

# On the Energy Consumption of Test Generation

Fitsum Kifetew  
Software Engineering Unit  
Fondazione Bruno Kessler  
Trento, Italy  
kifetew@fbk.eu

Davide Prandi  
Software Engineering Unit  
Fondazione Bruno Kessler  
Trento, Italy  
prandi@fbk.eu

Angelo Susi  
Software Engineering Unit  
Fondazione Bruno Kessler  
Trento, Italy  
susi@fbk.eu

*Abstract*—Research in the area of automated test generation has seen remarkable progress in recent years, resulting in several approaches and tools for effective and efficient generation of test cases. In particular, the `EvoSuite` tool has been at the forefront of this progress embodying various algorithms for automated test generation of Java programs. `EvoSuite` has been used to generate test cases for a wide variety of programs as well. While there are a number of empirical studies that report results on the effectiveness, in terms of code coverage and other related metrics, of the various test generation strategies and algorithms implemented in `EvoSuite`, there are no studies, to the best of our knowledge, on the energy consumption associated to the automated test generation. In this paper, we set out to investigate this aspect by measuring the energy consumed by `EvoSuite` when generating tests. We also measure the energy consumed in the execution of the test cases generated, comparing them with those manually written by developers. The results show that the different test generation algorithms consumed different amounts of energy, in particular on classes with high cyclomatic complexity. Furthermore, we also observe that manual tests tend to consume more energy as compared to automatically generated tests, without necessarily achieving higher code coverage. Our results also give insight into the methods that consume significantly higher levels of energy, indicating potential points of improvement both for `EvoSuite` as well as the different programs under test.

*Index Terms*—test generation, energy consumption

## I. INTRODUCTION

Automated test generation saves resources and helps reduce the cost of testing, eventually increasing the reliability of a piece of software. However, most automated test generation techniques adopt algorithms that are inherently based on search strategies, typically over an extremely large search space. This could make such techniques susceptible to potential inefficiency with respect to energy consumption. The energy inefficiency could be related to the test generation process itself or to the (repeated) execution of the generated test cases, say in the context of continuous integration. To shed light into this phenomenon, in this paper we analyze the energy consumption of automated test generation as well as those of the generated tests using the popular unit test generation tool `EvoSuite` [1]. More specifically we aim to answer the following research questions:

**RQ1 (Test Generation Cost):** What is the energy consumption of the test generation process? Are there any differences among the various test generation algorithms?

**RQ1.1 (Methods Profile):** How is energy consumption distributed at the method level? Which methods of which classes

consume the most energy?

**RQ2 (Test Execution Cost):** What is the energy consumption of executing test suites? Is there any difference in energy consumption between automatically generated and manually written test suites?

Earlier works (e.g., [2], [3], [4], [5]) compared the various test generation algorithms in terms of their code coverage and fault finding ability (measured through mutation analysis) using the `EvoSuite` tool. Works have also been carried out to assess the practical usefulness of automatically generated test cases through studies involving actual developers (e.g., [6]) in which various issues of automatically generated tests have been reported. A recent work by Zaidman [7] studied the environmental impact of testing and continuous integration. However, to the best of our knowledge, there has not been any study that analyzed the energy consumption aspect of automated test generation and subsequent considerations.

There are various methods for measuring the energy consumption of software, each offering different levels of detail and accuracy. Until recently, measuring energy consumption requires external metering hardware components, which implied a complex setup and did not provide fine-grained data [8]. An alternative is model based estimation, where a computational model maps performance reading (e.g., number of CPU cycles) into an estimate of the consumed energy. This approach does not require complicated hardware configurations, but its accuracy is quite limited [9]. A third approach exploits energy measurement sensors installed directly on modern microprocessor architectures. For instance, Intel’s Running Average Power Limit (RAPL) [10] provides real-time energy usage of different components, such as the CPU cores or the integrated GPU. Several tools rely on RAPL to estimate energy consumption of software as, e.g., [11], [12], [13], [14], [13], [15]. Among the other, we used the `PowerJoular` and `JoularJX` tools, which are specifically designed for Java code [15]. In particular, `JoularJX` focuses on monitoring Java code at the method level providing a detailed report of the energy consumed by each method called by an application.

In order to address the research questions, we conducted an empirical study to measure the energy consumption of test case generation for five algorithms and more than 350 Java classes selected from a large set of projects [16] (**RQ1** and **RQ1.1**). For eight projects, we compared the energy consumption of generating and executing whole-project tests

using the same algorithms (**RQ2**). Finally, for 162 projects, we executed tests manually written by developers as well as automatically generated (**RQ2**). The results of the study highlights marked differences in the energy consumption of the considered generation algorithms (**RQ1**). Moreover, the analysis of the methods (**RQ1.1**) reveals a significant variation in the energy contribution of each individual method. The analysis of test execution indicates that the generation process requires significantly more energy than test execution (**RQ2**). Finally, comparing manually written and automatically generated tests shows that complex manual test could be energy intensive without improving coverage compared to automatically generated tests **RQ2**.

The main contributions of this work are:

- 1) Empirical evaluation of energy consumption: we conducted an extended empirical evaluation of the energy consumption of test generation algorithms implemented in `EvoSuite`, focusing on Java programs. We make available a replication package with experimental data as well as scripts for reproducing the results reported [17].
- 2) Energy profile at the method level: we provided a complete energy characterization of the Java methods used during test generation, highlighting the methods that are more energy demanding.
- 3) Test case execution cost: we measured the energy consumed by executing test cases. We evaluate the differences when considering test cases generated with different algorithms as well as the differences between manually written and generated test.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the basic concepts about the energy profile of software and automatic test generation. Section III details the design of the experiments we performed. Section IV presents observed results and Section V discusses their implications. Threats to validity are presented in Section VI while Section VII concludes the paper and outlines future work.

## II. BACKGROUND

### A. Energy Profile of Software

Intel's Running Average Power Limit (RAPL) [10] is a power management and monitoring framework integrated into modern Intel processors. It provides real-time data on energy usage, allowing users to monitor power consumption for various hardware components. RAPL uses model specific registers (MSRs) updated approximately once every millisecond that report the energy consumed since the boot-up of the system. Depending on the specific hardware architecture, RAPL provides energy measurements for different power domain. A power domain represents a part of the hardware with its own power and energy characteristics. Modern CPU includes PSystem domain that monitors energy consumption of the whole System on Chip (SoC), including all the cores, the integrated graphic, and the memory integrated on the chip. The Linux Power Capping Framework<sup>1</sup> supplies a standard interface to read

energy consumption data from RAPL registers, simplifying the development of energy measurement tools. The accuracy of the RAPL measurements has been evaluated in several studies [18], [19], [20], [8] showing good concordance with energy measured at plug power.

