

A Catalog of Transformations to Remove Smells From Natural Language Tests

Manoel Aranda

Federal University of Alagoas
Maceió, Brazil
mpat@ic.ufal.br

Naelson Oliveira

Federal University of Alagoas
Maceió, Brazil
naelson@ic.ufal.br

Elvys Soares

Federal Institute of Alagoas
Maceió, Brazil
elvys.soares@ifal.edu.br

Márcio Ribeiro

Federal University of Alagoas
Maceió, Brazil
marcio@ic.ufal.br

Davi Romão

Federal University of Alagoas
Maceió, Brazil
dsr@ic.ufal.br

Ullyanne Patriota

Federal University of Alagoas
Maceió, Brazil
ufjp@ic.ufal.br

Rohit Gheyi

Federal Univ. of Campina Grande
Campina Grande, Brazil
rohit@dsc.ufcg.edu.br

Emerson Souza

Federal University of Pernambuco
Recife, Brazil
epss@cin.ufpe.br

Ivan Machado

Federal University of Bahia
Salvador, Brazil
ivan.machado@ufba.br

ABSTRACT

Test smells can pose difficulties during testing activities, such as poor maintainability, non-deterministic behavior, and incomplete verification. Existing research has extensively addressed test smells in automated software tests but little attention has been given to smells in natural language tests. While some research has identified and catalogued such smells, there is a lack of systematic approaches for their removal. Consequently, there is also a lack of tools to automatically identify and remove natural language test smells. This paper introduces a catalog of transformations designed to remove seven natural language test smells and a companion tool implemented using Natural Language Processing (NLP) techniques. Our work aims to enhance the quality and reliability of natural language tests during software development. The research employs a two-fold empirical strategy to evaluate its contributions. First, a survey involving 15 software testing professionals assesses the acceptance and usefulness of the catalog's transformations. Second, an empirical study evaluates our tool to remove natural language test smells by analyzing a sample of real-practice tests from the Ubuntu OS. The results indicate that software testing professionals find the transformations valuable. Additionally, the automated tool demonstrates a good level of precision, as evidenced by a F-Measure rate of 83.70%.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Software and its engineering** → **Software testing and debugging; Empirical software validation.**

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
EASE 2024, June 18–21, 2024, Salerno, Italy

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-1701-7/24/06...\$15.00
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3661167.3661225>

KEYWORDS

Natural Language Test, Test Smells, Software Testing

ACM Reference Format:

Manoel Aranda, Naelson Oliveira, Elvys Soares, Márcio Ribeiro, Davi Romão, Ullyanne Patriota, Rohit Gheyi, Emerson Souza, and Ivan Machado. 2024. A Catalog of Transformations to Remove Smells From Natural Language Tests. In *28th International Conference on Evaluation and Assessment in Software Engineering (EASE 2024)*, June 18–21, 2024, Salerno, Italy. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3661167.3661225>

1 INTRODUCTION

Test smells are indications of bad decisions when designing or implementing tests. Such decisions may introduce potential problems in testing activities [26]. Examples of these problems are poor maintainability (e.g., duplication in test code [11]), non-deterministic scenarios [16], and missing verifications [22] due to code branches. In this context, the literature is particularly vast when considering test smells in automated software tests. Previous studies have been introduced to provide catalogues of test smells [2, 9], to count and study their occurrences [4, 20, 21], and to provide tools capable of identifying and removing them automatically using code transformations [14, 15, 20, 21, 26].

Unfortunately, the same does not apply when considering test smells in manual tests, i.e., natural language tests. These tests are written in natural language and also suffer from problems introduced by smells [10, 19]. Figure 1 illustrates part of a natural language test extracted from the Ubuntu Operating System (Ubuntu OS) [25]. The test contains the *Ambiguous Test* smell [10], which indicates an “*under-specified test that leaves room for interpretation*.” In Step 2, the required action is to “*Open any application*.” However, it is not specified which application should be opened. This ambiguity can lead to different test results based on the application selected by the tester. Hence, identifying and removing this smell might bring better quality standards for the tests.

As mentioned, differently from test smells in automated software tests, test smells in natural language are still poorly explored.

#	Actions	Verifications
...
2	Open any application	...
...

Figure 1: Natural Language Test Smell: Ambiguous Test.

Hauptmann *et al.* [10] presented seven natural language test smells and after ten years Soares *et al.* [19] complemented the list with six additional smells. Both studies introduced rules to identify the test smells. However, we still miss a catalog of transformations to remove natural language test smells. In addition, we miss tool support to make this whole process automatic, *i.e.*, a tool capable of removing natural language test smells automatically.

To minimize these problems, in this paper we introduce a catalog of transformations to remove natural language test smells presented in recent research [19]. Our catalog contains seven transformations capable of removing the following natural language test smells: *Unverified Action*, *Misplaced Precondition*, *Misplaced Action*, *Misplaced Verification*, *Eager Action*, *Ambiguous Test*, and *Conditional Test*. For each smell, our catalog contains details with respect to the *addressed test smell*, the mechanics to apply the *transformation* in the test in order to remove such smell, and an *example*. The catalog works considering a left-hand side test, *i.e.*, the test that contains the test smell; and a right-hand side test, *i.e.*, the test after the transformation without the smell. We also contribute to a tool based on Natural Language Processing (NLP) techniques. The tool is capable of identifying the test smells and removing them automatically. In case the test contains more than one smell, the tool works sequentially, tackling one smell at a time.

