

# FAUXPY: A Fault Localization Tool for Python

Mohammad Rezaalipour and Carlo A. Furia

Software Institute – USI Università della Svizzera italiana  
Lugano, Switzerland  
{rezaam, furia}@usi.ch

**Abstract**—This paper presents FAUXPY, a fault localization tool for Python programs. FAUXPY supports seven well-known fault localization techniques in four families: spectrum-based, mutation-based, predicate switching, and stack trace fault localization. It is implemented as plugin of the popular Pytest testing framework, but also works with tests written for Unittest and Hypothesis (two other popular testing frameworks). The paper showcases how to use FAUXPY on two illustrative examples, and then discusses its main features and capabilities from a user’s perspective. To demonstrate that FAUXPY is applicable to analyze Python projects of realistic size, the paper also summarizes the results of an extensive experimental evaluation that applied FAUXPY to 135 real-world bugs from the BUGSINPY curated collection. To our knowledge, FAUXPY is the first open-source fault localization tool for Python that supports multiple fault localization families.

**Index Terms**—Fault Localization, Python, Debugging

## I. INTRODUCTION

Starting from around the 1990s [1], there has been a growing interest in automated *fault localization* techniques for programs, which spurred the development of increasingly sophisticated and effective techniques. Nowadays, fault localization techniques are widely used both on their own, and as components of more complex (dynamic) program analyses—for example, as ingredients of automated program repair.

Like with every program analysis technique, practical adoption of fault localization critically requires that reusable, flexible *tool* implementations are available, so that trying out new research ideas and applications does not require to re-implement from scratch techniques that are already known to work. Somewhat unexpectedly, however, the lion’s share of work in fault localization targets languages like C and Java (as we discuss in Sec. V); in contrast, there is comparatively little work—and, most important, barely any available tools—for the popular Python programming language.

To address this deficiency, this paper describes FAUXPY (read: “foh pie”): a fault localization tool for Python. To our knowledge, FAUXPY is the only available Python fault localization tool that supports multiple fault localization families (spectrum based, mutation based, stack-trace based, and predicate switching). The immediate motivation for implementing FAUXPY was to carry out a large scale empirical study of fault localization in Python, which we describe in a separate paper [2]. Nevertheless, we designed and implemented FAUXPY with the broader goal of making it a flexible, reusable stand-alone tool for all applications of fault localization in Python.

```
1 def equilateral_area(side):
2     const = math.sqrt(3) / 4
3     if side == 1:
4         return const
5     term = math.pow(side, 2)
6     area = const + term      # bug
7     return area
```

Listing 1: Python function `equilateral_area` computes the area of an equilateral triangle given its side length; this implementation has a bug at line 6.

The current paper presents, focusing on the user’s perspective, the tool FAUXPY, some of its concrete usage scenarios (Sec. II), and its main features and implementation (Sec. III). FAUXPY supports seven fault localization techniques, and two localization granularities (statement and function); it can use tests written for the most popular Python unit testing frameworks such as Pytest and Unittest; it can be extended with support for new techniques. To demonstrate that FAUXPY is applicable to real-world projects, we also summarize some of the results of our recent empirical study [2] that used it. As we detail in Sec. VI, FAUXPY is available as open source. A short demo of FAUXPY is available at <https://youtu.be/O4T7w-U8rZE>.

## II. USING FAUXPY

This section overviews using FAUXPY on two simple examples, from the perspective of Moe—a nondescript user.

### A. Spectrum-based and Mutation-based Fault Localization

To practice programming in Python, Moe has implemented function `equilateral_area` in Lst. 1. The function takes as input the length `side` of an equilateral triangle’s side, and returns its area computed using the formula  $side^2 \times \sqrt{3}/4$ . Unfortunately, Moe inadvertently introduced a bug<sup>1</sup> on line 6, which sums variables `const` and `term` instead of *multiplying* them. Fortunately, the bug does not go unnoticed thanks to the tests that Moe also wrote (see Lst. 2); in particular, the assertion in test `test_ea_fail` fails, indicating that `equilateral_area` does not work as intended.