Several tools based on Intel's RAPL have been developed to measure the energy usage of software. `CodeCarbon` [11] and `pyJoules` [12] are Python packages designed to estimate the power consumption of specific Python functions. `RJoules` [13] focuses on the energy usage of R code snippets, while `DBJoules` [14] allows for measuring the energy consumption of database queries. Finally, the tools `jRAPL` [13] and `JoularJX` [15] are designed for use with Java code and are compatible with the `EvoSuite` tool. However, `jRAPL` requires the use of specific methods within the code to measure method-level energy consumption, making it less suitable for large-scale energy evaluation. Instead, `JoularJX` is designed as a `JavaAgent` that attaches to the Java Virtual Machine to monitor power consumption at runtime and can be run alongside `EvoSuite` test case generation.

`JoularJX` is based on `PowerJoular` [15], a tool designed to monitor energy consumption of software components. `PowerJoular` tracks CPU and GPU energy consumption using the Intel's RAPL interface. `JoularJX` builds on `PowerJoular` to monitor the source code of Java applications. `JoularJX` runs as a Java agent integrated within the Java Virtual Machine (JVM) allowing to measure the power consumption of individual methods during execution. It uses `PowerJoular` to track overall CPU utilization and energy consumption, and statistically allocates this power usage to specific Java methods. Real-time tracking includes all Java methods, including those from the Java Development Kit (JDK) or other Java libraries, allowing a complete characterization of the energy footprint of a Java application. On Linux, `JoularJX` uses the Linux Power Capping interface to read the available power domains and selects, when available, PSystem domain.

### B. Automatic Test Generation

Automated Test Generation has come a long way over the years, in particular for Java applications, there are a number of mature tools and techniques proposed by the research community, as evidenced by the long running testing tool competitions [21]. Notably `EvoSuite` [1] is arguably the most popular test generation tool for Java, implementing a wide range of test generation criteria as well as assertion generation strategies. It includes a wide range of search algorithms for test generation [3], [2]. Given the nature of test generation algorithms, in particular those based on dynamically executing the program under test during the test generation process, the overall process is computationally intensive. While different aspects of the effectiveness and efficiency of the various tools and algorithms have been covered by different studies, aspects related to energy consumption of test generation have not so far been addressed. In this paper, we set out to investigate this issue with an empirical study on `EvoSuite` and the various algorithms implemented in it. In this section, we briefly

<sup>1</sup><https://www.kernel.org/doc/html/latest/power/powercap/powercap.html>

describe some details of the `EvoSuite` tool which we believe are relevant for understanding the experiment we performed.

`EvoSuite` has a multi-threaded client-server implementation where the *client* process performs the actual test generation activity while the *server* (master) process manages the overall process and tracks progress by continuously communicating with the client process. The master process also handles any communication with the tester by way of accepting command line arguments and finally reporting back the result of the test generation process. Hence, in our study related to the energy consumption of the automated test generation process, the roles of the client and master process are different. While the energy consumption due to the master process can easily be monitored by attaching the `JoularJX` JavaAgent directly to the main Java Virtual Machine (JVM) when launching `EvoSuite`, measuring the consumption due to the client process is not straightforward as it is not directly accessible. To be able to measure the energy consumption of the client process, we have modified `EvoSuite` in such a way that it is possible to attach a generic JavaAgent to the client process (which otherwise is not reachable directly from outside).

### III. EXPERIMENT DESIGN

This section summarizes the empirical study we run to address the research questions we presented in Section III.

#### A. Benchmark

We performed our analysis starting from the large set of Java projects collected in a recent study [16]. These projects contain tests written by developers as well as generated tests. We utilized Lizard<sup>2</sup> to extract the cyclomatic complexity (CCN) for each method, and then calculated the CCN of a class as the average CCN of its methods. Overall, we collected code complexity data from 7389 classes in 350 projects.

In order to estimate the energy consumption of the test generation process (**RQ1**), we selected two sets of Java classes: High CCN and Low CCN. High CCN consists of 73 classes from 42 projects and is defined as the set of classes in the top 1% of the CCN distribution (mean CCN 16.4). Low CCN comprises 288 classes from 141 projects and were randomly selected (mean CCN 1.7). Therefore, the total number of considered Java classes is 361. The same sets are used to assess the profile of the energy consumption at the method level (**RQ1.1**).

To evaluate the energy costs of test execution (**RQ2**), we would have ideally used the tests generated for answering **RQ1** and **RQ1.1**. However, our analysis of **RQ1** and **RQ1.1** focused on classes that resulted in small tests, and the energy consumed by their execution turned out to be too low for `JoularJX` to measure accurately. Therefore, to address **RQ2**, we instead considered eight randomly selected projects, which included a total of 350 classes. The number of classes in the eight projects is comparable with the number of classes used for **RQ1** and **RQ1.1**. However, note that the two sets of classes are different.

Finally, to compare the energy consumption of automatically generated and manually written test suites (**RQ2**), we executed both manually written and generated tests included in the original Java projects. We were able to compile and execute manual and generated tests for 162 projects. The main reasons for failure are the lack of dependencies and the requirement of a legacy Java version (e.g., JDK version 6). Note that tests are generated with the `EvoSuite` tool.

#### B. Empirical Procedure

For comparing the energy consumption of different test generation algorithms (**RQ1**), we considered, among the various implemented into the `EvoSuite` tool, five of them representative of four broader categories:

- Random search: Random
- Genetic algorithm: Steady-State
- Evolutionary strategies: Mu+Lambda
- Multi/many objectives: NSGAI I and DynaMOSA

Furthermore, because `EvoSuite` has a client-server architecture (see Section II-B), we only measured client energy to reduce `EvoSuite`-specific energy consumption. Additionally, we have disabled `EvoSuite` post processing for the same purpose. We then ran `EvoSuite` test case generation along with `JoularJX` JavaAgent 30 times for each algorithm and for each class in High and Low CCN sets, resulting in a total of 10,530 runs. All test case generation algorithms were executed using the same time budget of 180 seconds, while the other `EvoSuite` parameters were configured with default values.