To evaluate the catalog and the tool, we conduct a two-fold empirical strategy. First, we conduct a survey to answer the research question **RQ₁**: “How software testing professionals perceive and evaluate the transformations of our catalog?” To answer it, we recruited 15 software testing professionals from a large smartphone manufacturer. The name of the company is omitted due to non-disclosure agreements. Answering **RQ₁** is important to better understand whether the software testing professionals find our transformations useful to improve the quality of the tests. Second, we conduct an empirical study to evaluate our tool. Here we focus on the research question **RQ₂**: “How precise is our tool in the task of removing natural language test smells?” To conduct this study and answer **RQ₂**, we consider real-practice natural language tests from the Ubuntu OS. The tests consist of not only software functionalities, but also interactions with the hardware. After executing our tool against 973 natural language tests, we identified 8,386 occurrences of the seven smells we focus on in this paper. In this scenario, to evaluate the precision of our tool in removing the smells, we would need to manually analyze more than eight thousand transformations, exceeding our capabilities. Thus, to make our manual analysis feasible, we use the Cochran’s Sample Size Formula [3] and analyze a sample of 264 randomly selected smell occurrences.

The results of our survey indicate an average acceptance of 91.43% among the software testing professionals we recruited. Regarding the tool, our manual analysis showed that it achieved 83.70% rate of F-Measure.

In summary, this paper provides the following contributions:

- A catalog of transformations to remove seven test smells from natural language tests (Section 3);
- A survey with software testing professionals to validate the catalog (Section 4);
- The development of a tool that makes our transformations automatic (Section 5);
- An empirical study to check the precision of our tool using real-practice natural language tests from the Ubuntu OS (Section 6).

A replication package with all results is available at Figshare [23]. Our tool is available at our companion website [24].

2 NATURAL LANGUAGE TEST SMELLS

Previous works showed that test smells also exist in natural language tests [10, 19]. Besides the *Ambiguous Test* smell we discussed in Section 1, we now show three additional test smells in natural language tests. We also discuss why they could be harmful during testing activities. All examples of natural language tests in this paper are extracted from the Ubuntu OS manual test repository [25].

2.1 Unverified Action

This smell occurs when there is no verification for a given action. When compared to automated tests, this smell is similar to the *Assertionless* smell, which is defined by the absence of assertions [1]. Figure 2 presents the *Unverified Action* smell. Step 7 lacks a verification for the “Click one more time on the same message” action.

Test name: gwibber/gwb-002		
Preconditions: depends: gwibber/gwb-001 This test will check the Facebook integration		
#	Actions	Verifications
...
5	Click on a random message	New elements appear below the message; previous comments, a star, an input field with the phrase “Reply” and a “Send” button
6	Click on the same message	Additional elements disappear
7	Click one more time on the same message	
...

Figure 2: Unverified Action - Example

Without proper verification, tests may not effectively validate whether the application is behaving as expected. Regarding the example, the tester may experience confusion regarding the outcomes of the clicking action. Questions such as “What should happen when the message is clicked one more time?” and “Do additional elements disappear? And if they do not, does the test fail?” may arise, leaving the tester uncertain on how to proceed. Addressing these uncertainties is crucial to maintain clarity and ensure effective test execution.

2.2 Eager Action

This smell happens when a single step groups multiple actions. Figure 3 depicts an example of the *Eager Action* smell.

The *Eager Action* test smell can introduce problems such as non-isolated tests and difficulties in debugging. In our example, we have four actions, represented by the verbs “select”, “enter”, “select”, and

Test name: firefox/firefox-006		
Preconditions: This test will check that Firefox can print websites.		
#	Actions	Verifications
...
3	Select "print to file" as printer and enter "firefox.pdf" as filename. Select your home folder as location. Then click on "Print"	A window opens, showing the progress of the print
...

Figure 3: Eager Action - Example

"click." Since we have one verification for four actions, in the event of a failure, it may be unclear which action caused it.

2.3 Conditional Test

This smell is defined by a conditional clause appearing in a step description [10]. Figure 4 shows an example.

Test name: Printer		
Preconditions:		
#	Actions	Verifications
1	Plug in your printer and run Applications -> System -> Printing	
2	If your printer doesn't show up, add it to the list (click Add and follow the wizard)	
3	Try to print a test page	Did the printer print the test page?

Figure 4: Conditional Test - Example

The conditional introduces uncertainty and variability to the test, as the tester may not know how to proceed or what to expect. Notice that the action in Step 2 contains a conditional clause "If your printer doesn't show up, add it to the list (click Add and follow the wizard)." If the printer is already showing up, the tester might need assistance deciding whether to skip Step 2 and proceed to Step 3 or stop the test execution altogether because there is no mention of the printer being on the list. This situation can reduce the test's determinism, maintainability, coverage, and reliability [21].

3 REMOVING NATURAL LANGUAGE TEST SMELLS

This section introduces a catalog of proposals to remove test smells in natural language tests. Concerning our terminology, according to Fowler *et al.* [8], refactorings preserve the observable behavior of a code. On the other hand, van Deursen *et al.* [26] define test refactorings as changes in test code that do not add or remove test cases. Since our proposals do not strictly align with Fowler's and van Deursen's definitions because they may alter the test behavior and even introduce new test cases, we call them *transformations*.

Our catalog contains transformations in terms of a left-hand side and a right-hand side [21]. The left-hand side holds the problematic test (*i.e.*, the test with test smells). The right-hand side presents the test transformed, *i.e.*, the test without test smells, after the transformations. To apply a transformation, the catalog uses semantic pattern matching. In other words, a natural language test

that matches the left-hand side of a transformation is converted to the right-hand side.

3.1 Natural Language Test Template

To better explain our transformations, we first need to introduce a template to represent natural language tests. Here, we define a natural language test as $T = (P, S_1, S_2, S_3, \dots, S_i, \dots, S_n)$, where:

- P is a boolean expression, representing the preconditions to execute T ;
- S_i is a tuple representing the i -th step of the test. This tuple consists of an ordered list of actions A_i and an ordered list of verifications V_i , defined as $S_i = (A_i, V_i)$;
- The elements of the A_i list are denoted by $[a_{i1}, a_{i2}, \dots, a_{in}]$;
- The elements of the V_i list are denoted by $[v_{i1}, v_{i2}, \dots, v_{in}]$.

