

Combining Neuroevolution with the Search for Novelty to Improve the Generation of Test Inputs for Games

Patric Feldmeier

patric.feldmeier@uni-passau.de
University of Passau
Germany

Gordon Fraser

gordon.fraser@uni-passau.de
University of Passau
Germany

ABSTRACT

As games challenge traditional automated white-box test generators, the NEATEST approach generates test suites consisting of neural networks that exercise the source code by playing the games. NEATEST generates these neural networks using an evolutionary algorithm that is guided by an objective function targeting individual source code statements. This approach works well if the objective function provides sufficient guidance, but deceiving or complex fitness landscapes may inhibit the search. In this paper, we investigate whether the issue of challenging fitness landscapes can be addressed by promoting novel behaviours during the search. Our case study on two SCRATCH games demonstrates that rewarding novel behaviours is a promising approach for overcoming challenging fitness landscapes, thus enabling future research on how to adapt the search algorithms to best use this information.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Software and its engineering → Software testing and debugging; Search-based software engineering; • Computing methodologies → Search methodologies.

KEYWORDS

Neuroevolution, Software Testing, Games, Novelty Search

ACM Reference Format:

Patric Feldmeier and Gordon Fraser. 2024. Combining Neuroevolution with the Search for Novelty to Improve the Generation of Test Inputs for Games. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM International Workshop on Foundations of Applied Software Engineering for Games (FaSE4Games '24)*, July 16, 2024, Porto de Galinhas, Brazil. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 6 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3663532.3664467>

1 INTRODUCTION

In order to generate tests for games automatically, test generators must be able to produce test input sequences capable of reaching a wide variety of game states, such that the observed program behaviour within these states can be checked. However, producing input sequences for advanced program states is hard as games are designed to challenge players with increasingly difficult tasks. Thus,

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.

FaSE4Games '24, July 16, 2024, Porto de Galinhas, Brazil

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-0674-5/24/07

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3663532.3664467>



Figure 1: The *CreateYourWorld* game together with the condition checking if the player has reached the next level by touching the orange portal on the right side of the level.

test generators have to learn to play them to create input sequences capable of reaching advanced program states.

NEATEST tackles these challenges by generating test suites in which every test case is represented by a neural network [12]. Each of these networks serves as a test input generator optimised by an evolutionary search algorithm (i.e., neuroevolution) to reach a specific source code statement reliably, regardless of challenging or randomised program behaviour, by generating input actions for the given game dynamically based on the current program state. The search is guided by an objective function that measures the distance of candidate test executions to program statements the search has yet to reach [10].

Although it is based on the source code, the objective function includes aspects of program states. For instance, consider the *CreateYourWorld* SCRATCH game shown in Fig. 1, where the player, represented by a blue square, is tasked to manoeuvre through various levels by reaching orange portals, such as located on the right side in Fig. 1. The corresponding SCRATCH code shows that the program determines whether the player is eligible to get to the next level by evaluating if the player touches the portal's orange colour. Whenever the player touches the orange portal, they are placed into the next level by changing the scene's background image, resetting the player's location to the left and increasing a variable that keeps track of the current level. Since the if-condition serves as a guard for reaching these three statements, an objective function responsible for optimising test cases to reach one of those statements will compute the *Euclidean distance* between the player and the target location [10]. However, achieving this requires the player to temporarily increase the distance between the player and the portal in order to pass the wall depicted in grey. Although manoeuvring around the wall is necessary to reach the portal, the search will penalise such behaviour as it leads to worse fitness values.