The same methodology assessed test execution costs (**RQ2**). For the eight selected Java projects, we ran `EvoSuite` tool along with `JoularJX` JavaAgent 10 times<sup>3</sup> for each algorithm, resulting in 166,407 tests. In this experiment, we enabled `EvoSuite` post processing to store on the disk the generated tests. We subsequently executed these tests 30 times using JUnit [22] and `JoularJX` JavaAgent to measure energy consumption during test execution. This experiment allowed us to compare the energy footprint of test generation and execution.

The last experiment we conducted aimed to understand the differences, if any, between manually and automatically generated tests (**RQ2**). For each project, we executed manual and automatically generated tests 30 times using JUnit with the `JoularJX` JavaAgent.

All the experiments are performed on a server equipped with Intel Xeon Gold 6226R with 196GB of RAM. This CPU has the Cascade Lake architecture that supports PSys energy domain. The operating system used was Ubuntu 20.04.1 LTS, and `JoularJX` reads the PSys domain through the Linux Power Capping Framework (Section II-A).

#### C. Performance metrics

Both the `EvoSuite` test generation process and `JoularJX` energy measurements are stochastic processes, meaning their

<sup>3</sup>To lower the computational burden of generating whole project tests, we used 10 replicas instead of 30. The entire process required more than 12 days.

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/terryyin/lizard>




Fig. 1. Energy consumption stratified by full coverage achievement. The y axis represents the number (#) of classes. Note that data is not stratified per generation algorithm, and therefore classes are counted five times, one for each algorithm considered.

outputs vary from run to run. The empirical procedure outlined in the previous section involves performing multiple repetitions to address statistical fluctuations. When we report the consumption data of an algorithm for a Java class or project, we are referring to the average energy consumption across these repetitions. Furthermore, when comparing two energy distributions, we use the Wilcoxon rank sum test followed by Benjamini-Hochberg procedure [23] with a significance level of 5% to control the false discovery rate (FDR). When applicable, we compute effect size using the Vargha-Delaney statistic ( $\hat{A}$ ).

#### IV. RESULTS

In this section, we present the results of our experiment and provide answers to the research questions outlined earlier. First, we look at the energy consumption of the test generation process (**RQ1**), followed by an examination of the energy consumption due to the execution of test suites, of those automatically generated as well as those manually written by developers (**RQ2**).

##### A. **RQ1**: Generation Cost

With **RQ1**, we aim to investigate how much energy is consumed when generating test cases for Java programs, and whether or not the energy consumed varies with the test generation algorithm used. Furthermore, we also explore whether or not the energy consumed is dependent on the complexity of the system under test (CCN) and whether some methods/packages lead to higher energy consumption. Hence, we first take a look at the energy consumed during test generation by categorizing the systems under test into those where full coverage was achieved and those where full coverage was not achieved. Figure 1 shows a density plot (histogram) of the total energy stratified by full coverage.

As can be seen from Figure 1, the energy consumed during test generation tends to be much lower when full coverage is achieved, while higher consumption is observed when test generation fails to achieve full coverage, i.e., the algorithm runs for the full duration of the search budget. This later could potentially be because the system under test exhibits high complexity, making test generation difficult.

To get further insight into the factors that play into the overall energy consumption of test generation, we consider the CCN

of the systems under test by categorizing them into two groups: *Low CCN* and *High CCN* (Section III-A). Figure 2 reports the boxplots of the energy consumption of each search algorithm on subjects with low and high CCN, when full coverage is not achieved (figure on the left) and when it is (figure on the right).

As we observed in Figure 1 as well, we also see in Figure 2 that for subjects where full coverage is achieved, the energy consumed is lower, regardless of the algorithm. We also observe that the energy consumed tends to be higher for subjects with high CCN, independently of the algorithm and the fact that full coverage was achieved or not. Looking closer at Figure 2 we notice that when full coverage is not achieved, *Mu+Lambda* tends to consume higher, followed respectively by *NSGAI* and *Steady-State*. However, when full coverage is achieved (figure to the right), *DynaMOSA* tends to consume higher as well, though the difference is not statistically significant. We also observe interestingly that *Random* tends to consume less energy in both cases with high CCN.

To support Figure 2 with statistical tests of significance, we present detailed comparisons in Table I where we can see the result of applying the Wilcoxon test, adjusted using the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure to control FDR. Each line of the table compares the energy consumption of two sets of Java classes. For instance, line 1 compares the energy consumption of test suite generation between Low CCN (Group 1) and High CCN (Group 2) classes when using *Random* (Aggregate) and not achieving full coverage (Coverage). The energy consumption for Low CCN classes (Energy G1) is less than that of High CCN classes (Energy G2), with a small effect size (Effect size ( $\hat{A}$ )) and a significant adjusted p-value ( $p_{\text{adjusted}}$ ). Moreover, to facilitate easy reading, we have numbered and separated the rows in the table into three sections by double lines, and within each section we further make divisions using single lines to mark the different subcategories. For instance, we see from Table I (rows 1-10) that the difference between *Low CCN* and *High CCN* is statistically significant, independently of the search algorithm used and whether or not full coverage was achieved.

The second and third sections of Table I present pairwise comparisons among the algorithms when full coverage is not achieved (rows 11-30) and when full coverage is achieved (rows 31-50). For instance, when full coverage is not achieved for classes with low CCN (rows 11-20), differences among the algorithms are not statistically significant, except for *Random* vs *NSGAI*. On the other hand, looking at classes with high CCN where coverage is less than 100% (rows 21-30), we notice that all differences among the algorithms are significant, except for those between *DynaMOSA* and *Steady-State*, *Mu+Lambda* and *NSGAI*, and *NSGAI* and *Steady-State*. Similarly for classes with low CCN where full coverage is achieved (rows 31-40) we see that all differences among the algorithms are statistically significant, while for classes with high CCN (rows 41-50), none of the differences are statistically significant.




Fig. 2. Boxplot of energy consumption per algorithm stratified by CCN and full coverage achievement.

### B. RQ1.1: Methods Profile

Taking a closer look, considering the energy consumption data for each test generation run, we inspect the methods in the top 5%. Table II presents the methods at the top 5% of at least 20 classes in the systems under test. Table II reports, for each method, in how many classes (column *No. classes*) the method appears in the top 5% of the most consuming methods, regardless of the search algorithm used. The table also reports for each algorithm in how many classes the given method was in the top 5%. For instance, the method `java.lang.Thread.dumpThreads` was in the top 5% for 355 classes overall, and for 341 classes where the algorithm was NSGAI, 343 classes where the algorithm was DynaMOSA, etc. The results show that most of the top consuming methods are those with low level functionality that are likely to be called repeatedly from different high level methods. We also notice that most of them are from libraries used by EvoSuite, either provided by Java or third parties. Only three methods in the list are from EvoSuite (names shown in boldface in Table II).