Thus, given the above definitions, the following equations are interchangeable:

$$S_i = (A_i, V_i) \quad (1)$$

$$S_i = ([a_{i1}, a_{i2}, \dots, a_{in}], [v_{i1}, v_{i2}, \dots, v_{in}]) \quad (2)$$

Considering the test illustrated in Figure 3, we have:

- $P =$ "This test will check that Firefox can print websites";
- $A_3 =$ ["Select 'print to file' as printer", "enter 'firefox.pdf' as filename", "Select your home folder as location", "Then click on 'Print'"];
- $V_3 =$ ["A window opens, showing the progress of the print"].

Figure 5 presents T and all its elements in terms of a table. Notice that in Step S_i we use the form presented in Equation 1. When considering Steps S_1 and S_n we use the form presented in Equation 2.

T		
Preconditions: P		
#	Actions	Verifications
S_1	$[a_{11}, a_{12}, \dots, a_{1n}]$	$[v_{11}, v_{12}, \dots, v_{1n}]$
...
S_i	A_i	V_i
...
S_n	$[a_{n1}, a_{n2}, \dots, a_{nn}]$	$[v_{n1}, v_{n2}, \dots, v_{nn}]$

Figure 5: Natural Language Test Template

By using this template and particularly the Step S_i , we can discuss how to avoid natural language test smells. For example: to avoid the *Ambiguous Test* smell, the sentences in A_i and in V_i should not be ambiguous; To avoid the *Eager Action* smell in S_i , the cardinality of the list A_i should be $|A_i| = 1$, *i.e.*, there should be only one action instead of several ones in the i -th step; To avoid the *Unverified Action* smell in S_i , the cardinality of the list V_i should be $|V_i| \geq 1$, *i.e.*, there is at least one verification in V_i .

When presenting our transformations, we also consider the infix ++ operator, which is used for list concatenation. It takes two lists as operands and combines them to form a new list. Equation 3 shows a simple usage of the ++ operator.

$$\begin{aligned} S_i &= [a_{i1}, a_{i2}, \dots, a_{in}] ++ [a_k] \\ S_i &= [a_{i1}, a_{i2}, \dots, a_{in}, a_k] \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

3.2 A Catalog of Transformations

We now present our catalog having each transformation in terms of (i) the smell that the transformation addresses, (ii) the mechanics to apply the transformation (left-hand side and right-hand side), (iii) implications—in case the transformation removes a smell but adds another, or the transformation removes more than one smell —, and (iv) an example of the transformation in a natural language test extracted from the Ubuntu OS.

In this paper, we propose transformations for seven natural language test smells, namely *Unverified Action*, *Misplaced Precondition*, *Misplaced Action*, *Misplaced Verification*, *Eager Action*, *Ambiguous Test*, and *Conditional Test*. We focus on these smells because they may introduce difficulties in testing activities and have been studied by the literature [10, 19].

3.2.1 Fill Verification.

Addressed Smell. The *Unverified Action*. We discussed this smell in Section 2.1.

Formalization. Figure 6a presents our transformation to remove the *Unverified Action* smell. Notice that, at the left-hand side, the verifications list V_i is empty. To remove the smell, we can implement two strategies. The first and simplest one is to just warn the tester that V_i is empty and then add a sort of “FILL_VERIFICATION” flag in the Verifications field. The second strategy needs to deal with more complex algorithms. As A_i and V_i should be somehow linked by the same context, we can use NLP techniques to infer the verification from the action. Then, we add the inferred verification sentence in V_i .

Example. Figure 6b shows an example of the *Fill Verification* transformation. In this example, we add the “Dash appears” verification based on the text contained in the actions list A_1 .

#	Actions	Verifications
...
S_i	A_i	[]
...

→

#	Actions	Verifications
...
S_i	A_i	V_i
...

where $|V_i| > 0$

(a) Transformation

#	Actions	Verifications
1	Tap super to show the dash	
2	Click on the application lens icon	The search entry should show [...]
...

→

#	Actions	Verifications
1	Tap super to show the dash	Dash appears
2	Click on the application lens icon	The search entry should show [...]
...

(b) Example

Figure 6: Fill Verification

3.2.2 Extract Precondition.

Addressed Smell. The *Misplaced Precondition*, which appears when a precondition is placed as the first action of the test. This situation might bring difficulties in test correctness. For example, the tester might report a test failure. However, what actually happened was that a precondition to execute the test was not met.

Formalization. Figure 7a shows a precondition p as the first element of A_1 . We deal with the smell by removing p from the actions list A_1 and placing it in the boolean expression P using the conjunction operator, yielding $P \wedge p$.

Example. Figure 7b presents an example of applying our *Extract Precondition* transformation. Notice that the precondition “Ensure that Ristretto is loaded [...]” was removed from the actions list and added to the Preconditions field.

Preconditions: P		
#	Actions	Verifications
S_1	$[p, a_{11}, a_{12}, \dots, a_{1n}]$	V_1
...

→

Preconditions: $P \wedge p$		
#	Actions	Verifications
S_1	$[a_{11}, a_{12}, \dots, a_{1n}]$	V_1
...

(a) Transformation

Preconditions:		
#	Actions	Verifications
1	Ensure that Ristretto is loaded [...]. Toggle View->Show Toolbar.	The toolbar toggles on or off with each [...]
2	Toggle View->Show Status Bar.	The status bar toggles on or off with each [...]
...

→

Preconditions: Ensure that Ristretto is loaded [...]		
#	Actions	Verifications
1	Toggle View->Show Toolbar.	The toolbar toggles on or off with each [...]
2	Toggle View->Show Status Bar.	The status bar toggles on or off with each [...]
...