An orthogonal problem faced by objective functions is a lack of guidance. For instance, it is hard to define sensitive objective



Figure 2: The *PokéClicker* game together with two conditions that are evaluated when pressing the *Pokémon* button and responsible for navigating the player to different menus.

functions that measure how close the test generator is to reaching statements guarded by conditions involving non-numerical values such as strings or events like button presses. Take as an example the *PokéClicker* game shown in Fig. 2, in which players can buy various upgrades by spending points they can earn through repeatedly clicking on a Pokéball. Each of these menus consists of two buttons that lead the player to the next or previous menu screen, hosting a plethora of upgrades. As can be seen in the code shown in Fig. 2 that handles such button presses, pressing the same button may lead to different game states indicated by the name of the currently shown menu represented as a string. Since the string distance in this case cannot provide meaningful guidance, the search does not receive feedback on how close an execution came to reaching statements that are guarded by respective conditions. Fitness landscapes that lack guidance or are deceptive harm the search progress and may even render the search unable to find satisfying solutions [8, 20, 22].

In order to overcome deceptive fitness landscapes and those lacking guidance, previous work has suggested abandoning or combining objective functions that measure the performance within a problem domain and instead reward agents that interact with the environment in novel, previously unseen ways [21, 30]. Thus, an agent is not penalised for temporarily increasing the distance to a target location but is instead rewarded for exploring novel areas in the scene and experimenting with UI elements in different ways.

In this paper, we conduct an initial exploration of the integration of novelty search in neuroevolution-based test generation for games by encouraging the optimisation of novel behaviours in NEATEST. To this end, we derive the behaviour of an agent based on the final state reached after an agent interacted with the game and integrate novelty as a secondary fitness criterion in NEATEST. In detail, the contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We propose integrating novelty search into the test generation for games to cope with challenging fitness landscapes.
- We implement the proposed approach as an extension to the publicly available game testing framework NEATEST.
- In a case study on two SCRATCH games, we empirically demonstrate how novelty can help to overcome challenging fitness landscapes.

2 SEARCH-BASED SOFTWARE TESTING FOR GAMES VIA NEUROEVOLUTION

In this paper we investigate combining NEATEST, a test generator for games that uses neuroevolution as a search-based software testing method, with an approach that promotes novel behaviours of evolved solutions. Search-based software testing (SBST) [26] uses meta-heuristic search algorithms, such as evolutionary algorithms, to generate tests for a given application. Based on the chosen representation of viable solutions, search algorithms may be applied to a variety of software testing challenges, such as generating sequences of method calls [4, 15, 37], synthesising inputs for testing GUI applications [16, 25, 33], and optimising calls to REST services [3].

To succeed in this endeavour, the search algorithms must be guided by an objective function f that evaluates how close a generated test is to reaching the optimisation goal. For example, if test cases are to be optimised to reach a specific program statement s , the objective function must determine how close a generated test input sequence comes to reaching the target statement. The target statement counts as covered by the test case t if $f_s(t) = 0$ after executing the test case on the program. Otherwise, if the test case has not covered the target ($f_s(t) > 0$), it is further optimised via search algorithms by minimising the objective function until the statement is covered. A commonly used fitness function is defined by a linear combination of the approach level A and the branch distance B . The approach level measures how close an executed test case in the control dependence graph (CDG) [9] is from executing the control location on which the target branch depends. The branch distance is evaluated at the control location where a path through the program is taken that makes the execution of s impossible, and heuristically computes how far the predicate of the control location is from obtaining the opposite value that paves the way towards reaching s . For example, suppose that a predicate evaluated to *true* during the execution of a test case t , the branch distance computes the distance towards evaluating the same predicate to *false*.

Based on these two metrics, we define the objective function $f_s(t) = A_p(t) + \omega(B_p(t))$ that measures the distance of an executed test case t to the targeted statement s by applying the normalisation function ω to the branch distance B . This normalisation function $w : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$ maps the branch distance to values lower than 1 in order to guarantee that the approach level defined as an integer is weighted more important than the branch distance [1].

We consider games written in the SCRATCH [23] programming language, which is a block-based programming language that helps young students in learning to program. Each SCRATCH program consists of *Sprites* representing figures in the game, similar to *Game Objects* in *Unity* [17], and a *Stage* that sets the scene on top of which the *Sprites* act. The program logic is implemented by arranging and combining blocks that represent programming statements into scripts. These scripts are added to *Sprites* to model their behaviour or to the *Stage* to implement general properties of the scene. SCRATCH programs can be tested using the WHISKER [35] framework. WHISKER maps Boolean predicates such as the one shown in the code snippet of Fig. 1 to branch distance measurements based on the underlying program state (e.g., the distance between the current sprite and the closest pixel with the chosen target colour) [10].

