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Abstract

In this study, we apply co-word analysis—a text mining technique based on the co-occurrence of terms—to map the topology of software testing research topics, with the goal of providing current and prospective researchers with a map, and observations about the evolution, of the software testing field. Our analysis enables the mapping of software testing research into clusters of connected topics, from which emerge a total of 16 high-level research themes and a further 18 subthemes. This map also suggests topics that are growing in importance, including topics related to web and mobile applications and artificial intelligence. Exploration of author and country-based collaboration patterns offers similar insight into the implicit and explicit factors that influence collaboration and suggests emerging sources of collaboration for future work. We make our observations—and the underlying mapping of research topics and research collaborations—available so that researchers can gain a deeper understanding of the topology of the software testing field, inspiration regarding new areas and connections to explore, and collaborators who will broaden their perspectives.
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1. Introduction

Software testing, broadly, refers to the application of input to the system under development in order to identify potential issues that affect the correctness and ability of the system to deliver services, such as violations of the system requirements, crashes, slowdown, or security flaws [1]. While many quality assurance techniques exist, testing remains our primary means of ensuring the correctness of software.

Naturally, from nearly the beginning of software development as a discipline, both researchers and practitioners have reasoned about concepts related to testing or other forms of quality assurance [2, 3]. As software has grown in complexity and in the range of product domains it can be applied to, new types of testing (e.g., unit testing [4], system testing [5], and GUI testing [6]) and adaptations to particular domains have been proposed as well (e.g., cyber-physical systems [7], machine learning systems [8], and web services [9]). Testing is one of the largest areas of software engineering research [10], and there are dedicated conference\textsuperscript{1} and journal\textsuperscript{2} venues for software testing research.

Software development—and, by association, software testing—is a field that is rapidly evolving as new software and hardware advances are introduced. It is useful from time to time to step back and evaluate the field, to understand (a) what the predominant topics are of the field, (b) how those topics are connected, and (c), how the predominant topics have evolved over time. “Science of science” is an interdisciplinary field that aims to discover invisible patterns in research disciplines using quantitative techniques to map the topical structure of a field and how it has evolved from inception to the present day [11]. In this approach, bibliometric and scientometric techniques are used to analyze features of published studies, including text, authors, affiliations, and publication venues [12]. Computational methods such as text mining and citation analysis are applied in order to identify patterns and relationships in studies [13, 14].

We have applied co-word analysis in order to characterize the topology of software testing research over 35 years of research studies, based on the keywords provided

\textsuperscript{1}E.g., International Conference on Software Testing, Validation, and Verification.
\textsuperscript{2}E.g., Software Testing, Verification, and Reliability.
by the authors of studies indexed in the Scopus database. These keywords represent targeted research topics within the field of software testing. The use of co-word analysis links publications through the identification of clusters of topics, connected by their co-occurrence on research studies. Consider, for example, a study with the keywords “automated test generation, “code coverage”, and “regression testing”. This study links these three research topics. Are these topics often linked in software testing research? What other topics have strong connections to these three? Co-word analysis allows us to identify these connections between research topics, enabling a detailed mapping of the field of software testing through the topics assigned to each publication.

We visualize and analyze these connections using VOSviewer—a framework for constructing and analyzing networks of information\(^3\). Our analysis identifies topics that have attracted broad research interest, characterizes the periods in which such subjects have emerged—and, in some cases, when they have faded in importance—and makes clear the connections between those topics. A similar analysis of authors and the countries they come from enables a mapping of the researchers and their patterns of collaboration as well.

The goal of this study is to provide both current and prospective researchers with data-driven perspectives about the evolution of the software testing field. For potential future researchers, a snapshot of important disciplinary trends and authorship patterns can provide valuable insight into the current state of the field. Our analysis maps software testing research topics into clusters, from which emerge high-level research themes. This analysis also suggests topics that are growing in importance, or that may become important, in the near-future. This data can suggest topics to explore and connections (or lack thereof) between topics that can reveal new insights. Exploration of author and country-based collaboration patterns can additionally suggest potential sources of collaboration for future research.