(b) Example

Figure 7: Extract Precondition

3.2.3 Extract Action.

Addressed Smell. The *Misplaced Action*, which happens when there is an action in the verifications list. Such confusion can result in inconsistent execution and potentially misguide the interpretation of results.

Formalization. Figure 8a illustrates the action element a in the verifications list of Step S_i . To remove the smell, all we need to do is to remove a from the verifications list V_i and add it to the actions list A_i . To perform the adding task, we use the ++ operator.

Implications. The *Extract Action* transformation might introduce the *Eager Action* smell in case there already exists an action in A_i . In this sense, to remove the *Eager Action* smell, we propose the *Separate Actions* transformation. We introduce this transformation in Section 3.2.5.

Example. Figure 8b presents a test with the action “Open some windows” located in the verifications list. After executing our transformation, such an action is placed in the actions list and removed from the verifications list.

#	Actions	Verifications
...
S_i	A_i	$[a, v_{i1}, v_{i2}, \dots, v_{in}]$
...

→

#	Actions	Verifications
...
S_i	$A_i ++ [a]$	$[v_{i1}, v_{i2}, \dots, v_{in}]$
...

(a) Transformation

#	Actions	Verifications
...
2	Test 3.2	Open some windows and verify the [...]
...

→

#	Actions	Verifications
...
2	Test 3.2 Open some windows	Verify the [...]
...

(b) Example

Figure 8: Extract Action

3.2.4 Extract Verification.

Addressed Smell. The *Misplaced Verification*, which occurs when there is a verification in the actions list.

Formalization. Figure 9a illustrates a verification v in A_i list. To address the smell, we remove v from the actions list A_i and add it to the verifications list V_i . In this transformation, we rely on the ++ operator. Notice that we add v at the beginning of V_i . We opt for this because v should be the first verification to be checked right after executing action a_{in} .

Implications. Applying this transformation might remove not only the *Misplaced Verification*, but also the *Unverified Action* smell. This happens in case $|V_i| = 0$ and we move v from A_i to V_i , making $|V_i| = 1$.

Example. Figure 9b illustrates the verification “Verify that ‘Enable Volume Management’ is checked [...]” in the actions list. After our transformation, we place such a verification in the verifications list. With this transformation, notice that we remove the *Misplaced Verification* and the *Unverified Action* smells.

3.2.5 Separate Actions.

Addressed Smell. The *Eager Action*, discussed in Section 2.2.

Formalization. Figure 10a illustrates that A_i contains n elements, characterizing the *Eager Action* smell: $|A_i| > 1$. To remove the smell, we define a new step for each element of the A_i list. Additionally, in our transformation, we associate the verifications list V_i with the step created for the last action originally in A_i , i.e., the a_{in} action. We opt for this because we consider that the tester will check the verifications list V_i only after executing the last action.

#	Actions	Verifications
...
S_i	$[a_{i1}, a_{i2}, \dots, a_{in}, v]$	V_i
...

→

#	Actions	Verifications
...
S_i	$[a_{i1}, a_{i2}, \dots, a_{in}]$	$[v] ++ V_i$
...

where $|V_i| > 0$

(a) Transformation

#	Actions	Verifications
...
2	Click the 'Advanced' tab. Verify that 'Enable Volume Management' is checked [...]	
3	Click the 'Configure' link	The Removable Drives [...] opens.
...

→

#	Actions	Verifications
...
2	Click the 'Advanced' tab	Verify that 'Enable Volume Management' is checked [...]
3	Click the 'Configure' link	The Removable Drives [...] opens.
...

(b) Example

Figure 9: Extract Verification

Implications. The *Separate Actions* transformation may lead to the *Unverified Action* smell. After the transformation, we have empty verifications lists for the Steps from S_i to S_{k+n-1} . To deal with the *Unverified Action* smell, we introduce the *Fill Verification* transformation (Section 3.2.1).

Example. Figure 10b shows Step 3 with two actions: “Add content to the popped up memo” and “Then click the green tick.” According to our transformation, they should be split in two different steps. Moreover, the verification “Did the window showed [...]” has been associated with the last action, i.e., “Then click the green tick.”

3.2.6 Extract Ambiguity.

Addressed Smell. The *Ambiguous Test* smell. Ambiguities and under-specified activities may lead to problems during the test execution, such as different outcomes.

Formalization. Figure 11a shows the actions list A_i with n elements. Any of these elements might have ambiguous sentences, such as “quickly” or “accurately.” To remove the ambiguities, we propose the use of a γ function that receives an action sentence as input and returns the same action sentence in case it is not ambiguous; and a modified action sentence in case the original one is ambiguous. We then apply γ to all elements of A_i . Although our transformation to remove the *Ambiguous Test* smell focused on the actions list, we can use the same rationale on the verifications list.

Example. Figure 11b illustrates an action with the adverb in manner “approximately.” Here the tester could ask: “Is 25 seconds enough to make the wireless network visible? If I wait 25 seconds and the wireless network does not appear, did the test fail?”




Figure 10: Separate Actions




Figure 11: Extract Ambiguity

3.2.7 Extract Conditional.

Addressed Smell. The *Conditional Test* smell, detailed in Section 2.3. To deal with this smell, we create two different tests [7].

Formalization. Figure 12a illustrates our transformation. To do so, we rely on two functions. The first one, β , receives an action sentence a as input. In case a has no conditional, β simply skips. In case a has a conditional c , β returns a map (a', c) , where a' is the action element without the conditional and c is the removed conditional. In Figure 12a, β identified a conditional c in action a_{ik} and removed it, transforming a_{ik} into a'_{ik} . Because now we have the conditional c , it is time to create two tests. We consider another function θ that receives the original test T and the conditional c . θ yields two tests: T' considering c as true; and T'' considering c as false. Because the conditional c is necessary to execute T' , we place it in the boolean expression P using the conjunction operator, yielding $P \wedge c$. As to T'' , we exclude the step that originally contained the conditional and the following steps. Notice that we need to repeat this process to all actions in all steps of the original test.