NEATEST [12] extends WHISKER to tackle the many challenges of game testing by generating dynamic test suites. Within these test suites, each test case corresponds to a direct policy neural network agent optimised to reach a targeted program state by generating test-inputs for the program dynamically based on the current state of the program. To guarantee that the optimised network agents are robust against program randomisation, NEATEST only counts a target statement s as covered if the agent passes a robustness check that validates whether the agent is able to reach the targeted statement repeatedly in several randomised program executions. If a statement is covered reliably and passes the robustness check, the search proceeds with optimising networks for the next statement s using the objective function $f_s(t)$. This objective function is independent of the game being tested, which allows NEATEST to implicitly learn to win or lose games in different ways without requiring any domain-specific knowledge, such as the high score achieved or the time survived. Target statements are selected by querying the (CDG) [9] for statements that are direct children of already covered program statements, allowing NEATEST to apply a variation of *Curriculum Learning* [5] where the game is explored iteratively by seeding initial generations with prior solutions.

For a chosen target statement, NEATEST optimises networks via the neuroevolution algorithm NEAT [36] that applies evolutionary search operators over many generations in order to explore the search space of viable solutions. Evolutionary algorithms are inspired by Darwinian evolution as new generations are evolved by first selecting parents based on their achieved fitness value that is derived from a pre-defined fitness function such as the one defined above. The selected parents are then evolved using mutation and crossover operators. Within the NEAT algorithm, mutations introduce probabilistic variation by extending a network's topological structure or by changing attributes of existing genes such as the weights of a network. Crossover forms a single child from two parents by combining the genes of both parents. Selecting parents only based on their performance within their problem domain, might stall the search progress since in some scenarios temporarily decreasing the achieved fitness value might be a necessary step towards reaching a satisfying solution [8, 20, 22].

3 COMBINING TEST GENERATION FOR GAMES WITH THE SEARCH FOR NOVELTY

Novelty search algorithms behave like other evolutionary search algorithms [2, 15] as they repeatedly apply selection, mutation and crossover operations on their individuals to form new generations. However, instead of using an objective function that measures how close an individual is to finding a solution, novelty search algorithms evaluate individuals based on the novelty of their behaviour [21, 30]. To this end, a novelty metric is defined that operates within the space of feasible behaviours to measure the distance between an individual's behaviour and already observed behaviours collected in an archive. The novelty score $n(t)$ of an individual t is commonly computed using the k -nearest neighbours algorithm $n(t) = 1/k \sum_{i=0}^k d(x, \mu_i)$, with μ_i representing the i -th nearest neighbour of t with respect to the distance metric $d : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. This metric aims to capture behavioural differences between two individuals in the domain-specific behaviour space. For instance,

in a two-dimensional maze navigation task, the behaviour space might be defined by all coordinates that are reachable within the maze. Since high novelty scores point to behaviours in that have not been explored thoroughly, the resulting novelty-based fitness function expresses a gradient toward behavioural difference that puts constant pressure on discovering novel solutions and avoids deceptive fitness landscapes [8, 20, 22].

There are many different possibilities of how to integrate novelty metrics into search algorithms. For our initial investigation, we integrate novelty in NEATEST as a secondary fitness criterion such that the novelty acts as a tiebreaker between individuals that have performed equally well according to the objective function. For example, during selection individuals with identical fitness values are ranked based on their novelty scores. The behaviour of an evolved neural network is derived from the program state reached after executing the network agent within the problem domain.

