

Automated flakiness detection in quantum software bug reports

Lei Zhang

Department of Information Systems
University of Maryland, Baltimore County
Maryland, USA
leizhang@umbc.edu

Andriy Miranskyy

Department of Computer Science
Toronto Metropolitan University
Ontario, Canada
avm@torontomu.ca

Abstract—A flaky test yields inconsistent results upon repetition, posing a significant challenge to software developers. An extensive study of their presence and characteristics has been done in classical computer software but not quantum computer software. In this paper, we outline challenges and potential solutions for the automated detection of flaky tests in bug reports of quantum software. We aim to raise awareness of flakiness in quantum software and encourage the software engineering community to work collaboratively to solve this emerging challenge.

I. INTRODUCTION

Tests run on the same code sometimes produce different results, e.g., passing sometimes, failing other times. Such tests are called flaky tests. Developers of programs for classical computers (CCs) are plagued by these misleading signals provided by flaky tests. At Google, in 2014, 73K out of 1.6M (4.56%) of test failures were caused by flaky tests [1]; in 2017, 1.5% of 4.2M tests were flaky [2], [3]. In the literature, flaky tests in CC programs have been well studied in terms of empirical analysis [1], [4]–[7], automated detection [8]–[11], and mitigation techniques [12]–[14].

The evolution of quantum computing has led to the growth and expansion of quantum software development. However, more efforts are needed to establish quantum software engineering best practices, novel methods, and tools to address the challenges brought by quantum computing [15]–[18]. For instance, one of the challenges is to analyze flaky tests in quantum software.

Conceptually, we know that a flaky test can be caused by two factors: random behaviors in the source code and problematic tests [1], [4], [7], [11], [12], [19]. Quantum programs are inherently non-deterministic. The randomness comes from a variety of sources. For example, it can be caused by the physical properties of quantum systems (e.g., quantum indeterminacy [20, Ch. 1]) or hardware issues (e.g., measurement errors or networking problems) or both (e.g., quantum decoherence [21, Ch. 7]). In a simulation of a QC on a CC, pseudo-random number generators (PRNGs) are used to emulate these sources of randomness. Randomness from all these sources leads to a distribution of output values, which may result in flaky tests.

As part of this effort, the question arises: how prevalent are flaky tests in programs for quantum computers (QCs), and do

they differ from flaky tests for CCs? To empirically assess the effect of flaky tests on QC programs, we explored the code and bug-tracking repositories of 14 quantum software [22]. We estimate that flaky tests account for 0.26% to 1.85% of bug reports in 12 software packages (46 unique flaky test reports in total).¹

In these test reports, we identify and categorize eight types of flakiness and seven common fixes. While flakiness types for CC and QC are similar, the most common causes and fixes are not. Randomness is the most common cause of flakiness in QC, and the most common solution is to fix PRNG seeds. The findings for CC vary depending on programming language platforms, e.g., test order dependency takes the top place of root causes for Python program [1]. Moreover, quantum programmers do not use some recent countermeasures (e.g., [11], [12]) developed by software engineers to deal with flaky tests.

Finding the root causes and fixes of flaky tests will become more challenging as quantum hardware develops and quantum software becomes larger and more complex. Thus, it would be helpful² to automate the detection of flaky tests in a bug report. The following are some possible approaches and challenges to achieving this objective.

II. METHOD AND CHALLENGES

Automated detection of flaky tests can be framed as a supervised or semi-supervised learning problem. The approaches and challenges in this section are grouped by the steps in a typical machine learning (ML) pipeline.

Step 1: Dataset preparation. This step involves preparing a dataset to train and test ML models. Each observation in the dataset is mapped to a specific bug report. Observation features are derived from the text and metadata of the bug report. Labels on observations are binary, i.e., a bug report is related to flaky tests (positive label) or not (negative label).

¹The dataset is available at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7888639>.

²Classification of their root causes and fix patterns, as well as mitigation and remediation, should also be considered in the future. As we focus on detection in this paper, we intentionally leave out these topics. However, it is important to note that some of the existing research for addressing flakiness in software for CC—such as Oracle approximation [23] or fuzz testing tools [24]—can be applied to QC software.

At least three *challenges* stem from the nature of the dataset: 46 of the 5,484 bug reports in 12 popular software relate to flaky tests [22]. First, the amount of data is limited (due to the relatively short history of quantum computing software). We may compensate for the lack of data by enriching training data with CC software data (since the symptoms may be similar, although the underlying causes may differ).

Additionally, the dataset is highly imbalanced (which is common for CC and QC software). Standard Data Science techniques, such as oversampling, can be used to combat the imbalance.

Finally, the dataset may contain noisy labels. Since multiple co-authors vetted the observations, we are confident that the positive labels are accurate. However, negative labels may be incorrect since potential flaky tests were identified using keywords, and we cannot guarantee that the keywords set was exhaustive [22].

Step 2: Model development. To classify the dataset labels, a model should be designed and trained. As discussed in Step 1, the *challenge* arises from the nature of the dataset again. The dataset is small, so we may have to resort to classical ML models (e.g., Random Forest [25] or XGBoost [26]). However, we may also explore artificial neural networks, particularly the transfer learning approach (training the initial model on the larger CC dataset). We can mitigate dataset imbalance during training using standard techniques, such as weight balancing. We can also leverage semi-supervised learning techniques by treating some noisy negative labels as unlabelled.

Step 3: Model validation. The performance of trained models should be evaluated. As the dataset contains noisy labels, validation of model performance can be *challenging*. Active learning techniques (see [27] for review) may be used to identify and fix potentially mislabeled instances in the dataset. Thus, we would be able to simultaneously improve the dataset’s quality and evaluate the model’s performance.