Example. Figure 12b presents an example of the *Conditional Test* smell removal. Once we identify the conditional “If you have a USB drive,” we create a test considering it in the precondition and another test without the step that originally had the conditional and the subsequent steps.

3.2.8 Summary. Illustrated in Table 1 is the list of our proposed transformations and their addressed smells.

Table 1: Transformations and addressed smells

No.	Transformation	Addressed Smell
1	Extract Conditional	Conditional Test
2	Extract Action	Misplaced Action
3	Separate Actions	Eager Action
4	Extract Verification	Misplaced Verification
5	Extract Ambiguity	Ambiguous Test
6	Extract Precondition	Misplaced Precondition
7	Fill Verification	Unverified Action

4 CATALOG EVALUATION

This section presents our evaluation, conducted as an online survey with software testing professionals. Here we aim to answer the research question RQ₁: “How do software testing professionals perceive and evaluate the transformations of our catalog?”

4.1 Planning

The goal of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of our transformations. To do so, we assess the opinions of software testing professionals about the transformations through an online survey. By analyzing “before” and “after” test transformation snippets—originally taken from the Ubuntu OS manual tests and transformed according to our proposals—along with the participants’ comments on their answers, we would be able to validate whether the respondents were aware of any benefits.

Each survey question had a test smell definition, problem, identification steps, original and transformed samples, the query “Do you agree that, in the example below, the identified problem was addressed according to the definition?”, a Likert scale ranging from “I

T		
Preconditions: P		
#	Actions	Verifications
...
S_i	$[\beta(a_{i1}), \beta(a_{i2}), \dots, \beta(a_{ik}), \dots, \beta(a_{in})]$	V_i
...
S_n	A_n	V_n

→

T'		
Preconditions: $P \wedge c$		
#	Actions	Verifications
...
S_i	$[a_{i1}, a_{i2}, \dots, a'_{ik}, \dots, a_{in}]$	V_i
...
S_n	A_n	V_n

T''		
Preconditions: P		
#	Actions	Verifications
...
S_{i-1}	A_{i-1}	V_{i-1}

where $\beta(a) = \begin{cases} \text{SKIP} & \text{if there is no conditional in } a; \\ (a', c) & \text{if there is a conditional } c \text{ in } a. \end{cases}$

(a) Transformation

T		
Preconditions:		
#	Actions	Verifications
1	Install applications	The applications are installed correctly [...]
2	If you have a USB drive, plug it in	The USB drive is mounted and you [...]
...

→

T'		
Preconditions: You have a USB drive		
#	Actions	Verifications
1	Install applications	The applications are installed correctly [...]
2	You have a USB drive, plug it in	The USB drive is mounted and you [...]
...

T''		
Preconditions:		
#	Actions	Verifications
1	Install applications	The applications are installed correctly [...]

(b) Example

Figure 12: Extract Conditional

strongly agree” to “I strongly disagree”, and an optional comments field. Finally, we recruited participants from a large smartphone manufacturer, which received invitations by email.

4.2 Results

We performed the survey in November 2023 – January 2024, achieving 15 responses. Concerning the demographics, 71% of the participants defined their primary work area as the industry (over academia) and their average experience with software testing was 4,1 years. One participant works in Portugal and 14 in Brazil. Figure 13 details the obtained results concerning the participants’ opinions about the transformation samples.

4.3 Discussion

Regarding the proposed transformations, the opinion of the experienced test professionals served as a validation that obtained a high average acceptance rate of 91.43%. There were no disagreements to the *Extract Action* transformation, that was accepted by 93.3% of the respondents (one respondent was indifferent). Four transformations reached 93.3% acceptance rate (14 respondents) and 6.7% of rejection rate (one respondent): *Fill Verification*, *Separate Actions*, *Extract Verification*, and *Extract Conditional*. Our transformations with the lowest acceptance rate were the *Extract Ambiguity* and *Extract Precondition*, and still achieved an 86.7% approval. Among the transformations positively commented, we highlight “*Following the logic that every action has a reaction, every test step must have an expected result [...]*,” which reinforces the *Fill Verification* transformation. Another comment received highlights that “*In this case, some steps could be included in a ‘test setup’ column, so that before the person/machine performs the steps, it ensures that it has the necessary resources to carry out the test.*” This comment reinforces transforming the *Misplaced Precondition* smell.

Some respondents disagreed with some transformations offered and exemplified in our research. For example, in one of the tests presented in our survey, we used the following actions: “*Start Nautilus*,” “*Maximize it’s window*,” and “*Start Firefox*.” Our transformation considered three verifications for these three actions. However, a respondent mentioned the following: “*[...] its not necessary a verification in this case.*” Another disagreement was in the *Extract Verification*, where a respondent commented: “*There’s (verify xxxxx) two times. If you’ll join to one block, don’t repeat process.*” This case is connected to the provided example, where a test had two similar verifications written slightly differently but for the same action. This outcome highlights the need to identify semantic *Test Clones* [10] in future work.

Answer to RQ1. The online survey shows software testing professionals mostly agree with our proposals.

4.4 Threats to Validity

As a threat to **external validity**, collecting answers from only 15 participants may bring bias in terms of generalization. We minimize this threat by relying on the experience of the participants to provide good responses. Also, we might experience a threat to **internal validity** when selecting the examples for the study. We minimize this threat by using real-practice examples from the Ubuntu OS. A last threat to the **conclusion validity** relates to all participants working for the same company. We minimize this selection bias with staff from different roles and hierarchical positions.

5 A TOOL TO REMOVE SMELLS FROM MANUAL TESTS

We now present details on developing an NLP-based tool called Manual Test Alchemist. It extends prior work [19] on automatically detecting natural language test smells and implements their removal according to the transformations presented in Section 3.