Zooming out from the specific methods and looking at the high level packages to which these methods belong, we obtain the barplot in Figure 3 where we see, for each algorithm, the packages of the top consuming methods. The data is stratified in a similar manner as previous plots considering CCN and full coverage status.

### C. RQ2: Tests Execution Cost

In RQ2 we investigate the energy consumption of executing test suites. Typically tests are generated/written once, and executed several times (e.g., in a continuous integration setting). Hence, the energy consumption of the execution of the test suites could be a relevant aspect to take into consideration. To get insight into this aspect, we look at the energy consumption of executing the test suites generated by the various algorithms for eight projects (Section III-A). We also compare the energy consumption of executing manually written test suites with that of automatically generated ones.

Figure 4 shows the energy consumption during the execution of test suites generated automatically by the different

algorithms<sup>4</sup>. To give perspective, the figure also shows the energy consumption of generating tests. As we can see from the figure, there does not appear to be a huge difference in the energy consumption of executing the test suites generated by the different algorithms. Furthermore, aside from some outliers (in particular for Mu+Lambda), the energy consumed is generally low. On the other hand, looking at the energy consumption of the test generation process for the same set of systems under test using the different algorithms, we notice that there are indeed differences among the generation algorithms. We also notice that test generation consumes much higher levels of energy compared to test execution.

Finally, we compare the energy consumption of executing test suites manually written by developers with those automatically generated. In Figure 5 we plot, for all the 162 projects in the dataset [16] (Section III-A), the energy consumption of manually written (x-axis) against that of automatically generated test suites (y-axis). For this analysis, we executed all the test suites (both manually written by developers of the respective projects as well as those generated by EvoSuite) present in the original dataset used for our experiments. That is, we did not generate the test suites as they were already available in the dataset, and for this particular analysis, we deemed it sufficient to use the test suites generated by the default EvoSuite configurations available in the dataset. As can be seen from Figure 5, most of the test suites referred to each one of the projects (both manually written and generated automatically) have low energy consumption (mostly below a few hundred Joules) with a few exceptions where the consumption is much higher. For these outlier cases (shown in Figure 5 in light blue color) we computed the branch coverage<sup>5</sup> achieved by the test suites as well as the complexity of the test code (as described in Section III-A) to get further insight. It turns out that the manually written test suites exhibit a high level of code complexity (1.36-4.76 on average, maximum 135) compared to those automatically generated (1.16-1.45 on average, maximum 8). Looking at the branch coverage achieved

<sup>4</sup>here we present data for eight randomly selected projects to limit the number of executions we had to perform

<sup>5</sup>using JaCoCo <https://www.jacoco.org/jacoco/>

No.	Group 1	Group 2	Aggregate	Coverage	Energy G1. (J)	Energy G2. (J)	Effect size ( $\hat{A}$ )	pval	p_adjusted
1	Low CCN	High CCN	Random	<100%	1,283.890	1,355.880	0.364 (small)	0.003	<b>0.006</b>
2	Low CCN	High CCN	DynaMOSA	<100%	1,328.570	1,473.130	0.334 (medium)	0.000	<b>0.001</b>
3	Low CCN	High CCN	Mu+Lambda	<100%	1,293.650	2,302.620	0.078 (large)	0.000	<b>0.000</b>
4	Low CCN	High CCN	NSGAI	<100%	1,356.580	2,176.080	0.217 (large)	0.000	<b>0.000</b>
5	Low CCN	High CCN	Steady-State	<100%	1,332.780	1,749.530	0.288 (medium)	0.000	<b>0.000</b>
6	Low CCN	High CCN	DynaMOSA	100%	45.790	205.700	0.119 (large)	0.000	<b>0.000</b>
7	Low CCN	High CCN	Mu+Lambda	100%	39.870	195.370	0.099 (large)	0.000	<b>0.000</b>
8	Low CCN	High CCN	NSGAI	100%	64.040	165.820	0.174 (large)	0.007	<b>0.013</b>
9	Low CCN	High CCN	Random	100%	36.350	54.090	0.193 (large)	0.020	<b>0.036</b>
10	Low CCN	High CCN	Steady-State	100%	59.340	97.430	0.178 (large)	0.007	<b>0.014</b>
11	Random	DynaMOSA	Low CCN	<100%	1,283.890	1,328.570	0.423 (small)	0.066	0.100
12	Random	Mu+Lambda	Low CCN	<100%	1,283.890	1,293.650	0.483 (negligible)	0.680	0.765
13	Random	NSGAI	Low CCN	<100%	1,283.890	1,356.580	0.375 (small)	0.002	<b>0.005</b>
14	Random	Steady-State	Low CCN	<100%	1,283.890	1,332.780	0.426 (small)	0.076	0.112
15	Mu+Lambda	DynaMOSA	Low CCN	<100%	1,293.650	1,328.570	0.55 (negligible)	0.234	0.300
16	DynaMOSA	NSGAI	Low CCN	<100%	1,328.570	1,356.580	0.455 (negligible)	0.288	0.343
17	DynaMOSA	Steady-State	Low CCN	<100%	1,328.570	1,332.780	0.502 (negligible)	0.958	0.998
18	Mu+Lambda	NSGAI	Low CCN	<100%	1,293.650	1,356.580	0.41 (small)	0.032	0.055
19	Mu+Lambda	Steady-State	Low CCN	<100%	1,293.650	1,332.780	0.452 (negligible)	0.254	0.318
20	Steady-State	NSGAI	Low CCN	<100%	1,332.780	1,356.580	0.547 (negligible)	0.264	0.322
21	DynaMOSA	Mu+Lambda	High CCN	<100%	1,473.130	2,302.620	0.206 (large)	0.000	<b>0.000</b>
22	DynaMOSA	NSGAI	High CCN	<100%	1,473.130	2,176.080	0.303 (medium)	0.000	<b>0.000</b>
23	Random	DynaMOSA	High CCN	<100%	1,355.880	1,473.130	0.614 (small)	0.024	<b>0.043</b>
24	DynaMOSA	Steady-State	High CCN	<100%	1,473.130	1,749.530	0.398 (small)	0.045	0.072
25	NSGAI	Mu+Lambda	High CCN	<100%	2,176.080	2,302.620	0.575 (small)	0.141	0.186
26	Random	Mu+Lambda	High CCN	<100%	1,355.880	2,302.620	0.858 (large)	0.000	<b>0.000</b>
27	Steady-State	Mu+Lambda	High CCN	<100%	1,749.530	2,302.620	0.683 (medium)	0.000	<b>0.001</b>
28	Random	NSGAI	High CCN	<100%	1,355.880	2,176.080	0.771 (large)	0.000	<b>0.000</b>
29	Steady-State	NSGAI	High CCN	<100%	1,749.530	2,176.080	0.603 (small)	0.039	0.066
30	Random	Steady-State	High CCN	<100%	1,355.880	1,749.530	0.313 (medium)	0.000	<b>0.001</b>
31	Mu+Lambda	DynaMOSA	Low CCN	100%	39.870	45.790	0.612 (small)	0.000	<b>0.000</b>
32	DynaMOSA	NSGAI	Low CCN	100%	45.790	64.040	0.188 (large)	0.000	<b>0.000</b>
33	Random	DynaMOSA	Low CCN	100%	36.350	45.790	0.711 (medium)	0.000	<b>0.000</b>
34	DynaMOSA	Steady-State	Low CCN	100%	45.790	59.340	0.241 (large)	0.000	<b>0.000</b>
35	Mu+Lambda	NSGAI	Low CCN	100%	39.870	64.040	0.161 (large)	0.000	<b>0.000</b>
36	Random	Mu+Lambda	Low CCN	100%	36.350	39.870	0.601 (small)	0.001	<b>0.002</b>
37	Mu+Lambda	Steady-State	Low CCN	100%	39.870	59.340	0.194 (large)	0.000	<b>0.000</b>
38	Random	NSGAI	Low CCN	100%	36.350	64.040	0.878 (large)	0.000	<b>0.000</b>
39	Steady-State	NSGAI	Low CCN	100%	59.340	64.040	0.6 (small)	0.001	<b>0.002</b>
40	Random	Steady-State	Low CCN	100%	36.350	59.340	0.145 (large)	0.000	<b>0.000</b>
41	Mu+Lambda	DynaMOSA	High CCN	100%	195.370	205.700	0.478 (negligible)	0.903	0.960
42	NSGAI	DynaMOSA	High CCN	100%	165.820	205.700	0.5 (negligible)	1.000	1.000
43	Random	DynaMOSA	High CCN	100%	54.090	205.700	0.778 (large)	0.110	0.148
44	Steady-State	DynaMOSA	High CCN	100%	97.430	205.700	0.537 (negligible)	0.860	0.934
45	NSGAI	Mu+Lambda	High CCN	100%	165.820	195.370	0.5 (negligible)	1.000	1.000
46	Random	Mu+Lambda	High CCN	100%	54.090	195.370	0.82 (large)	0.058	0.090
47	Steady-State	Mu+Lambda	High CCN	100%	97.430	195.370	0.583 (small)	0.625	0.727
48	Random	NSGAI	High CCN	100%	54.090	165.820	0.833 (large)	0.083	0.115
49	Steady-State	NSGAI	High CCN	100%	97.430	165.820	0.583 (small)	0.689	0.765
50	Random	Steady-State	High CCN	100%	54.090	97.430	0.167 (large)	0.083	0.115