To help him debug `equilateral_area`, Moe runs our fault localization tool FAUXPY. All fault localization techniques implemented by FAUXPY are *dynamic* (i.e., based on tests); therefore, Moe points FAUXPY to the location of `equilateral_area`’s implementation, as well as of its *tests*.

Work partially supported by SNF grant 200021-182060 (Hi-Fi).

<sup>1</sup>In the paper, we use the terms “fault” and “bug” as synonyms.

```

8 def test_ea_fail():
9     area = equilateral_area(side=3)
10    assert area == pytest.approx(9 * math.sqrt(3) / 4)
11
12 def test_ea_pass():
13     area = equilateral_area(side=1)
14     assert area == pytest.approx(math.sqrt(3) / 4)

```

Listing 2: Tests for function `equilateral_area` in Lst. 1. Library function `pytest.approx` checks equality of floating points within some tolerance.

By default, `FAUXPY` performs spectrum-based fault localization (SBFL)—a family of widely used fault localization techniques based on the idea of comparing program traces (“spectra”) of passing and failing runs of a program. `FAUXPY` currently supports three techniques (DStar [3], Ochiai [4], Tarantula [5]) that belong to the SBFL family; since they only differ in the formula used to aggregate the information about traces, `FAUXPY` reports the output for all SBFL techniques with a single analysis run.

SBFL runs quite fast, taking only 0.3 seconds on this example. The output, like for every fault localization technique, is a list of program locations (identified by line numbers) ranked by their *suspiciousness score*; the absolute value of the suspiciousness score does not matter, what matters is the *rank* of a location: the higher its rank, the more likely the location is implicated with the failure triggered by the tests. As shown in Tab. I, all three SBFL techniques correctly assign the top rank to the fault location (line 6 in Lst. 1); however, they also assign the top rank to some nearby locations (lines 5 and 7) which tie the faulty location’s suspiciousness score. This example highlights a fundamental limitation of SBFL techniques: since they compare traces in different executions, they cannot distinguish between locations that are in the same basic block (a portion of code without branches).

Mutation-based fault localization (MBFL) techniques use a different approach, which is capable of distinguishing between locations in the same basic block. As the name suggests, MBFL techniques are based on mutation testing: given a program to analyze, they generate many different *mutants*—syntactic mutations obtained by systematically applying a number of mutation operators. The intuition is that if mutating the code at a certain program location changes the program behavior (a test passes on the original program and fails on the mutant, or vice versa), then the program location is likely to be implicated with the fault.

To run MBFL with `FAUXPY`, Moe simply adds the option `--family mbfl`. `FAUXPY` currently supports two techniques (Metallaxis [6] and Muse [7]) that belong to the MBFL family; just like for SBFL techniques, a single analysis run of `FAUXPY` computes the output of both MBFL techniques. MBFL is notoriously time consuming; in fact, it takes 15.9 seconds on Lst. 1’s example (over 50 times longer than SBFL). As shown in Tab. I, the two MBFL techniques achieve quite different results despite using the same 32 mutants for analysis: Muse is very accurate, as it singles out line 6 as the most suspicious location; Metallaxis also ranks it at the top, but together with

```

15 def isosceles_area(leg, base):
16     def height():
17         t1, t2 = math.pow(base, 2), math.pow(leg, 2) / 4 # bug
18         return math.sqrt(t1 - t2)
19
20     area = 0.5 * base * height()
21     return area

```

Listing 3: Python function `isosceles_area` computes the area of an isosceles triangle given its `leg` and `base` lengths; this implementation has a bug at line 17.

```

22 def test_ia_crash():
23     area = isosceles_area(leg=9, base=4)
24     assert area == pytest.approx(2 * math.sqrt(77))
25
26 def test_ia_pass():
27     area = isosceles_area(leg=4, base=4)
28     assert area == pytest.approx(2 * math.sqrt(12))

```

Listing 4: Tests for function `isosceles_area` in Lst. 3. Library function `pytest.approx` checks equality of floating points within some tolerance.

two other locations that are not responsible for the fault.