The Manual Test Alchemist tool development is centered on spaCy [12]—a commercial open-source library for NLP—to implement our transformations for natural language test smells. The spaCy library features convolutional neural network models for




Figure 13: Online Survey Results

part-of-speech (POS) tagging [13], dependency parsing [17], morphology parsing, and named entity recognition [12]. Table 2 shows the analysis of the action sentence in Figure 11b provided by spaCy. Such analysis enables the implementation of our transformations.

For example, **adverbs of manner** can be identified through POS=ADV, TAG=RB and Dependency=advmod properties, *i.e.*, the *approximately* found in Table 2. Such detection is used in the Extract Ambiguity transformation (Section 3.2.6).

In another example, **imperative verbs** identify action steps POS=VERB, VerbForm=Inf and Dependency=ROOT properties, *i.e.*, *open* in Table 2. This detection is used in the *Separate Actions* (Section 3.2.5), *Extract Action* (Section 3.2.3), and *Extract Precondition* (Section 3.2.2) transformations.

Table 2: Example of spaCy’s text analysis in detail.

Text	POS	TAG	Dependency	Morphology
After	ADP	IN	prep	
approximately	ADV	RB	advmod	
30	NUM	CD	nummod	NumType=Card
seconds	NOUN	NNS	pobj	Number=Plur
,	PUNCT	,	punct	PunctType=Comm
open	VERB	VB	ROOT	VerbForm=Inf
the	DET	DT	det	Definite=DefPronType=Art
network	NOUN	NN	compound	Number=Sing
manager	NOUN	NN	dobj	Number=Sing
.	PUNCT	.	punct	PunctType=Peri

Illustrated in Figure 14 is a simplified architecture of our tool, which functions by receiving an XML file of a test suite as its input. This test suite may contain multiple tests and is parsed using a customizable parser implementation into a consistent test format. Every implementation of the Transformator interface is responsible for identifying and addressing a specific test smell.

The *Extract Conditional* transformation results in the creation of new tests. Therefore, a relation between the execution order of transformations and their impact was identified. According to the implications shown in Section 3, the correction of some test smells may result in new ones. For instance, adjusting actions before *Separate Actions* is important for proper functionality, and *Fill Verification* should run last to address the *Unverified Action* smell generated by *Separate Actions* and *Extract Action*. Hence, to minimize this effect, we defined the execution sequence to be the one presented on Table 1.

To provide a more detailed account of the tool’s inner workings, Algorithm 1 presents the pseudocode of the *Separate Actions*




Figure 14: Simplified UML class diagram.

transformation. The algorithm highlights the key steps involved in identifying the presence of multiple action verbs within a single test step, separating the sentences related to each of these actions, allocating the separated sentences to new steps, and notifying the test professional that a verification must be written for the newly added step.

Algorithm 1 The Separate Actions transformation (simplified)

```

for every test step do
  Search for action verbs;
  if action verbs > 1 then
    for every action verb do
      Identify sentence connectors;
      Separate sentences;
      for every sentence do
        Move sentence to new step;
        Fill missing verification advise;
      end for
    end for
  end if
end for

```

6 TOOL EVALUATION

In this section, we present our tool evaluation. Here we aim to answer the research question **RQ₂**: “How precise is our tool in the task of removing natural language test smells?”

6.1 Planning

The goal of this evaluation is to validate the tool in terms of Precision, Recall, and F-Measure metrics. To accomplish the goal, we first execute our tool against the 973 natural language tests from

Ubuntu OS, yielding 8,386 test smell occurrences. However, validating more than eight thousand transformations manually would be infeasible. Therefore, we perform a manual analysis in a sample of 264 randomly selected smell occurrences (90% confidence with 5% margin of error, using the Cochran’s Sample Size Formula [3]). Table 3 distributes the total and sampled occurrences per test smell.

Table 3: Total and sample occurrences per test smell

Test Smell	Total	Sample
Unverified Action	1,967	67
Misplaced Precondition	49	5
Misplaced Action	345	8
Misplaced Verification	426	16
Eager Action	2,663	69
Ambiguous Test	2,656	90
Conditional Test	279	9
TOTAL	8,386	264

For each transformation, three authors analyzed and validated whether the tool performed the transformations steps correctly or not, assuming that the transformation itself has been correctly chosen [19]. In eight cases out of 264 occurrences (0.03%), they disagreed. However, the researchers reached a consensus in all cases after discussions. They collected the results in terms of true positives (*TP*)—the smell was corrected—, false positives (*FP*)—the smell was not corrected—, and false negatives (*FN*)—no correction was attempted.

6.2 Results

As results, we achieved the following: a Precision of 86.75%, a Recall of 80.85%, and a F-Measure of 83.70%. Table 4 illustrates our results for each transformation presented in Section 3.

Notice that the *Fill Verification* transformation reached the highest *TP* percentage. On the other hand, the *Separate Action* transformation reached the lowest *TP* percentage. Two extract transformations reached 25% false positive rate: *Extract Action* and *Extract Verification*. Last but not least, the *Separate Action* transformation reached 36.23% false negative rate.

Table 4: TP, FP, and FN per transformation

Transformation	TP %	FP %	FN %
Fill Verification	89.55%	2.99%	7.46%
Extract Precondition	80.00%	0.00%	20.00%
Extract Action	62.50%	25.00%	12.50%
Extract Verification	62.50%	25.00%	12.50%
Separate Actions	50.72%	13.04%	36.23%
Extract Ambiguity	76.67%	12.22%	11.11%
Extract Conditional	77.78%	11.11%	11.11%

6.3 Discussion

After having the results illustrated in Table 4, we performed an in-depth analysis on some of our 264 sample tests to better understand potential problems of our tool.