Since NEATEST aims to generalise to any game regardless of its genre, we avoid extracting genre-specific game states such as the coordinates in a maze navigation task. Instead, we extract the same features from the game NEATEST already uses as an input signal to the networks. Although we define the state features from which observed behaviour is defined from SCRATCH games in this work, this approach also generalises to other programming environments. State features are extracted by iterating over all *visible* figures on the game screen while deriving the following attributes from corresponding *Sprites* that are bounded by the SCRATCH environment [23] and normalised into the range $[0, 1]$:

- **Position** defined by 2-dim coordinates $a \in [-240, 240]$ and $b \in [-180, 180]$ on a 2-dim game canvas.
- **Heading direction** defined by an angle $\alpha \in [-180, 180]$.
- **Costume** of a figure defined by the index $i \in N$ over the list of available costumes if the figure changes its appearance.
- **Size** of a figure defined by the size (%) of the selected costume.
- **Private variable** values $v \in \mathbb{R}$ for each numeric variable.
- **Distance** $d \in [-600, 600]$ to a sprite or colour if the figure contains listeners for touching other sprites or colours.

Besides attributes specific to visible figures, we also collect global variables that host numeric values ($v \in \mathbb{R}$) and the mouse position ($a \in [-240, 240]$, $b \in [-180, 180]$) if the game contains code that listens to the position of the mouse.

In order to calculate the distance d between two observed behaviours, we compute the *cosine similarity* over both behaviours after arranging them into feature vectors in which every index corresponds to a specific state feature [18]. The output space of the *cosine similarity* function \cos is restricted to the interval $[-1, 1]$, where two parallel vectors have a similarity of 1, two orthogonal vectors a similarity of 0, and two opposite vectors a similarity of -1. However, for our application scenario, we normalise the obtained similarity score d_{\cos} via $d_{\cos} = (d_{\cos} + 1)/2$. This normalisation step outputs a similarity score of 0 if the vectors represent opposite states, 0.5 if they are orthogonal to each other and 1 if they are the same. Finally, since NEATEST is modelled as a maximisation task, and we want to reward low degrees of similarity, we invert the obtained similarity score by subtracting it from one, which results in the formula $d_{\cos} = 1 - ((\cos(s_1, s_2) + 1)/2)$ for computing the similarity distance between two observed game states s_1 and s_2 .




Figure 3: Achieved coverage of NEATEST and the proposed novelty approach over both dataset games.

4 CASE STUDY

Our case study analyses whether the neuroevolution-based generation of test cases benefits from promoting novel behaviours. To this end, we extend NEATEST, which is part of the open-source WHISKER testing framework [10] with a novelty score integrated into the test generator as a secondary fitness criterion as explained in Section 3. The effect of adding novelty-rewarding mechanisms to the search is evaluated by comparing the achieved coverage of the default NEATEST algorithm (*Fitness*) against our proposed approach (*Fitness+Novelty*). In addition, we compute the *Vargha and Delaney* effect size (A_{12}) [38] between the two approaches and determine statistical significance based on the *Mann-Whitney-U* test [24] using a significance threshold of 0.05. To account for randomisation inherent to neuroevolution, both algorithm configurations are executed ten times against our two case study SCRATCH games.

Both games correspond to a different genre of which we hypothesise that NEATEST might suffer from challenging fitness landscapes: maze navigation (*CreateYourWorld*) and clicker games (*PokéClicker*). *CreateYourWorld* was extracted from an introductory tutorial¹ while *PokéClicker* was gathered by searching for the clicker genre on the SCRATCH website² and sorting the results by popularity. Although the case study games are implemented in SCRATCH, they nevertheless represent games that may also be found online as web games.