Step 4: Model deployment. It is possible to integrate models that identify flaky bug reports into bug trackers (e.g., GitHub has a continuous integration/workflow automation feature called GitHub Actions³). The *challenge* here is that the dataset used to train the model may eventually become obsolete (e.g., since developers may describe flaky tests differently in future reports). It is, therefore, essential to incorporate mitigation techniques, such as periodic dataset refreshes and a feedback mechanism for detecting data and model drift.

III. CONCLUSIONS

In our previous work, we confirmed the existence of flaky tests in quantum programs and analyzed their common causes and fixes. This paper proposes a research agenda for automatically detecting bug reports (related to flaky tests) in quantum programs. Moreover, we discuss possible approaches and challenges for producing this automation. Following the development of these detection techniques, we will investigate how flakiness risks can be mitigated and remedied in quantum software.

³<https://github.com/features/actions>

- [1] Q. Luo, F. Hariri, L. Eloussi, and D. Marinov, “An empirical analysis of flaky tests,” in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSOFT international symposium on foundations of software engineering*, 2014, pp. 643–653.
- [2] J. Micco, “The state of continuous integration testing @Google,” 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://storage.googleapis.com/pub-tools-public-publication-data/pdf/45880.pdf>
- [3] A. Memon, Z. Gao, B. Nguyen, S. Dhanda, E. Nickell, R. Siemborski, and J. Micco, “Taming Google-scale continuous testing,” in *Proceedings of the 2017 IEEE/ACM 39th International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Practice Track (ICSE-SEIP)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 233–242.
- [4] M. Gruber, S. Lukaszczuk, F. Kroiß, and G. Fraser, “An empirical study of flaky tests in Python,” in *2021 14th IEEE Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation (ICST)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 148–158.
- [5] W. Lam, K. Muşlu, H. Sajjani, and S. Thummalapenta, “A study on the lifecycle of flaky tests,” in *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering*, 2020, pp. 1471–1482.
- [6] W. Lam, P. Godefroid, S. Nath, A. Santhiar, and S. Thummalapenta, “Root causing flaky tests in a large-scale industrial setting,” in *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*, 2019, pp. 101–111.
- [7] O. Parry, G. M. Kapfhammer, M. Hilton, and P. McMinn, “A survey of flaky tests,” *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM)*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 1–74, 2021.
- [8] C. Zifci and D. Cavalcanti, “De-flake your tests: Automatically locating root causes of flaky tests in code at Google,” in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution (ICSME)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 736–745.
- [9] J. Bell, O. Legunsen, M. Hilton, L. Eloussi, T. Yung, and D. Marinov, “DeFlaker: Automatically detecting flaky tests,” in *Proceedings of the 40th international conference on software engineering*, 2018, pp. 433–444.
- [10] W. Lam, R. Oei, A. Shi, D. Marinov, and T. Xie, “iDFlakies: A framework for detecting and partially classifying flaky tests,” in *2019 12th IEEE conference on software testing, validation and verification (icst)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 312–322.
- [11] S. Dutta, A. Shi, R. Choudhary, Z. Zhang, A. Jain, and S. Misailovic, “Detecting flaky tests in probabilistic and machine learning applications,” in *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGSOFT international symposium on software testing and analysis*, 2020, pp. 211–224.
- [12] S. Dutta, A. Shi, and S. Misailovic, “FLEX: fixing flaky tests in machine learning projects by updating assertion bounds,” in *Proceedings of the 29th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2021, pp. 603–614.
- [13] R. Wang, Y. Chen, and W. Lam, “iPFlakies: A framework for detecting and fixing python order-dependent flaky tests,” in *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 44th International Conference on Software Engineering: Companion Proceedings*, 2022, pp. 120–124.
- [14] S. Fatima, T. A. Ghaleb, and L. Briand, “Flakify: A black-box, language model-based predictor for flaky tests,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 2022.
- [15] A. Miranskyy and L. Zhang, “On testing quantum programs,” in *Proceedings of the 2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering: New Ideas and Emerging Results (ICSE-NIER)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 57–60.
- [16] A. Miranskyy, L. Zhang, and J. Doliskani, “Is your quantum program bug-free?” in *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering: New Ideas and Emerging Results*, ser. ICSE-NIER ’20. ACM, 2020, p. 29–32.
- [17] —, “On testing and debugging quantum software,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.09172*, 2021.
- [18] J. Zhao, “Quantum software engineering: Landscapes and horizons,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.07047*, 2020.
- [19] M. Eck, F. Palomba, M. Castelluccio, and A. Bacchelli, “Understanding flaky tests: The developer’s perspective,” in *Proceedings of the 2019 27th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2019, pp. 830–840.
- [20] D. C. Marinescu, *Classical and quantum information*. Academic Press, 2011.

- [21] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2010.
- [22] L. Zhang, M. Radnejad, and A. Miranskyy, "Identifying flakiness in quantum programs," in *2023 ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement (ESEM)*, 2023, pp. 1–7.
- [23] M. Nejadgholi and J. Yang, "A study of oracle approximations in testing deep learning libraries," in *2019 34th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 785–796.
- [24] S. Dutta, O. Legunsen, Z. Huang, and S. Misailovic, "Testing probabilistic programming systems," in *Proceedings of the 2018 26th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2018, pp. 574–586.
- [25] L. Breiman, "Random forests," *Machine learning*, vol. 45, pp. 5–32, 2001.
- [26] T. Chen and C. Guestrin, "Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system," in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2016, pp. 785–794.
- [27] P. Ren, Y. Xiao, X. Chang, P.-Y. Huang, Z. Li, B. B. Gupta, X. Chen, and X. Wang, "A survey of deep active learning," *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 54, no. 9, pp. 1–40, 2021.