### B. Stack Trace and Predicate Switching Fault Localization

`FAUXPY` supports two other fault-localization families: stack-trace (ST [8]) fault localization and predicate switching (PS [9]).<sup>2</sup> Moe tries them out on `equilateral_area` but the results are disappointing: both techniques return the empty list of locations, meaning that they could not gather any evidence of suspiciousness. The reason for ST’s failure in this case is quite obvious: ST analyzes the stack trace dumped after a program *crash* (usually, an uncaught exception); since all tests in Lst. 2 terminate without crashing, ST is completely ineffective on this example.

In order to try an example where ST may stand a chance, Moe considers another little Python program he wrote: function `isosceles_area` returns the area of an isosceles triangle computed as  $base/2 \times \sqrt{leg^2 - base^2/4}$ .<sup>3</sup> The implementation in Lst. 3 erroneously swaps `base` and `leg`; thus, when executing test `test_ia_crash`, expression `t1 - t2` in Lst. 3 evaluates to a negative number, which crashes the program with an uncaught `ValueError` exception raised by `math.sqrt`.

Executing `FAUXPY` with option `--family st` on Lst. 3’s example terminates quickly (around 0.1 seconds) and ranks the three locations 16, 17, 18 as top suspiciousness. Even this simple example showcases ST’s key features: first, it is usually very fast, since it does not have to collect any information other than the stack trace of crashing tests. Second, it can be quite effective with crashing bugs (after all, the fault location 17 is ranked at the top), but fundamentally operates at the level of whole *functions*: a stack trace reports the list of functions that were active when the program crashed; hence, ST fault localization cannot distinguish between the suspiciousness of locations that belong to the same function (height in the

<sup>2</sup>Unlike SBFL and MBFL, there is only one implementation of ST and one of PS—hence, ST and PS denote both families and individual techniques.

<sup>3</sup>The *legs* of an isosceles triangle are the two sides of equal length; the third side is called *base*.

EXAMPLE		MBFL		SBFL			PS	ST
		Metallaxis	Muse	DStar	Ochiai	Tarantula		
Lst. 1	TIME [seconds]	15.9		0.3			1.2	0.2
	TOP-RANK LOCATIONS	3 5 <b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	5, <b>6</b> , 7	5, <b>6</b> , 7	5, <b>6</b> , 7	–	–
Lst. 3	TIME [seconds]	18.4		0.1			0.2	0.1
	TOP-RANK LOCATIONS	<b>17</b> , 18, 20	<b>17</b> , 18, 20	16, <b>17</b> , 18, 20	16, <b>17</b> , 18, 20	16, <b>17</b> , 18, 20	–	16, <b>17</b> , 18

TABLE I: A summary of running FAUXPY on the two examples in Lst. 1 (`equilateral_area`) and Lst. 3 (`isosceles_area`). For each fault localization technique (grouped by family), the table reports the running TIME of FAUXPY in seconds, and the program locations (line numbers) with the highest suspiciousness (TOP-RANK). A colored background **highlights** the actual location of the bug in each example. Since the running time of all techniques in a family is the same, it is only reported once per family.

example, which consists of three lines). Still, on this example, ST is a bit more accurate than SBFL (which also ranks line 20 in the top position), and arguably somewhat better than MBFL (which also reports three locations at the top rank, but one of them is line 20, which is the call location of `height`, and hence not really responsible for the fault). The running time of ST and SBFL is practically indistinguishable on this simple example; in general, however, SBFL takes more time than ST because the latter only runs failing tests and does not require any *tracing* when executing the tests. As usual, MBFL takes considerably longer (18.4 seconds) to generate several mutants (48 mutants) and to execute all tests on each mutant.