All experiments were conducted on a computing cluster consisting of AMD Epic 7443P CPU cores with a clock frequency of 2.85GHz. In order to reduce the time required for evaluating network agents in the problem domain, we make use of WHISKER’s test execution acceleration and update the game state as fast as the employed CPU cores can process action events that are sent to the game by the test generator. Similar to previous research, we only count a statement as covered if the test generator is able to reach the same target in ten randomised program executions [12, 13]. Every network is allowed to play the game until it reaches a game over state, wins the game or has played the game for five seconds,




Figure 4: Achieved coverage over time of NEATEST and the proposed novelty approach for the PokéClicker game.

which corresponds to a much higher game time due to the employed program acceleration. In our experiments, NEATEST evolves a population of 150 networks using speciation coefficients, as well as mutation and crossover probabilities that have shown to work well in the SCRATCH domain, according to previous work [13]. We use a search duration of ten hours since challenging landscapes may only be encountered after some time has passed. To avoid penalising novel discoveries, we add observed behaviours with a probability of 0.1 to the behaviour archive regardless of their novelty score. This probability is chosen together with a k value of 15 for the k nearest neighbour algorithm as it has shown to produce promising results in previous work [19, 22].

4.1 Threats to Validity

The evaluation uses two SCRATCH games for which we hypothesised that the search would benefit from promoting novelty in order to evaluate the effect of integrating novelty strategies into NEATEST. In future work, we seek to extend the dataset by sampling games without this bias to confirm that the results generalise. We mitigate the effects of randomisation inherent to the neuroevolution algorithm by repeating every experiment ten times and determining statistical significance using the *Mann-Whitney-U* test [24]. We use block coverage as a proxy to measure the effectiveness of an evolved test suite. However, block coverage must be treated with caution in SCRATCH as high coverage values may already be achieved by simply starting the game.

4.2 Results

As shown in Fig. 3, our study on two games involving challenging fitness landscapes reveals that NEATEST benefits from integrating novelty search in the neuroevolution algorithm with an increase in average program coverage to 82.73% and 47.99% from 79.52% and 45.79% for the games *CreateYourWorld* and *PokéClicker*, respectively.

In the *PokéClicker* game shown in Fig. 2, high program coverage may be achieved by navigating through the many menus of this

¹[March2024]: <https://codeclub.org/en/>

²[March 2024]: <https://scratch.mit.edu>




Figure 5: Achieved coverage over time of NEATEST and the proposed novelty approach for the CreateYourWorld game.

game effectively by pressing buttons in these menus at different game states. However, since many conditions in this game compare two strings against each other, the objective function cannot give the search any guidance towards reaching statements guarded by the respective conditions. Thus, most individuals get assigned the same fitness value regardless of how they interact with the game. As indicated by the coverage plateau in Fig. 4, which NEATEST encounters after around one hour, this lack of guidance affects the search negatively. In contrast, analysing the achieved coverage over time for the novelty approach, we can observe that adding novelty as a secondary fitness criterion helps overcome this plateau by selecting promising parents to evolve in the presence of many similarly rated individuals. Especially after around five to six hours, we can observe an enormous increase in the achieved program coverage. This is very likely a point within the search at which the selection pressure increases dramatically toward novel behaviours due to the behaviour archive being filled with many common behaviours.

A significant ($p < 0.01$) increase in coverage from 79.52% to 82.73% and an effect size of 0.85 can be observed for the *CreateYourWorld* game. To shed more light on this observation, we analysed how often each algorithm configuration was able to reach the next level in this maze navigation game by touching the orange portal depicted in Fig. 1. While NEATEST overcomes the grey wall separating the player and the orange door only in 7/10 cases, our proposed novelty-based approach manages to reach the next level in every experiment repetition. As depicted in Fig. 5, the novelty search approach reaches the next level relatively early in the search, after around two hours, allowing the test generator to explore more parts of the game and reach much higher program coverage.

Overall, our case study demonstrates that integrating novelty search into the optimisation of tests for games is a promising approach to overcome deceptive fitness landscapes encountered in maze navigation tasks. Furthermore, adding the novelty score as an additional fitness criterion has been shown to assist the search in scenarios with poor optimisation gradients, as frequently encountered in games that involve many menus, such as clicker games.