We make the following observations through mapping the software testing field:

- Research in software testing can be divided into 16 themes: automated test gener-

\(^3\)Available from https://www.vosviewer.com/.
ation, creation guidance, evolution and maintenance, machine learning and predictive modeling, model-based testing, GUI testing, processes and risk, random testing, reliability, requirements, system testing, test automation, test case types, test oracles, verification and program analysis, and web application testing. Beneath these themes are 18 additional subthemes. These themes are summarized in Section 4.1.3.

• The most popular individual research topics include automated test generation, regression testing, mutation testing, test automation, model-based testing, genetic algorithms, fault injection, software quality, simulation, software reliability, test case prioritization, verification, coverage criteria, combinatorial testing, and machine learning.

• Emerging topics and themes generally relate to web and mobile applications, machine learning and AI—including autonomous vehicles—energy consumption, automated program repair, or fuzzing and search-based test generation.

• The themes of random testing, requirements-based testing, regression testing, and test prioritization have not substantially grown in popularity over the past five years.

We also make the following observations regarding researcher collaboration:

• The national research communities that have published the most studies in software testing are the United States, China, Germany, India, United Kingdom, Italy, Canada, Brazil, Japan, and France.

• Collaborations between national research communities are heavily influenced by the geographic neighborhood. Cultural, historical, linguistic, and political connections may also influence collaborations through their influence on the movement of researchers or by creating implicit or explicit incentives to collaborate.

• Research communities are emerging in southeast Asia, Africa, and South America. Researchers in these communities often collaborate with those in well-
established countries (e.g., South American researchers often collaborate with Spanish researchers).

• Researchers tend to collaborate heavily with others in their own institution, national community, or in nearby countries. They also collaborate heavily on particular research topics, encouraged by community-building efforts such as dedicated workshops.

• Connections between localized sub-clusters of researchers are formed through the movement of researchers and through the collaborations of prolific researchers.

We believe that these insights—and, more importantly, the rich underlying networks of research topics and research collaborations—can inspire both current and future researchers in the field of software testing. We make our data available so that others may make additional observations or broaden the horizons of their own research and collaborations.4

2. Background and Related Work

This section will explore important background topics for this study. We will also discuss related work characterizing the software testing research field.

2.1. Bibliometrics and Co-Word Analysis

Bibliometric analysis is “the application of mathematical and statistical methods to books and other means of communication” [15]. Bibliometric studies perform quantitative analysis of published literature and its associated metadata—e.g., keywords, authors, institutions, and citations—in order to identify patterns of publication within a research field [16]. Bibliometric analysis enables researchers to examine the body of literature in a specific research field in order to identify major research themes [17]. Such analysis is often combined with mapping techniques to visualize the hidden structures in the metadata of a particular research field [18].

4A package containing our data is available at https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5376190.
methods used include citation-based analysis, co-word analysis (also known as keyword co-occurrence analysis), and co-authorship analysis [19]. In this study, we focus primarily on co-word analysis.

Natural language processing and text mining techniques are used in co-word analysis to discover the most meaningful noun phrases in a collection of documents and visualize the relationship of the words in a two-dimensional map [20]. In this map, the terms co-occur are connected, with stronger co-occurrence resulting in a “closer” placement. Co-word analysis is often based on the co-occurrence of keywords—that is, on the number of research publications where two keywords are used together to describe the research being reported [21]. By discovering the existence and measuring the strength of the keyword co-occurrence, co-word analysis reveals and visualizes the connections between published research studies in the field [22]. Since keywords are then used to succinctly verbalize the context of the research article, co-word analysis is a powerful means to explore the structure of a research field and identify its trends [14].

Scholars have previous used co-word analysis to depict the structure of different fields of science, including renewable energy [23], global warming [24], nanoscience and nanotechnology [25], wine studies [26], psychology [27], human computer interaction [28], and big data [29, 30]. To date, such techniques have not been applied to software testing research.