TABLE I

STATISTICAL TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE RESULTS IN FIG. 2 USING WILCOXON, WITH P-VALUES ADJUSTED FOR FDR (COLUMN  $p\_adjusted$  SHOWS THE ADJUSTED P VALUES). EFFECT SIZE COMPUTED USING THE VARGHA-DELANEY STATISTIC ( $\hat{A}$ ). SIGNIFICANT P-VALUES ARE IN BOLDFACE.

(shown in gray boxes next to the blue circles in Figure 5), we notice that the execution of manually written test suites tends to consume high levels of energy while achieving lower levels of coverage as compared to automatically generated test suites.

## V. DISCUSSION

The study presented in this paper is exploratory in nature with the main objective of getting insight into the energy consumption aspect of test generation, as such we did not set out to prove or disprove hypotheses but rather to quantify the energy consumed by test generation and eventually the execution of the test suites. While in principle any test generation tool could be used for such a study, we opted for *EvoSuite* as it is readily available, it implements different test generation algorithms, and it is the most widely used tool in the automated testing literature. *EvoSuite* however has specific design choices that should be taken into consideration with respect to energy consumption, the most important of which is that *EvoSuite* separates the test generation process into *master* and *client* processes that run in parallel, with continuous communication for exchanging data. The actual test generation

algorithm runs in the *client* process. In our experiments we measure the energy consumption of both processes, however, we reported the results (Section IV) for the *client* process only. This is because we wanted to focus on the actual test generation process, which allows us to compare the different algorithms. The *master* process does mainly housekeeping activities such as keeping track of statistics, writing out tests and reports, etc. In our experiments, the *master* process accounts on average for 22% of the total energy consumed during the test generation process. Furthermore, the relative consumption of the *master* process is higher when full coverage is achieved. Specifically, the *master* process accounts for 41% of the total consumption when full coverage is achieved, while for cases where full coverage was not achieved the proportion drops to 17%. In other words, the longer the search algorithm runs, the less the relative consumption by the *master* process.

Another aspect to take into account regarding the top consuming methods (Section IV-B) is that handling of threads, eventually resulting in dumping of threads, which leads to high energy consumption, as can be seen from Table II. In the case of *EvoSuite*, test execution heavily relies on



Method name	No. classes	NSGAll	DynaMOSA	Mu+Lambda	Random	Steady-State
java.lang.Thread.dumpThreads	355	341	343	347	334	346
jdk.internal.misc.Unsafe.unpark	251	201	144	90	32	189
java.net.SocketInputStream.socketRead0	182	165	159	174	178	165
sun.nio.cs.UTF_8\$Decoder.decodeArrayLoop	176	158	128	124	113	141
java.io.RandomAccessFile.readBytes	174	121	105	96	103	121
java.lang.ClassLoader.defineClass1	164	161	161	158	151	159
java.util.HashMap.hash	157	136	111	104	108	124
java.util.zip.Inflater.inflateBytesBytes	149	143	132	119	101	140
io.github.xstream.mxparser.MXParser.nextImpl	148	140	139	142	139	141
jdk.internal.misc.Unsafe.park	126	67	97	85	33	15
java.util.HashMap.putVal	116	101	15	1	6	84
<b>org.evosuite.testcase.variable.VariableReferenceImpl.getStPosition</b>	104	86	1	0	47	14
java.lang.Class.getEnclosingMethod0	51	36	1	3	21	3
io.github.xstream.mxparser.MXParser.parseStartTag	49	30	24	25	24	32
java.lang.StackTraceElement.initStackTraceElements	42	25	11	14	6	25
<b>org.evosuite.util.ListenableList\$ObservableListIterator.hasNext</b>	38	29	0	0	24	0
java.lang.Object.clone	35	33	0	0	1	25
<b>org.evosuite.testcase.TestChromosome.size</b>	32	0	0	0	0	32
java.net.SocketOutputStream.socketWrite0	30	1	0	23	0	13
java.lang.StringBuilder.append	22	17	2	1	2	18
java.lang.Class.getDeclaringClass0	22	15	1	1	10	1

TABLE II

THE METHODS WITH HIGH ENERGY CONSUMPTION (TOP 5%) IN EACH CLASS. METHODS BELONGING TO EVOSUITE SHOWN IN BOLDFACE.