When there is poor test writing (e.g., wrong phrases, excessive use of special characters, wrong formatting, etc.), the tool malfunctions, mostly adding new special characters and breaking phrases into small ones. Also, in some tests, the special characters led the tool to apply the *Extract Action* and *Extract Verification* in a wrong way. For example, the tool detected the following action as a verification: “*Re-Check release-setting [...]*,” leading the *Extract Verification* transformation to wrongly move the action. Here, spaCy separated “*Re-Check*” in two words, and then the “*Check*” verb was considered as a verification.

As our tool depends on semantic pattern matching coupled with syntax analysis, a transformation that relies on verb placement such as *Separate Actions* is heavily affected by spaCy rules that do not comprehend some cases, such as in the following phrase: “*Select a plugin and configure it by doing click on ‘Configure’*”. In this example, the tool considered “*Configure*” as an action. This way, it created a Step S_i containing only the “*Configure*” word.

To sum up, the results presented in Table 4 provide a comprehensive overview of the effectiveness of each transformation, guiding further refinements and optimizations in our tool.

Answer to RQ₂. Our analysis shows promising tool results, achieving a F-Measure of 83.70%.

6.4 Threats to Validity

As a threat to external validity, we have validated the tool in 264 test smells occurrences, but all the sample is based only on one system (Ubuntu OS). This way, it may be difficult to generalize to other systems. To validate the tool, we performed a manual analysis, which poses threats to internal validity. The subjectivity of the process and the unawareness regarding technical items of the tests may led the authors who performed the manual analysis to disagreements and to commit errors. We minimize this threat by considering three persons to analyze the transformations. All disagreements have reached a consensus.

7 RELATED WORK

Hauptmann *et al.* [10] firstly applied the idea of smells to natural language tests. A set of seven test smells has been proposed and analyzed in real-practice tests. Ten years later, Soares *et al.* [19] complemented the list of natural language test smells with six more. Both works presented techniques to identify the smells. Whilst Hauptmann *et al.* used keywords and metrics, Soares *et al.* used newer NLP-based technologies. However, differently from our work, none of them presented neither transformations nor tools to remove the smells automatically.

Our work is also related to the software requirements field, since some test smells are similar to smells that appear in requirements. For example, Femmer *et al.* [5] define a set of requirements smells from ISO 29148. As an example, they define the *Ambiguous Adverbs and Adjectives* requirement smell, which is quite related to the *Ambiguous Test* smell. Also, Rajkovic and Enou [18] proposed a tool, named NALABS, to identify requirements smells, like *Vagueness*, *Optionality*, and *Subjectivity* (all of them also related to the *Ambiguous Test*). Recently, Fischbach *et al.* [7] implemented a tool to generate a minimal set of test cases to a given set of requirements containing conditionals. The requirement smell explored is very

related to the *Conditional Test*. These works provide tools to identify the requirements smells, but not to remove them automatically as we do in the context of natural language test smells.

Fischbach *et al.* [6] conducted a survey to understand how requirements engineers interpret conditionals in software requirements. The authors found that the conditionals led the engineers to interpret the requirements in an ambiguous way. In our work, we considered an analogous smell, *i.e.*, the *Conditional Test* smell. We also conducted a survey and our results show that the majority of the respondents agrees with our transformation to remove the *Conditional Test* smell.

8 IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

As implications for practitioners, our catalog and tool might provide a standardized and systematic approach to address natural language test smells, promoting consistency in test practices across projects and teams and ensuring that similar issues are addressed uniformly. Also, they can help to improve test quality and maintenance. In addition, our tool avoids repetitive tasks related to identifying and fixing test smells, which provides time and cost savings and could lead practitioners to focus on more complex and valuable aspects of testing. Last but not least, our research could also bring implications for the training and development of software testing professionals. By providing a catalog of transformations along with a tool to remove test smells, we introduce learning resources for understanding what these smells are and how to address them.

For researchers, our catalog represents a step forward towards more research on NLP-based techniques to avoid and remove smells in natural language tests. For instance, researchers can build upon our catalog as a starting point to develop more transformations and improve our propositions. Our work might also be a preliminary benchmark for evaluating and comparing different NLP-based techniques and tools to remove natural language test smells.

9 CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, we introduced a catalog of transformations to remove seven natural language test smells. We assessed the quality of our catalog by recruiting 15 software testing professionals. The professionals found the transformations valuable, which is supported by the high average acceptance rate. We also introduced a tool that implements the catalog. We executed the tool in 264 occurrences of test smells and achieved 83.70% of F-Measure rate.

As future work, we intend to (i) increase the set of transformations to include other smells (*e.g.*, *Tacit Knowledge* [19], *Test Clones* [10], and *Long Test Steps* [10]); and (ii) use Large Language Models (LLMs) to improve the effectiveness of our tool.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was partially funded by CNPq 312195/2021-4, 310313/2022-8, 403361/2023-0, 443393/2023-0, 404825/2023-0, 315840/2023-4, FAPEAL 60030.0000000462/2020, 60030.0000000161/2022, and FAPESB PIE002/2022 grants.