2.2. Bibliometrics and Software Engineering

No other studies have applied scientometric or bibliometric techniques to the specific field of software testing. However, bibliometric techniques have been applied to other aspects of software engineering (SE).

Garousi and Mäntylä performed a bibliometric analysis of more than 70,000 SE studies, finding that the most popular research topics were web services, mobile and cloud computing, industrial case studies, source code, and test generation [31]. They found that a small number of large countries produce the majority of studies, while small European countries are proportionally the most active in the field. Garousi and Fernandes used this set of studies to assess questions related to quantity versus impact of SE research [32]. They broadly found that journal articles have more impact than
conference publications, and that studies from English speaking researchers have more visibility and impact.

Karanatsiou et al. targeted SE publications from 2010-2017 for analysis, identifying top institutions and scholars from this period [33]. Wong et al. did the same for the periods of 2001-2005 [34], 2002-2006 [35], and 2003-2007 and 2004-2008 [36]. Garousi et al. also performed bibliometric analysis, specifically, on the SE research communities in Canada [37] and Turkey [38].

Farhoodi et al. reviewed literature related to the development of Scientific Software, finding that many software engineering techniques are being applied in the field and that there is still a need to explore the usefulness of specific techniques in this context [39]. De Freitas and de Souza performed a bibliometric analysis on the first ten years of research in search-based software engineering—the application of optimization techniques to automated software engineering tasks [40]. They identified networks of collaborations and distributions of publications in various venues.

2.3. Other Related Work

Several qualitative analyses of software testing research have been performed. Harrold provided a summary of testing research up to 2000 [41]. She identified areas of focus for future research, including improvements in integration testing, the use of pre-code artifacts like specifications to plan and implement testing activities, the development of tools for estimating, predicting, and performing testing on evolving systems, and process improvements.

Bertolino provided a summary of testing research in 2007, and identified achievements in the testing process, reliability testing, protocol testing, test criteria, object-oriented testing, and component-based testing as the major advances [42]. She identified a number of challenges related to testing education, testing patterns, cost of testing, controlled evolution, leveraging users, test input and oracle generation, model-based testing, and testing of specialized domains, among others.

Orso and Rothermel assessed research performed in the field between 2000-2014, asking over 50 colleagues what they believed were the most significant contributions and the greatest challenges and opportunities [10]. The research contributions were
categorized into the areas of automated test generation, testing strategies, regression testing, and support for empirical studies. Challenges identified included better testing of modern, real-world systems, generation of test oracles, analysis of probabilistic programs, testing non-functional properties (e.g., performance), testing of specialized domains (e.g., mobile), and leveraging of the cloud and crowd.

3. Methodology

Software testing is one of the most popular areas of research in software engineering [10], and remains a fast-growing field. Although there are a number of surveys, mapping studies, and systematic literature reviews on individual aspects of the field, few systematic studies have been examined the field as a whole, mapping research topics and their connections.

Therefore, our primary goal is to provide and examine a “map” of the field of software testing, based on the many distinct research topics that form the field and the connections between these topics linked through research studies. We wish to examine how research topics can be linked into broader clusters, summarize those clusters into high-level research themes, and examine how interest in particular topics has changed over time. Secondarily, we also wish to characterize the international collaborations of researchers contributing to this field—i.e., how individual researchers and researcher from particular countries have worked together to accomplish their goals. Specifically, we address the following research questions:

1. What are the key research topics in the field of software testing, and what themes can be observed from the connections between topics?

2. What research topics and high-level themes have emerged and grown in popularity over the past five years?

3. What observations can we infer about international collaborations in software testing research (between individual researchers and research communities in different countries)?
4. What research communities and collaborations have emerged or grown in strength over the past five years?

In order to answer these questions, we have performed the following study:

1. Collected research studies related to software testing (Section 3.1).

2. Constructed a map, using co-word analysis, of research topics and their connections based on the keywords provided in the collected studies (Section 3.2).

3. Constructed maps, using co-word analysis, of the connections between individual researchers and connections between national research communities\(^5\), based on the authorship of the collected studies (Section 3.2).