As a last experiment of FAUXPY’s capabilities, Moe runs PS fault localization on `isosceles_area`. Just like on `equilateral_area`, PS fails to localize the bug and returns an empty list of locations. Once again, the program features explain why these examples are a poor match for PS’s capabilities. As the name suggests, PS is based on the idea of *forcefully changing* the outcome of a program conditional branch dynamically during different test executions; the intuition is that if switching a *predicate* (branch condition) turns a failing test into a passing one, then the predicate may be responsible for the fault. Clearly, if a program has no conditionals (like `isosceles_area`), or its conditionals are unrelated to the locations of failure (like `equilateral_area`), PS is unlikely to be of any help to locate the bug.

### III. FAUXPY’S ARCHITECTURE AND IMPLEMENTATION

FAUXPY is an automated fault localization tool for Python. The current version of FAUXPY supports seven fault localization techniques in four families: the spectrum-based (SBFL) techniques DStar [3], Ochiai [4], and Tarantula [5]; the mutation-based (MBFL) techniques Muse [7] and Metallaxis [6]; and the predicate switching (PS) [9] and stack trace (ST) [8] fault localization families/techniques.

FAUXPY can perform fault localization with two granularities: statement-level and function-level. That is, the granularity determines what program *entities* are localized: the locations of individual statements in the source code, or the functions that compose the programs.

FAUXPY is a command-line tool, implemented as a plugin of the popular Pytest testing framework. As essential input, FAUXPY takes the location of the source code of a Python project where to perform fault localization, as well as the

location of a test suite. FAUXPY accepts tests in the formats of Pytest, as well as Unittest (another widely used Python testing framework) and Hypothesis (a property-based Python testing tool, which supports the definition of parametric tests). As output, FAUXPY returns a CSV file listing program entities ranked by their suspiciousness score; the higher an entity’s suspiciousness score, the more likely the entity is the location of the fault.

#### A. Features and Options

The only mandatory command line argument to use FAUXPY is `--src PACKAGE`, which runs SBFL at the statement granularity on the Python package in directory `PACKAGE`, using any tests discovered by Pytest within the project’s source files.

Flags `--family` and `--granularity` respectively select the fault localization family (SBFL, MBFL, ST, and PS) and the granularity (statement and function) at which to perform fault localization. As mentioned in Sec. II, FAUXPY simultaneously runs all techniques that belong to the selected family, since it is able to reuse the output of the same underlying analysis.

Using Pytest’s command line options, users can select specific tests to be used by FAUXPY. For example, you can run a test selection algorithm to identify a subset of the tests, and then feed its output to FAUXPY. The command line option `--failing-list` explicitly asks FAUXPY to only use the given list of *failing* tests. Normally, FAUXPY runs all available tests, and figures out which are passing and which are failing. However, a technique like ST only needs to run failing tests; thus, if those are given to FAUXPY explicitly, ST can run much faster by simply ignoring all passing tests. Another scenario where selecting failing tests is useful is whenever a test suite includes multiple failing tests that trigger *different* bugs; localizing one bug at a time is likely to increase the effectiveness of fault localization techniques—whose heuristics usually assume that all failures refer to the same fault.

#### B. Implementation

Fig. 1 overviews the workflow of FAUXPY. The first step of FAUXPY’s dynamic analysis is always running the available tests. Then, different components collect different kind of information required by the selected fault localization technique.

SBFL techniques rely on coverage information; to this end, FAUXPY runs `Coverage.py` [10], a popular coverage library for Python. MBFL techniques generate several mutants of the input program; to this end, FAUXPY uses state-of-the-art




Fig. 1: An overview of FAUXPY’s architecture.

mutation framework Cosmic Ray [11]. By default, FAUXPY applies the framework’s default mutation operators, but users can also provide other custom operators. FAUXPY includes a module `ps_inst` that we developed to generate the kind of instrumentation needed by PS fault localization; our implementation is based on Python’s `ast` library. FAUXPY’s support of ST fault localization parses the dumped output of all crashing tests, reconstructs the stack trace, and then locates the corresponding functions in the program’s source code.