5 RELATED WORK

To this day, most video games are tested manually [11, 14] or use semi-automated testing approaches [7, 31, 34]. However, since games are commonly built incrementally, both approaches are not only time-consuming but also expensive and error-prone, as testers have to re-validate the same program in updated program versions repeatedly [29, 32]. Various approaches for generating tests automatically have been proposed, such as combining reinforcement learning with computer vision techniques [28], employing evolutionary search to find simulation traces [6] or combining reinforcement learning with evolutionary algorithms and multi-objective optimisation [40]. To tackle the challenges of heavy program randomisation inherent to games, NEATEST evolves test cases in the form of neural networks that produce input sequences dynamically based on the current state of the program [12]. NEATEST has been previously improved using gradient descent [13] for mutation. In this work, we extend NEATEST with the search for novel solutions to cope with challenging fitness landscapes.

Novelty search has previously been combined with neuroevolution to escape deceptive fitness landscapes in various tasks [21, 22, 30]. Since abandoning the actual objective may be too harsh in many scenarios, previous research has investigated combining novelty-based and objective-based fitness functions via multi-objective evolutionary algorithms using *Pareto dominance* [39] to sort the population [27]. While we aim to promote the search for novel solutions to reach a wide variety of states within a game for testing purposes, previous work has used novelty search to reach a specific goal within an environment, like winning a game or navigating through a maze. To the best of our knowledge, applying novelty search for testing games has not been explored previously.

6 CONCLUSIONS

Test generators for games must be capable of producing test inputs that explore many areas of a game while also solving game objectives in order to reach advanced program states. NEATEST tackles the challenges of generating tests for games by optimising test cases using an objective function that minimises the distance towards reaching yet uncovered program statements. Since this objective function might not produce good guidance for the search in specific scenarios, this work explores extending NEATEST with a secondary fitness criterion that rewards novel test behaviour. A case study on two SCRATCH games demonstrates that novelty search may be a promising approach to overcome challenging fitness landscapes, as it can help to increase the achieved program coverage.

In the future, we aim to evaluate different approaches of extending NEATEST with novelty search, such as casting the problem of evolving diverse suites for games into a multi-objective optimisation task [27]. Furthermore, we envision using novelty search to improve the test generator’s fault detection capability by evolving multiple test cases for the same program state that exhibit different behaviours and thus test the same state in different ways.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by DFG project FR2955/3-1 “TENDER-BLOCK: Testing, Debugging, and Repairing Block-based Programs”. The authors are responsible for this publication’s content.

