

CoCoA-5 - Support #251

How to add a test for CoCoA-5 (CoCoAInterpreter)

02 Oct 2012 09:10 - Anna Maria Bigatti

<b>Status:</b>	Closed	<b>Start date:</b>	02 Oct 2012
<b>Priority:</b>	Normal	<b>Due date:</b>	
<b>Assignee:</b>	Anna Maria Bigatti	<b>% Done:</b>	100%
<b>Category:</b>	Manual/documentation	<b>Estimated time:</b>	1.50 hour
<b>Target version:</b>	CoCoA-5.1.2 summer 2015	<b>Spent time:</b>	1.75 hour
<b>Description</b>			
<div>1. write a test file <b>foo.cocoa5</b> in <b>tests/</b></div> <div>2. run it and check if it really does what you want it to do ;-)</div> <div>3. add <b>foo.cocoa5</b> in <b>tests/Makefile</b> (in the list TESTS= ...)</div> <div>4. in <b>tests/</b> run (the first <b>make check</b> will obviously return an error)</div> <div><pre>make check mv foo.found foo.out make check</pre></div>			
See below for external libs			
<b>Related issues:</b>			
Related to CoCoA-5 - Feature #243: Normaliz tests for CoCoA5		Closed	28 Sep 2012
Related to CoCoA-5 - Support #286: How to test (automatically) a user defined...		Closed	11 Dec 2012
Related to CoCoA-5 - Feature #500: Interpreter: is it possible to avoid usele...		Closed	28 Mar 2014

History

#1 - 02 Oct 2012 09:54 - Anna Maria Bigatti

For external libraries:  
same as above, but the test file has to be called, say for library **Foo**,  
**ExtLibFOO.cocoa5**

Such test is run only if the variable **HAVE\_FOO** is set to "yes" in **autoconf.mk**.

If it isn't no test is run, because a different mechanism has to be used to automatically check "errors" in an easy way (still thinking ...)

#2 - 29 Nov 2012 08:21 - Anna Maria Bigatti

- Category set to Portability

#3 - 29 Nov 2012 08:22 - Anna Maria Bigatti

- Category deleted (Portability)

#4 - 23 Jan 2013 12:31 - Anna Maria Bigatti

- Category set to Manual/documentation

#5 - 02 Apr 2014 17:33 - Anna Maria Bigatti

- Target version set to CoCoA-5.1.0 Easter14

**#6 - 14 Apr 2014 09:19 - Anna Maria Bigatti**

- Estimated time set to 1.50 h

**#7 - 14 Apr 2014 11:02 - John Abbott**

JAA suggests as a general rule: try to avoid designing tests that produce much output (unless the test specifically checks some "output" function).

Why do I think this? Not entirely sure; but I definitely prefer "silent" tests(*e.g.* `TEST_ASSERT(fn(a,b) == c)`).

If a test is long, it might be worth printing out a little "progress report" every so often...?

**#8 - 05 May 2014 12:14 - John Abbott**

I have recently added a new C5 test (exbugs.cocoa5) and was surprised to find that it produces output. What happened was that the file was read using *input redirection* rather than being passed to C5 as a comand line argument; this means that every input line produced a prompt.

I suggest passing the file name as a cmd line arg to avoid this; doing so would make exbugs.cocoa5 a "silent" test. This would then require modifying the expected output of all tests.

**#9 - 07 May 2014 14:13 - John Abbott**

- Target version changed from CoCoA-5.1.0 Easter14 to CoCoA-5.1.1 Seoul14

**#10 - 11 Sep 2014 17:45 - John Abbott**

- Target version changed from CoCoA-5.1.1 Seoul14 to CoCoA-5.1.2 summer 2015

**#11 - 29 Jul 2015 12:12 - Anna Maria Bigatti**

- Status changed from Resolved to Closed

- % Done changed from 90 to 100