FAUXPY outputs the results of its fault localization analysis in CSV format, encoding a ranked list of program entities and their suspiciousness scores. For performance reason, FAUXPY stores all the intermediate results (the outcome of running the various analyses and tools) of its analysis in an SQLite database file. This SQLite database remains available to the user after FAUXPY terminates executing, which can be useful both for debugging and to perform additional analyses on the large amount of data collected by FAUXPY’s dynamic analysis.

#### IV. EXPERIMENTS

To demonstrate FAUXPY’s applicability to projects of realistic size and complexity, Tab. II summarizes a few key results of the large-scale experiments we performed in our related work [2]. These experiments involved 135 bugs from 13 open-source Python projects taken from the BUGSINPY curated collection of real-world Python bugs [12]. Each bug  $b$  in BUGSINPY consists of two revisions  $B_b, F_b$  of a Python project complete with its programmer-written tests; the first revision  $B_b$  includes a bug exposed by the tests, and the second revision  $F_b$  is the programmer-written fix. Overall, these experiments involve over 1.2 million lines of code and over 100 thousand tests.

For each bug  $b$ , we ran FAUXPY on each buggy revision  $B_b$ , and used the fixed revision  $F_b$  to determine whether FAUXPY localized the actual bug locations (i.e., where the programmer edited the program to fix it). As key metric of fault localization accuracy (effectiveness), Tab. II reports the @5 count for each fault localization technique: the number of bugs that the technique correctly localized within the top-5 ranks of its output. This is a common metric of fault localization effectiveness, which is based on a scenario where the user only inspects a few (i.e., five) locations in the output, and ignores any other locations that are ranked lower. Tab. II indicates that SBFL techniques (DStar, Ochiai, Tarantula) are the most effective ones according to this metric, followed by MBFL techniques (Metallaxis, Muse). As we explained intuitively in Sec. II, PS and ST are more specialized techniques that are only applicable to bugs that involve branching predicates (PS) or that result in a crash (ST); in fact, they are accurate only for a fraction of the bugs in the experiments.

The average running time of FAUXPY on each bug (also reported in Tab. II) confirms on a much larger scale the same trends that Sec. II’s toy examples demonstrated in the small. Namely, ST is by far the fastest technique, since it just runs failing tests (usually, only a handful of a whole test suite); SBFL is still nimble but has to run *all* tests while collecting coverage information; PS and MBFL take considerably more time, since they have to run all tests on several variants of the programs. We refer interested readers to our related work [2] for many more details about the practical capabilities of different fault localization techniques on Python programs.

#### V. RELATED WORK

Fault localization research spans over three decades [13], during which it produced diverse fault localization techniques, using a variety of sources of information (e.g., traces, mutation analysis, static analysis) as heuristics to identify locations suspicious of being implicated with a fault. For lack of space, we only outline some essential related work, and refer readers to surveys for more details and references [13].

Spectrum-based fault localization (SBFL) [3]–[5]—based on a straightforward dynamic analysis of traces—is probably the most studied family of techniques. Despite the apparent simplicity of SBFL techniques, they remain generally quite effective and scalable [2], [8]. In contrast, mutation-based fault localization (MBFL) [6], [7] computes a location’s suspiciousness using mutation analysis (i.e., the number of tests that “kill” a mutant that targets the location). MBFL has gained attraction in recent years, since it can outperform SBFL for certain categories of faults; however, it remains a computational expensive approach, since the more mutants are generated the more test executions are needed.