REFERENCES

- [1] Wajdi Aljedaani, Anthony Peruma, Ahmed Aljohani, Mazen Alotaibi, Mohamed Wiem Mkaouer, Ali Ouni, Christian D. Newman, Abdullatif Ghallab,

- and Stephanie Ludi. 2021. Test Smell Detection Tools: A Systematic Mapping Study. In *EASE 2021*. 170–180.
- [2] Diogo Almeida, José Creissac Campos, João Saraiva, and João Carlos Silva. 2015. Towards a catalog of usability smells. In *SAC 2015*. 175–181.
- [3] James E. Bartlett II, Joe W. Kotlik, and Chadwick C. Higgins. 2001. Organizational research: Determining appropriate sample size in survey research. *Information technology, learning, and performance journal* 19, 1 (2001), 43–50.
- [4] Gabriele Bavota, Abdallah Qusef, Rocco Oliveto, Andrea De Lucia, and Dave Binkley. 2015. Are test smells really harmful? an empirical study. *Empirical Software Engineering* 20 (2015), 1052–1094.
- [5] Henning Femmer, Daniel Méndez Fernández, Stefan Wagner, and Sebastian Eder. 2017. Rapid quality assurance with Requirements Smells. *Journal of Systems and Software* 123 (2017), 190–213.
- [6] Jannik Fischbach, Julian Frattini, Daniel Mendez, Michael Unterkalmsteiner, Henning Femmer, and Andreas Vogelsang. 2021. How Do Practitioners Interpret Conditionals in Requirements?. In *PROFES 2021*. 85–102.
- [7] Jannik Fischbach, Julian Frattini, Andreas Vogelsang, Daniel Mendez, Michael Unterkalmsteiner, Andreas Wehrle, Pablo Restrepo Henao, Parisa Yousefi, Tedi Juricic, Jeannette Radduenz, and Carsten Wieher. 2023. Automatic creation of acceptance tests by extracting conditionals from requirements: NLP approach and case study. *Journal of Systems and Software* 197 (2023), 111549.
- [8] Martin Fowler and Kent Beck. 1997. Refactoring: Improving the design of existing code.
- [9] Vahid Garousi and Barış Küçük. 2018. Smells in software test code: A survey of knowledge in industry and academia. *Journal of systems and software* 138 (2018), 52–81.
- [10] Benedikt Hauptmann, Maximilian Junker, Sebastian Eder, Lars Heinemann, Rudolf Vaas, and Peter Braun. 2013. Hunting for smells in natural language tests. In *ICSE 2013*. 1217–1220.
- [11] Benedikt Hauptmann, Maximilian Junker, Sebastian Eder, Elmar Juergens, and Rudolf Vaas. 2012. Can clone detection support test comprehension?. In *ICPC 2012*. 209–218.
- [12] Matthew Honnibal and Ines Montani. 2024. *spaCy – Industrial-strength Natural Language Processing in Python*. <https://spacy.io/>
- [13] Mitchell P. Marcus, Beatrice Santorini, and Mary Ann Marcinkiewicz. 1993. Building a Large Annotated Corpus of English: The Penn Treebank. *Computational Linguistics* 19, 2 (1993), 313–330. <https://aclanthology.org/J93-2004>
- [14] Luana Martins, Heitor Costa, and Ivan Machado. 2023. On the diffusion of test smells and their relationship with test code quality of Java projects. *Journal of Software: Evolution and Process* (2023).
- [15] Luana Martins, Heitor Costa, Márcio Ribeiro, Fabio Palomba, and Ivan Machado. 2023. Automating Test-Specific Refactoring Mining: A Mixed-Method Investigation. In *SCAM 2023*. 13–24.
- [16] Gerard Meszaros. 2006. *XUnit Test Patterns: Refactoring Test Code*. Prentice Hall PTR, USA.
- [17] Joakim Nivre, Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, Filip Ginter, Yoav Goldberg, Jan Hajič, Christopher D. Manning, Ryan McDonald, Slav Petrov, Sampo Pyysalo, Natalia Silveira, Reut Tsarfaty, and Daniel Zeman. 2016. Universal Dependencies v1: A Multilingual Treebank Collection. In *LREC 16*. 1659–1666.
- [18] Kostadin Rajkovic and Eduard Paul Enoiu. 2022. *NALABS: Detecting Bad Smells in Natural Language Requirements and Test Specifications*. Technical Report. Mälardalen Real-Time Research Centre, Mälardalen University. <http://www.es.md.se/publications/6382->
- [19] Elvys Soares, Manoel Aranda, Naelson Oliveira, Márcio Ribeiro, Rohit Gheyi, Emerson Souza, Ivan Machado, André Santos, Balduino Fonseca, and Rodrigo Bonifácio. 2023. Manual Tests Do Smell! Cataloging and Identifying Natural Language Test Smells. In *ESEM 2023*. 1–11.
- [20] Elvys Soares, Márcio Ribeiro, Guilherme Amaral, Rohit Gheyi, Leo Fernandes, Alessandro Garcia, Balduino Fonseca, and André Santos. 2020. Refactoring Test Smells: A Perspective from Open-Source Developers. In *SAST 2020*. 50–59.
- [21] Elvys Soares, Márcio Ribeiro, Rohit Gheyi, Guilherme Amaral, and André Santos. 2023. Refactoring Test Smells With JUnit 5: Why Should Developers Keep Up-to-Date? *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 49, 3 (2023), 1152–1170.
- [22] Davide Spadini, Martin Schvachbacher, Ana-Maria Oprescu, Magiel Bruntink, and Alberto Bacchelli. 2020. Investigating Severity Thresholds for Test Smells. In *MSR 2020*. 311–321.
- [23] Manoel Terceiro, Naelson Oliveira, Elvys Soares, Márcio Ribeiro, Davi Romão, Ulysses Patriota, Rohit Gheyi, Emerson Souza, and Ivan Machado. 2024. *A Catalog of Transformations to Remove Test Smells in Natural Language Tests - Replication Package*. <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.24993906.v1>
- [24] Manoel Terceiro, Naelson Oliveira, Elvys Soares, Márcio Ribeiro, Davi Romão, Ulysses Patriota, Rohit Gheyi, Emerson Souza, and Ivan Machado. 2024. *Manual Test Alchemist*. Retrieved April 19, 2024 from <https://github.com/easy-software-ufal/manual-test-alchemist>
- [25] Ubuntu. 2024. *Ubuntu Manual Tests in Launchpad*. <https://launchpad.net/ubuntu-manual-tests>
- [26] Arie Van Deursen, Leon Moonen, Alex Van Den Bergh, and Gerard Kok. 2001. Refactoring test code. In *XP 2001*. 92–95.