Fig. 3. Barplot of methods energy consumption per algorithm stratified by CCN and full coverage achievement.

threads, eventually resulting in frequent calls to the method `java.lang.Thread.dumpThreads`. An example of such call sequences is the following:

```

TestCaseExecutor.execute →
org.evosuite.testcase.execution.
    .TestRunnable.storeCurrentThreads →
org.evosuite.runtime.thread.
    .ThreadStopper.storeCurrentThreads →
java.lang.Thread.getAllStackTraces →
java.lang.Thread.dumpThreads

```

Full details of the energy consumption information with the specific call sequences together with all the other experimental data are available in our replication package [17] for further inspection.

Coming back to the different algorithms and their energy consumption, the results show that the principal factor

impacting energy consumption is the code complexity of the systems under test, independent of whether or not full coverage was achieved. This is true for all the algorithms in our experiments. It is also true that when full coverage is achieved, the differences in the energy consumption of the different algorithms are minimal. While, when full coverage is not achieved, there are observable differences among the algorithms as shown in Figure 2. However, Figure 2 does not show the full picture. In particular, it does not show the number of times an algorithm performs better than another in terms of coverage. To this end, we have analyzed the total dominance relation among the algorithms, i.e., the proportion of classes for which one algorithm dominates another (performs statistically significantly better both in terms of code coverage and energy consumption). As an example, in Tables III and IV we show the dominance tables for DynaMOSA and Mu+Lambda respectively. Due to lack of space, we do not report the tables for the other algorithms, however, the full data




Fig. 4. Boxplot of the energy consumption of whole project test case generation (above) and execution (below). The y axis reports the  $\log_{10}$  of the Joule consumed. Projects names: prj\_1 = 15058126273-mysql-table-helper, prj\_2 = alipay-sofa-common-tools, prj\_3 = amazonwebservices-aws-elasticache-cluster-client-memcached-for-java, prj\_4 = carlosthe19916-sunat-web-services, prj\_5 = CatDou-common-export, prj\_6 = chrlembeck-chrlembeck-util, prj\_7 = codelibs-jhighlight, prj\_8 = easyinnova-Tiff-Library-4J

Algorithm	Total Dominance (%)	Energy Dominance (%)
Mu+Lambda	2	21
NSGAll	9	75
Random	4	9
Steady-State	7	68

TABLE III  
DOMINANCE TABLE FOR DYNAMOSA

Algorithm	Total Dominance (%)	Energy Dominance (%)
Dynamosa	1	57
NSGAll	5	68
Random	4	11
Steady-State	5	64

TABLE IV  
DOMINANCE TABLE FOR MU+LAMBDA

is available in the replication package [17]. The dominance table for an algorithm reports the percentage of classes where the algorithm totally dominates the other algorithms (*Total Dominance* column), and dominates with respect to energy consumption (*Energy Dominance* column) when there is no statistically significant difference in coverage. For example, DynaMOSA totally dominates (i.e., achieves better coverage and consumes less energy) Mu+Lambda in 2% of the classes, NSGAll in 9%, Random in 4% and Steady-State in 7%. It is worth noting that Mu+Lambda has a higher energy dominance over DynaMOSA, even though DynaMOSA has (slightly) higher total dominance.

Looking at the energy consumption of test suite execution (Section IV-C), one aspect worth mentioning is that in some cases we have noticed manually written test cases that are thousands of lines long and have quite high cyclomatic complexity. As an example, in the project

albertoirurueta-irurueta-navigation-indoor (one of the high consuming projects in Figure 5), the test `BeaconWithPowerAndLocated3DTest.testConstructor`<sup>6</sup> is more than 2600 lines long with hundreds of assertions and exception handling constructs, leading to a high CCN of 135. The high CCN is due to a high number of exception testing constructs (try-catch-fail) in the same test, which increases the number of independent paths in the test. This mechanism is also used by EvoSuite for exception testing, however, the number of such constructs in EvoSuite generated tests is quite low, hence we do not observe high CCN values for tests generated by EvoSuite (as mentioned in Section IV-C).

Finally, it is important to highlight that in our experiments we do not track the energy consumption measurement of the Java Virtual Machine (JVM). This is because different JVM versions have different energy consumption profiles, depending also on the various configuration parameters, such as those concerning garbage collection. Furthermore, our objective in this study is to explore the energy consumption related to the test generation processes without getting into details regarding the JVM configuration, which is outside the scope of this paper. We refer the interested reader to a recent study on the energy consumption of JVMs [24].

<sup>6</sup><https://github.com/albertoirurueta/irurueta-navigation-indoor/blob/master/src/test/java/com/irurueta/navigation/indoor/BeaconWithPowerAndLocated3DTest.java>






Fig. 5. Scatter plot comparing the energy consumption of executing manually written (x-axis) and automatically generated (y-axis) tests for 162 projects. Each dot represents a project and its median energy consumption measured with `JoularJX` over 30 replicas. Selected outliers (blue points) are annotated with the branch coverage reached by manual (MC) and automatic (AC) tests. Note that the x and y axis are given in the  $\log_{10}$  scale.

## VI. THREATS TO VALIDITY

Threats to *construction validity* of an experiment assess whether the experimental design is concordant with the theory. We used a tool based on Intel’s RAPL to quantify energy consumption, branch coverage for measuring code coverage, and cyclomatic complexity to assess code complexity. All metrics are widely adopted in the literature.