Practical adoption of fault localization techniques require scalable fault localization tools that work on real-world programs. Although there exists several fault localization tools [14]–[17] in the literature, they are mostly developed for programming languages such as Java, C/C++, and the .NET languages. Despite Python’s popularity, there is not much fault

TABLE II: Overview of FAUXPY’s experimental evaluation on an ample selection of bugs from BUGSINPY [12]. For each PROJECT, the table shows its size in KLOC, number of TESTS, number of FAULTS analyzed with FAUXPY, and how many of them each technique correctly localized within the top-5 positions (@5 COUNT), and the AVERAGE TIME per fault taken by FAUXPY (by fault localization family, since all techniques in a family take the same time).

PROJECT	KLOC	TESTS	FAULTS	@5 COUNT ON PROJECT							AVERAGE TIME/FAULT [sec]				
				MBFL		PS		SBFL			ST	MBFL	PS	SBFL	ST
				Metallaxis	Muse	PS	DStar	Ochiai	Tarantula	ST					
black	96.0	142	13	5	1	2	4	4	4	1	28 936	45 149	62	1	
cookiecutter	4.7	300	4	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	51	13	9	1	
fastapi	25.3	842	13	3	3	1	5	5	5	1	592	745	7	1	
httpie	5.6	309	4	0	3	1	1	1	1	0	646	116	9	1	
keras	48.2	841	18	6	4	0	6	7	7	0	31 330	2 977	196	4	
luigi	41.5	1 718	13	7	4	1	5	5	5	2	14 188	1 486	22	1	
pandas	292.2	70 333	18	2	1	2	3	3	3	0	36 561	29 653	3 810	1	
sanic	14.1	643	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	11 772	365	209	0	
spaCy	102.0	1 732	6	1	2	1	3	3	3	0	4 920	13 916	60	0	
thefuck	11.4	1 741	16	7	7	0	15	15	15	1	73	49	6	1	
tornado	27.7	1 160	4	1	1	0	2	2	2	0	28 013	1 445	976	1	
tqdm	4.8	88	7	1	0	0	4	4	4	2	7 154	192	42	1	
youtube-dl	124.5	2 367	16	7	8	1	6	6	6	1	6 767	1 257	54	4	
<b>total</b>	<b>1253.5</b>	<b>112 602</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>15 774</b>	<b>9 751</b>	<b>589</b>	<b>2</b>	

localization research targeting Python [2], [18]; and even less tool support [19]. To our knowledge, CharmFL [20] is the only publicly available fault localization tool for Python other than FAUXPY. CharmFL, implemented as a plugin of the PyCharm IDE, only supports SBFL techniques. In contrast, FAUXPY supports a variety of techniques and granularities, which was instrumental to perform our large-scale empirical study of fault localization in Python [2].

## VI. CONCLUSIONS AND TOOL AVAILABILITY

This paper presented FAUXPY, an automated fault localization tool for Python programs. We explained the motivation behind developing FAUXPY, its implementation details, and simple examples of usage. We also summarized the experimental results of running FAUXPY on 135 bugs in 13 popular real-world projects, which demonstrate that it is a flexible tool, usable on projects of considerable size.

Users can easily install FAUXPY from PyPI<sup>4</sup>, using `pip install fauxpy`. FAUXPY’s source code is also publicly available.<sup>5</sup> A companion repository<sup>6</sup> makes available the complete dataset of our related empirical study [2].

