remove
performance bottlenecks. Morgenthaler et al. [16] developed
a tool that ranks libraries based on their utilization rank to
identify under utilized nodes that can be refactored.

Our work is closely related to Vakilian et al. [22] that
attempts to decompose build nodes into two or more nodes
to improve build times. Their work shares a similar goal with
our work, i.e., avoid unnecessary building of nodes when
dependencies change. TestOptimizer significantly differs from
their technique due to the following reasons. First, we focus
on moving individual tests in test nodes into either existing or
new test nodes. We allow movements to existing test nodes,
as opposed to their technique that only creates new nodes.
Second, since test nodes are essentially the leaf nodes in the
dependency graph, we do not have to update dependencies
for any child nodes. Third, their technique does not take
historical information into consideration, i.e., they assume all
nodes are built in every build. In contrast to that, we take
historical information into consideration to ensure that tests
are moved away from test nodes that have a high historical
build count. Finally, their techniques identifies dependencies
statically, whereas our technique uses dynamic analysis (code
coverage), which is more precise. Although, it would be
ideal to evaluate both techniques on common subjects, it is
not practical since both are proprietary applications and are
targeted for different technologies.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we present TestOptimizer, a technique that
helps reduce wasteful test executions due to suboptimal place-
ment of tests. We formulate the problem of wasteful test exe-
cutions and develop an algorithm for reducing the number of
wasteful test executions. We have implemented our technique
in a prototype tool on top of Microsoft’s CloudBuild. We
show the effectiveness of TestOptimizer by applying it on
five proprietary projects. Our results show that our technique
can reduce 21.66 million test executions (17.09%) across all
our subjects. Furthermore, developers of four of our subjects
accepted and intend to implement ≈80% of our suggestions;
developers have already implemented some of these sugges-
tions as well. Beyond saving machine resources, the reduction
in test executions can also help reduce the developer effort
in triaging the test failures, if these irrelevant tests are flaky.
In future work, we plan to use TestOptimizer incrementally to
suggest ideal placements for newly added tests, soon after they
are added. We also plan to extend TestOptimizer to refactoring
build nodes as well to improve build times. Finally, we plan
on exploring large-scale automated refactoring techniques [23]
for applying our suggestions.
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