Threats to *internal validity* consist of the elements in the experimental design that could impact the observed results. A critical threat relates to the randomness underlying test generation strategies implemented in `EvoSuite` and energy measurements performed with `JoularJX`. To minimize random fluctuations, we repeated test case generation and the related energy measurements 30 times and used robust statistical methods to compare energy consumption. In the case of per-project test generation, we performed 10 replicas to lower the required computational burden. In this case, to avoid possible threats, we performed qualitative and not quantitative analyses. Another potential threat could originate from the choice of considering only a single test generation tool because it could bias our results. Choosing a different test generation tool could result in different absolute values in, for instance, Figure 2. However, by exclusively using `EvoSuite`, we can effectively minimize potential confounding factors and ensure a fair comparison of test generation algorithms in line with our research questions.

Threats to *conclusion validity* may occur when the conclusions are not consistently derived from the experimental results. To support our conclusions, we utilized rigorous statistical analysis along with repeated executions. We used non-parametric tests to compare distributions, as parametric tests rely on strict assumptions such as variance homogeneity. Furthermore, to account for multiple hypothesis testing, we

adopted the conservative Benjamini-Hochberg procedure with a significance level of 5%.

Threats to *external validity* account for the generalization of the results. In our analysis, we only considered a single test generation tool for Java. However, Java is among the most popular programming languages<sup>7</sup> and its analysis is significant to the testing community. Moreover, `EvoSuite` implements different test generation strategies making it a good candidate to check for differences among the various algorithms. Generalization of the results reported should be taken with care, and future analysis of programming languages and test generation tools could further support our conclusions. The search budget is another potential source of external validity. We used a budget of 180 seconds, larger than the 120 seconds used in other large-scale test case generation experiments [2].

## VII. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORKS

In this article, we conducted an extended empirical evaluation of the energy consumption associated with automatic test case generation. In particular, we compared the energy consumption of five different algorithms implemented in the tool `EvoSuite`, a widely used test generation tool for Java. Moreover, we assessed energy usage of test case execution by analyzing two key aspects: the variances among the tests generated by the considered `EvoSuite` algorithms, and the differences between automatically generated and manually written tests.

Our study showed varying energy consumption levels among the different test case generation algorithms considered. Moreover, we identified the cyclomatic complexity of the class under test as a key driving factor (Figure 2). In particular, Java classes with high cyclomatic complexity tend to require

<sup>7</sup><https://spectrum.ieee.org/top-programming-languages-2024>

more energy, mainly when time budget is consumed and full coverage is not achieved. Among the algorithms we considered, we found that NSGAI and Mu+Lambda are the most energy demanding, especially when the cyclomatic complexity is high and complete code coverage is not achieved.

The analysis of the energy consumption at the method level indicates that there is a significant variation in the energy contribution of individual methods. We have identified a small subset of high energy consuming methods, which are mainly associated with low-level operations such as thread management and I/O operation. Methods like `java.lang.Thread.dumpThreads` and `jdk.internal.misc.Unsafe.unpark` are consistently among the top consuming methods (Table II). These methods are related to the multi-threaded nature of EvoSuite, which relies on threads to manage the execution of test cases. In general, energy analysis at the method level can be combined with recent studies that assess the energy usage of Java libraries, e.g. [25] and [26], to gain insight into how to reduce the energy impact of test case generation. For instance, the method `java.util.HashMap.putVal` is among the top consuming methods (Table II). Analysis of the Java collection classes highlights that the energy consumed by HashMap insertion varies depending on the specific implementation [26]. Using a different HashMap implementation in EvoSuite could potentially impact the energy footprint of the automatic test case generation process. Interestingly, we also identified a few EvoSuite methods, highlighted in bold in Table II, which indicate potential optimization can be applied to the internal mechanisms of EvoSuite.

Focusing on the energy consumed by the execution of the tests, it becomes evident that generating tests requires significantly more energy than running them (Figure 4). Moreover, comparing the execution of automatically generated and manually written test suites did not highlight major differences in energy consumption (Figure 5). However, we observed that some manually written tests are quite complex and energy demanding while achieving lower levels of coverage when compared to more energy efficient automatically generated tests. A deeper evaluation should be performed, but these results suggest that simpler tests require less energy while maintaining comparable coverage levels.

This is an exploratory study and could be extended in various directions in future work. The study is based on EvoSuite and mainly focuses on search based software testing of Java programs. However, other approaches should be considered from the energy point of view. Moreover, other programming languages should be considered in future studies. The work from which we collected our dataset [16] includes a large set of Python projects with both manually written and automatically generated tests. Extending our analysis to this dataset would be very interesting if suitable tools that allow for fine grained energy analysis (like JoularJX) become available. However, tools like CodeCarbon [11] and pyJoules [12] can be adapted to our study in a future extension to evaluate the energy consumption of Python code. Method level analysis is a

promising approach to identify energy leaks in software. The analysis presented is still preliminary and should be extended by analyzing call sequences in a future extension. Looking further ahead, we could consider an energy aware version of EvoSuite, which would be particularly interesting but challenging. This is because energy improvements need to be related to performance, a key feature in test generation, and it would not be trivial to reduce energy consumption while maintaining comparable performance levels. The comparison of manually written and automatically generated tests suggests potential development opportunities. The concept of energy debt [27] has been recently introduced as a metric to capture the energy consumption of software execution, leading to tools like E-Debitum [28] able to analyze software and identify candidate energy flows. E-Debitum targets Java applications for Android, but the same approach could be applied in software testing to envision a tool that supports testers in writing energy aware tests.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We acknowledge the support of the PNRR project FAIR - Future AI Research (PE00000013), under the NRRP MUR program funded by the NextGenerationEU.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] G. Fraser and A. Arcuri, "EvoSuite: automatic test suite generation for object-oriented software," in *SIGSOFT/FSE'11 19th ACM SIGSOFT Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (FSE-19) and ESEC'11: 13th European Software Engineering Conference (ESEC-13)*, Szeged, Hungary, September 5-9, 2011, T. Gyimóthy and A. Zeller, Eds. ACM, 2011, pp. 416–419. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2025113.2025179>
- [2] A. Panichella, F. M. Kifetew, and P. Tonella, "A large scale empirical comparison of state-of-the-art search-based test case generators," *Inf. Softw. Technol.*, vol. 104, pp. 236–256, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2018.08.009>
- [3] J. Campos, Y. Ge, N. M. Albulian, G. Fraser, M. Eler, and A. Arcuri, "An empirical evaluation of evolutionary algorithms for unit test suite generation," *Inf. Softw. Technol.*, vol. 104, pp. 207–235, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2018.08.010>
- [4] J. Campos, Y. Ge, G. Fraser, M. Eler, and A. Arcuri, "An Empirical Evaluation of Evolutionary Algorithms for Test Suite Generation," in *Search Based Software Engineering - 9th International Symposium, SSBSE 2017, Paderborn, Germany, September 9-11, 2017, Proceedings*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, T. Menzies and J. Petke, Eds., vol. 10452. Springer, 2017, pp. 33–48. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-66299-2\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-66299-2_3)
- [5] G. Fraser and A. Arcuri, "A Large-Scale Evaluation of Automated Unit Test Generation Using EvoSuite," *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 8:1–8:42, 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2685612>
- [6] G. Fraser, M. Staats, P. McMinn, A. Arcuri, and F. Padberg, "Does automated white-box test generation really help software testers?" in *International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis, ISSA '13, Lugano, Switzerland, July 15-20, 2013*, M. Pezzè and M. Harman, Eds. ACM, 2013, pp. 291–301. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2483760.2483774>
- [7] A. Zaidman, "An Inconvenient Truth in Software Engineering? The Environmental Impact of Testing Open Source Java Projects," in *Proceedings of the 5th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Automation of Software Test (AST 2024)*, 2024, pp. 214–218.
- [8] K. N. Khan, M. Hirki, T. Niemi, J. K. Nurminen, and Z. Ou, "RAPL in action: Experiences in Using RAPL for Power Measurements," *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Performance Evaluation of Computing Systems (TOMPECS)*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 1–26, 2018.