## REFERENCES

- [1] W. E. Wong, R. Gao, Y. Li, R. Abreu, and F. Wotawa, “A survey on software fault localization,” *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, vol. 42, no. 8, pp. 707–740, 2016.
- [2] M. Rezaalipour and C. A. Furia, “An empirical study of fault localization in Python programs,” 2023, to appear in EMSE. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.19834>
- [3] W. E. Wong, V. Debroy, R. Gao, and Y. Li, “The DStar method for effective software fault localization,” *IEEE Transactions on Reliability*, vol. 63, no. 1, pp. 290–308, 2014.
- [4] R. Abreu, P. Zoetewij, and A. J. C. van Gemund, “On the accuracy of spectrum-based fault localization,” in *Proc. TAICPART-MUTATION*, 2007, pp. 89–98.
- [5] J. A. Jones and M. J. Harrold, “Empirical evaluation of the Tarantula automatic fault-localization technique,” in *Proc. ASE*, 2005, pp. 273–282.
- [6] M. Papadakis and Y. Le Traon, “Metallaxis-FL: Mutation-based fault localization,” *Softw. Test. Verif. Reliab.*, vol. 25, no. 5–7, pp. 605–628, 2015.
- [7] S. Moon, Y. Kim, M. Kim, and S. Yoo, “Ask the mutants: Mutating faulty programs for fault localization,” in *Proc. ICST*, 2014, pp. 153–162.
- [8] D. Zou, J. Liang, Y. Xiong, M. D. Ernst, and L. Zhang, “An empirical study of fault localization families and their combinations,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 332–347, 2021.
- [9] X. Zhang, R. Gupta, and N. Gupta, “Locating faults through automated predicate switching,” in *Proc. ICSE*, 2006, pp. 272–281.
- [10] N. Batchelder, “Coverage.py,” <https://coverage.readthedocs.io/>, 2023, [Online; accessed 6-April-2023].
- [11] “Cosmic Ray: mutation testing for Python,” <https://cosmic-ray.readthedocs.io/>, 2019, [Online; accessed 6-April-2023].
- [12] R. Widayarsi, S. Q. Sim, C. Lok, H. Qi, J. Phan, Q. Tay, C. Tan, F. Wee, J. E. Tan, Y. Yieh, B. Goh, F. Thung, H. J. Kang, T. Hoang, D. Lo, and E. L. Ouh, “BugsInPy: A database of existing bugs in python programs to enable controlled testing and debugging studies,” in *Proc. ESEC/FSE*, 2020, pp. 1556–1560.
- [13] W. E. Wong, R. Gao, Y. Li, R. Abreu, and F. Wotawa, “A survey on software fault localization,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 42, no. 8, pp. 707–740, 2016.
- [14] T. Janssen, R. Abreu, and A. J. van Gemund, “Zoltar: a spectrum-based fault localization tool,” in *Proc. SINTER*, 2009, pp. 23–30.
- [15] H. L. Ribeiro, R. P. A. de Araujo, M. L. Chaim, H. A. de Souza, and F. Kon, “Jaguar: A spectrum-based fault localization tool for real-world software,” in *Proc. ICST*, 2018, pp. 404–409.
- [16] F. Horváth, A. Beszédés, B. Vancsics, G. Balogh, L. Vidács, and T. Gyimóthy, “Experiments with interactive fault localization using simulated and real users,” in *Proc. ICSME*, 2020, pp. 290–300.
- [17] C. Chen and N. Wang, “Unitfl: A fault localization tool integrated with unit test,” in *Proc. ICCSNT*, 2016, pp. 136–142.
- [18] R. Widayarsi, G. A. A. Prana, S. A. Haryono, S. Wang, and D. Lo, “Real world projects, real faults: Evaluating spectrum based fault localization techniques on Python projects,” *Empirical Softw. Engg.*, vol. 27, no. 6, 2022.
- [19] Q. I. Sarhan and A. Beszédés, “A survey of challenges in spectrum-based software fault localization,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 10618–10639, 2022.
- [20] Q. Idrees Sarhan, A. Szatmári, R. Tóth, and A. Beszédés, “CharmFL: A fault localization tool for python,” in *Proc. SCAM*, 2021, pp. 114–119.

<sup>4</sup><https://pypi.org/project/fauxpy>

<sup>5</sup><https://github.com/atom-sw/fauxpy>

<sup>6</sup><https://github.com/atom-sw/fauxpy-experiments>