REFERENCES

- [1] Andrea Arcuri. 2010. It Does Matter How You Normalise the Branch Distance in Search Based Software Testing. In *Proceedings of the 2010 Third International Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation (ICST'10)*. IEEE, 205–214. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICST.2010.17>
- [2] Andrea Arcuri. 2018. Test Suite Generation With the Many Independent Objective (MIO) Algorithm. *Information and Software Technology* 104 (2018), 195–206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2018.05.003>
- [3] Andrea Arcuri. 2019. RESTful API Automated Test Case Generation with EvoMaster. *Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM'19)* 28, 1 (2019), 1–37. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3293455>
- [4] Luciano Baresi, Pier Luca Lanzi, and Matteo Miraz. 2010. TestFul: An Evolutionary Test Approach for Java. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation (ICST'10)*. IEEE, 185–194. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICST.2010.54>
- [5] Yoshua Bengio, Jérôme Louradour, Ronan Collobert, and Jason Weston. 2009. Curriculum Learning. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML'09)*. ACM, 41–48. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1553374.1553380>
- [6] Rodrigo Casamayor, Lorena Arcega, Francisca Pérez, and Carlos Cetina. 2022. Bug Localization In Game Software Engineering: Evolving Simulations to Locate Bugs in Software Models of Video Games. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems (MODELS'22)*. ACM, 356–366. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3550355.3552440>
- [7] Chang-Sik Cho, Kang-Min Sohn, Chang-Jun Park, and Ji-Hoon Kang. 2010. On-line Game Testing using Scenario-Based Control of Massive Virtual Users. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Advanced Communication Technology (ICACT'10)*, Vol. 2. IEEE, 1676–1680.
- [8] Steffen Christensen and Franz Oppacher. 2007. Solving the Artificial Ant on the Santa Fe Trail Problem in 20,696 Fitness Evaluations. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation (GECCO'07)*. ACM, 1574–1579. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1276958.1277275>
- [9] Ron Cytron, Jeanne Ferrante, Barry K Rosen, Mark N Wegman, and F Kenneth Zadeck. 1991. Efficiently computing static single assignment form and the control dependence graph. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems (TOPLAS)* 13, 4 (1991), 451–490.
- [10] Adina Deiner, Patrick Feldmeier, Gordon Fraser, Sebastian Schweikl, and Wengran Wang. 2023. Automated Test Generation for Scratch Programs. *Empirical Software Engineering* 28, 3 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-022-10255-x>
- [11] Heather Desurvire, Martin Caplan, and Jozsef A. Toth. 2004. Using Heuristics to Evaluate the Playability of Games. In *Proceedings of the Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA'04)*. ACM, 1509–1512. <https://doi.org/10.1145/985921.986102>
- [12] Patric Feldmeier and Gordon Fraser. 2022. Neuroevolution-Based Generation of Tests and Oracles for Games. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE'22)*. ACM, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3551349.3556939>
- [13] Patric Feldmeier and Gordon Fraser. 2023. Learning by Viewing: Generating Test Inputs for Games by Integrating Human Gameplay Traces in Neuroevolution. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference (GECCO'23)*. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3588313.3590448>
- [14] Xavier Ferre, Angelica de Antonio, Ricardo Imbert, and Nelson Medinilla. 2009. Playability Testing of Web-Based Sport Games with Older Children and Teenagers. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction (HCI'09)*. Springer, 315–324. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-02583-9_35
- [15] Gordon Fraser and Andrea Arcuri. 2011. EvoSuite: Automatic Test Suite Generation for Object-Oriented Software. In *Proceedings of the 19th Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (ESEC/FSE'11)*. ACM, 416–419. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2025113.2025179>
- [16] Florian Gross, Gordon Fraser, and Andreas Zeller. 2012. Search-Based System Testing: High Coverage, No False Alarms. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis (ISSTA'12)*. ACM, 67–77. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2338965.2336762>
- [17] John K Haas. 2014. A History of the Unity Game Engine. *Diss. Worcester Polytechnic Institute* 483, 2014 (2014), 484.
- [18] Shuai Hao, Bin Liu, Suman Nath, William GJ Halfond, and Ramesh Govindan. 2014. PUMA: Programmable UI-Automation for Large-Scale Dynamic Analysis of Mobile Apps. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Mobile Systems, Applications, and Services (MobiSys '14)*. ACM, 204–217. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2594368.2594390>
- [19] Ethan C. Jackson and Mark Daley. 2019. Novelty Search for Deep Reinforcement Learning Policy Network Weights by Action Sequence Edit Metric Distance. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference Companion (GECCO'19)*. ACM, 173–174. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3319619.3321956>