- [9] J. C. McCullough, Y. Agarwal, J. Chandrashekar, S. Kuppaswamy, A. C. Snoeren, R. K. Gupta *et al.*, “Evaluating the effectiveness of model-based power characterization,” in *USENIX Annual Technical Conf*, vol. 20, 2011, pp. 19–20.
- [10] Intel, “Intel architecture software developer’s manual volume 3: System programming guide,” 2024.
- [11] B. Courty, V. Schmidt, S. Luccioni, Goyal-Kamal, MarionCoutarel, B. Feld, J. Lecourt, LiamConnell, A. Saboni, Inimaz, supatomic, M. Léval, L. Blanche, A. Cruveiller, ouminasara, F. Zhao, A. Joshi, A. Bogroff, H. de Lavoreille, N. Laskaris, E. Abati, D. Blank, Z. Wang, A. Catovic, M. Alencon, M. Stęchły, C. Bauer, L. O. N. de Araújo, JPW, and MinervaBooks, “mlco2/codecarbon: v2.4.1,” May 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11171501>
- [12] G. Fieni, D. R. Acero, P. Rust, and R. Rouvoy, “PowerAPI: A Python framework for building software-defined power meters,” *Journal of Open Source Software*, vol. 9, no. 98, p. 6670, 2024.
- [13] R. Chattaraj and S. Chimalakonda, “RJoules: An Energy Measurement Tool for R,” in *2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 2026–2029.
- [14] H. S. Lella, R. Chattaraj, S. Chimalakonda, and M. Kurra, “Towards Comprehending Energy Consumption of Database Management Systems—A Tool and Empirical Study,” in *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Evaluation and Assessment in Software Engineering*, 2024, pp. 272–281.
- [15] A. Noureddine, “PowerJoular and JoularJX: Multi-Platform Software Power Monitoring Tools,” in *18th International Conference on Intelligent Environments, IE 2022, Biarritz, France, June 20-23, 2022*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1–4. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/IE54923.2022.9826760>
- [16] M. Gruber, M. F. Roslan, O. Parry, F. Scharnböck, P. McMinn, and G. Fraser, “Do Automatic Test Generation Tools Generate Flaky Tests?” in *Proceedings of the 46th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2024, Lisbon, Portugal, April 14-20, 2024*. ACM, 2024, pp. 47:1–47:12. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3597503.3608138>
- [17] F. Kifetew, D. Prandi, and A. Susi, “On the Energy Consumption of Test Generation: Replication Package,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13881363>
- [18] D. Hackenberg, T. Ilsche, R. Schöne, D. Molka, M. Schmidt, and W. E. Nagel, “Power measurement techniques on standard compute nodes: A quantitative comparison,” in *2013 IEEE International Symposium on Performance Analysis of Systems and Software (ISPASS)*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 194–204.
- [19] S. Huang, M. Lang, S. Pakin, and S. Fu, “Measurement and characterization of haswell power and energy consumption,” in *Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Energy Efficient Supercomputing*, 2015, pp. 1–10.
- [20] S. Desrochers, C. Paradis, and V. M. Weaver, “A validation of DRAM RAPL power measurements,” in *Proceedings of the Second International Symposium on Memory Systems*, 2016, pp. 455–470.
- [21] X. Devroey, A. Gambi, J. P. Galeotti, R. Just, F. M. Kifetew, A. Panichella, and S. Panichella, “JUGE: an infrastructure for benchmarking Java unit test generators,” *Softw. Test. Verification Reliab.*, vol. 33, no. 3, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1002/stvr.1838>
- [22] C. Tudose, *JUnit in action*. Simon and Schuster, 2020.
- [23] Y. Benjamini and Y. Hochberg, “Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing,” *Journal of the Royal statistical society: series B (Methodological)*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 289–300, 1995.
- [24] Z. Ournani, M. C. Belgaid, R. Rouvoy, P. Rust, and J. Penhoat, “Evaluating the Impact of Java Virtual Machines on Energy Consumption,” in *ESEM ’21: ACM / IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement, Bari, Italy, October 11-15, 2021*, F. Lanubile, M. Kalinowski, and M. T. Baldassarre, Eds. ACM, 2021, pp. 15:1–15:11. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3475716.3475774>
- [25] Z. Ournani, R. Rouvoy, P. Rust, and J. Penhoat, “Comparing the energy consumption of java i/o libraries and methods,” in *ICSME 2021-37th International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution*, 2021.
- [26] S. Hasan, Z. King, M. Hafiz, M. Sayagh, B. Adams, and A. Hindle, “Energy profiles of Java collections classes,” in *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Software Engineering*, 2016, pp. 225–236.
- [27] M. Couto, D. Maia, J. Saraiva, and R. Pereira, “On energy debt: managing consumption on evolving software,” in *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Technical Debt*, 2020, pp. 62–66.
- [28] D. Maia, M. Couto, J. Saraiva, and R. Pereira, “E-debitum: managing software energy debt,” in *Proceedings of the 35th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, 2020, pp. 170–177.