4. Performed a clean-up stage to remove unrelated or redundant topics (Section 3.3).

\(^5\)Defined as the community of researchers within a single country. For example, the “United States” research community is the implicit community formed by all researchers based in the United States.
3.1. Data Collection

To gain an inclusive overview of the field of software testing, we gathered publications from the Scopus database. Scopus is a comprehensive database of scientific literature, covering many conference and journal publication venues in computer science and engineering. We initially retrieved all publications returned for the term “software testing”. Only studies published in English were used. We retrieved this set of studies on September 26, 2020. No studies published since this date were included.

This collection included 57,233 studies, including 40,746 conference papers, 14,986 journal articles, and 1,501 other articles (book chapters, editorials, notes, etc.). Following a manual cleaning stage (see Section 3.3), 49,802 studies were included, including 36,774 conference papers, 11,640 journal articles, and 1,388 other articles. Figure 1 gives an overview of the number of studies published per year from 1985 to September of 2020. This search was not intended to capture all articles ever written about software testing. Rather, our aim was to capture a representative sample of the field for our analysis. When we quote specific numbers of studies, these numbers should not be taken as absolutes, but as an approximation of the popularity of a topic or productivity of a community.

For each study, we gathered the following attributes to use as part of our analysis of the research field: title, author data (names, affiliations, locations), keywords, year of publication, venue metadata (publisher, venue, volume, article number, page numbers, dates, locations, ISSN, ISBN), number of citations, DOI, link, language, and funding information. Our analysis focuses on the keywords (research topics), author names, and author locations.

3.2. Map Construction

There are several quantitative methods that can be used to characterize a research field. To map research topics in software testing, we used co-word analysis [20]. Co-word analysis is a natural language processing method that extracts important phrases from a textual dataset and identifies their relationships in a network based on the number of times that two terms co-occur together in all documents. This technique assumes that terms that co-occur more often in the dataset are more strongly related to
each other. As a result, all identified terms are classified into different clusters using co-occurrence to measure term similarity and depict the extracted terms and their relationship in a two-dimensional visualization.

We used VOSviewer (visualization of similarities viewer) to analyze the collected data. VOSviewer is a software tool that creates maps based on network data [43]. These maps provide visualizations that allow researchers to explore items and relationships in the target area. Using VOSviewer makes it possible to construct networks of scientific publications, journals, researchers, research organizations, countries, keywords, or terms. There are various methods for establishing connections between items in these networks, including co-authorship, co-occurrence, citation, bibliographic coupling, and co-citation.

We tested title, abstracts, and author keywords as the unit of analysis and found that author-supplied keywords are the most promising way to identify research topics and their connections. In this analysis, we considered 20 as the minimum threshold of keyword occurrences. That is, topics appearing in fewer than 20 studies were omitted from the set. We then iteratively removed topics that were unrelated to software testing (e.g., studies that used software as part of classroom testing) and merged redundant topics (e.g., “automated test generation” and “automated test case generation”)—see Section 3.3—leaving a final set of 406 research topics.

We produced similar maps for national research communities and researcher collaborations, based on co-authorship of the sampled studies. For example, researchers that co-authored studies together will have a connection in the produced network, with higher numbers of co-authored publications leading to stronger connections. Although the underlying type of connection differs, the core idea—examining how entities are linked through their co-occurrence in study metadata—is the same.

In VOSviewer, a map is visualized in three ways: The network visualization, the overlay visualization, and the density visualization [44]. The network visualization is the standard view, displaying clusters of related items (nodes), connected with edges based on their co-occurrence. In this view, nodes are colored based on their cluster.

The overlay visualization uses colors to indicate certain properties of a node, like the number of times the journal a study is published in has been cited or the average
year of publication of the study a term is linked to. In our case, we use this visualization to analyze the average year of publication for studies within a research topic, for studies published by a particular author, and for studies published by the research community of a particular country.