- [20] William B Langdon and Riccardo Poli. 1998. Why Ants are Hard. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference on Genetic Programming*. IEEE, 193–201.
- [21] Joel Lehman and Kenneth O. Stanley. 2010. Efficiently Evolving Programs Through the Search for Novelty. In *Proceedings of the 12th Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation (GECCO'10)*. ACM, 837–844. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1830483.1830638>
- [22] Joel Lehman, Kenneth O Stanley, et al. 2008. Exploiting Open-Endedness to Solve Problems Through the Search for Novelty. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on the Synthesis and Simulation of Living Systems (ALIFE'08)*. MIT Press, 329–336.
- [23] John Maloney, Mitchel Resnick, Natalie Rusk, Brian Silverman, and Evelyn Eastmond. 2010. The Scratch Programming Language and Environment. *ACM Transactions on Computing Education (TOCE'10)* 10, 4 (2010), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1868358.1868363>
- [24] Henry B Mann and Donald R Whitney. 1947. On a Test of Whether One of Two Random Variables is Stochastically Larger than the Other. *The annals of mathematical statistics* (1947), 50–60.
- [25] Ke Mao, Mark Harman, and Yue Jia. 2016. Sapienz: Multi-Objective Automated Testing for Android Applications. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis (ISSTA'16)*, 94–105. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2931037.2931054>
- [26] Phil McMinn. 2004. Search-based software test data generation: a survey. *Software testing, Verification and reliability* 14, 2 (2004), 105–156.
- [27] Jean-Baptiste Mouret. 2011. Novelty-based Multiobjectivization. In *New Horizons in Evolutionary Robotics: Extended Contributions from the 2009 EvoDeRob Workshop*. Springer, 139–154. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-18272-3_10
- [28] Ciprian Paduraru, Miruna Paduraru, and Alin Stefanescu. 2021. Automated Game Testing Using Computer Vision Methods. In *2021 36th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering Workshops (ASEW'21)*. IEEE, 65–72. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASEW52652.2021.00024>
- [29] Cristiano Politowski, Fabio Petrillo, and Yann-Gaël Guéhéneuc. 2021. A Survey of Video Game Testing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automation of Software Test (AST'21)*. IEEE, 90–99. <https://doi.org/10.1109/AST52587.2021.00018>
- [30] Sebastian Risi, Sandy D. Vanderbleek, Charles E. Hughes, and Kenneth O. Stanley. 2009. How Novelty Search Escapes the Deceptive Trap of Learning to Learn. In *Proceedings of the 11th Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation (GECCO'09)*. ACM, 153–160. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1569901.1569923>
- [31] Christopher Schaefer, Hyunsook Do, and Brian M Slator. 2013. Crusinator: A framework Towards Game-Independent Testing. In *Proceedings of the 28th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE'13)*. IEEE, 726–729. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE.2013.6693143>
- [32] Charles P Schultz and Robert Denton Bryant. 2016. *Game testing: All in one*. Mercury Learning and Information.
- [33] Leon Sell, Michael Auer, Christoph Frädlich, Michael Gruber, Philemon Werli, and Gordon Fraser. 2019. An Empirical Evaluation of Search Algorithms for App Testing. In *Testing Software and Systems (ICTSS'19)*. Springer, 123–139. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-31280-0_8
- [34] Adam Smith, Mark Nelson, and Michael Mateas. 2009. Computational Support for Play Testing Game Sketches. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Interactive Digital Entertainment (AIIDE'09)*, Vol. 5. 167–172. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aiide.v5i1.12368>
- [35] Andreas Stahlbauer, Marvin Kreis, and Gordon Fraser. 2019. Testing Scratch Programs Automatically. In *Proceedings of the Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (ESEC/FSE 2019)*. ACM, 165–175. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3338906.3338910>
- [36] Kenneth O Stanley and Risto Miikkilainen. 2002. Evolving Neural Networks Through Augmenting Topologies. *Evolutionary Computation* 10, 2 (2002), 99–127. <https://doi.org/10.1162/106365602320169811>
- [37] Paolo Tonella. 2004. Evolutionary Testing of Classes. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis (ISSTA'04)*. ACM, 119–128. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1007512.1007528>
- [38] András Vargha and Harold D Delaney. 2000. A Critique and Improvement of the CL Common Language Effect Size Statistics of McGraw and Wong. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics* 25, 2 (2000), 101–132. <https://doi.org/10.3102/10769986025002101>
- [39] Mark Voorneveld. 2003. Characterization of Pareto Dominance. *Operations Research Letters* 31, 1 (2003), 7–11. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-6377\(02\)00189-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-6377(02)00189-X)
- [40] Yan Zheng, Xiaofei Xie, Ting Su, Lei Ma, Jianye Hao, Zhaopeng Meng, Yang Liu, Ruimin Shen, Yingfeng Chen, and Changjie Fan. 2019. Wuji: Automatic Online Combat Game Testing Using Evolutionary Deep Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE'10)*. IEEE, 772–784. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE.2019.00077>

Received 2024-03-28; accepted 2024-04-26