In the density visualization, colors indicate how nodes are distributed in the two-dimensional space underlying the visualization—revealing dense areas where many nodes are closely located. We use all three of these visualizations in our analysis, primarily focusing on the network and overlay visualizations.

VOSviewer produces maps based on a co-occurrence matrix—a two-dimensional matrix where each column and row represents an item—e.g., a research topic—and each cell indicates the number of times those items co-occur. This map construction consists of three steps. In the first step, a similarity matrix is created from the co-occurrence matrix. A map is then formed by applying the VOS mapping technique to the similarity matrix. Finally, the map is translated, rotated, and reflected.

**Forming the similarity matrix:** VOSviewer takes as input a similarity matrix. This similarity matrix is obtained from the co-occurrence matrix through normalization. Normalization is done by correcting the matrix for differences in the total number of occurrences or co-occurrences. VOSviewer uses the association strength as its similarity measure [44]. Using the association strength, the similarity $s_{i,j}$ between two keywords $i$ and $j$ is calculated as:

$$s_{i,j} = \frac{2mc_{i,j}}{w_iw_j} \quad (1)$$

where $m$ represents the total weight of all edges in the network (the total number of co-occurrences of all items), $c_{i,j}$ denotes the weight of the the edge between nodes $i$ and $j$ (the total number of co-occurrences of items $i$ and $j$), and $w_i$ and $w_j$ denote the total weight of all edges of node $i$ or $j$ (the total number of occurrences of items $i$ or $j$ and the total number of co-occurrences of these items with all items that they co-occur with). Specifically:

$$w_i = \sum_j c_{i,j} \quad (2)$$
The similarity between items $i$ and $j$ calculated using Equation 1 is proportional to the ratio between the observed number of co-occurrences of items $i$ and $j$ and the expected number of co-occurrences of items $i$ and $j$ under the assumption that occurrences of the two items are independent.

**Map formation:** The VOS mapping technique constructs a two-dimensional map in which items $1, ..., n$ (where $n$ is the total number of items) are placed such that the distance between any pair of items $i$ and $j$ reflects their similarity $s_{i,j}$ as accurately as possible. Items with a high similarity are located close to each other, while items with a low similarity are located far from each other.

The goal of the VOS mapping technique is to minimize the weighted sum of the squared Euclidean distances between all pairs of items [44]. The higher the similarity between the two items, the higher the weight of their squared distance in the summation. The specific function minimized by the mapping technique is:

$$V(x_1, ..., x_n) = \sum_{i<j} s_{i,j} \|x_i - x_j\|^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where $x_i$ denotes the location of item $i$ in a two-dimensional space, and where $\|x_i - x_j\|$ denotes the Euclidean distance between items $i$ and $j$. To avoid trivial maps in which all items have the same location, minimization is subject to the constraint that the average distance between two items must be equal to 1. Specifically:

$$\frac{2}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i<j} \|x_i - x_j\| = 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

The constrained optimization problem—minimizing Equation 4, subject to Equation 5—is solved in two steps [43]. The constrained problem is first converted into an unconstrained problem. Second, the unconstrained problem is solved using a variant of the SMACOF algorithm, an optimization algorithm commonly used in multidimensional scaling to produce human-understandable network or graph layouts through minimization of a stress function over the positions of nodes in the graph [45].
**Clustering of Terms:** Items are assigned to clusters by maximizing the function:

\[
V(c_1, ..., c_n) = \sum_{i<j} \delta(c_i, c_j)(s_{i,j} - \gamma)
\]

where \(c_i\) is the cluster that item \(i\) has been assigned to. \(\delta(c_i, c_j)\) is a difference function that yields 1 if \(c_i = c_j\) and 0, otherwise. \(\gamma\) determines the level of clustering, with higher values yielding a larger number of clusters. This is a common approach for clustering nodes in a network [46], and is unified with the mapping function minimized in Equation 4. Equation 6 is maximized using the smart local moving algorithm [47].

**Translation, rotation, and reflection:** The optimization problem introduced in Equation 4 does not have a single global optimal solution [43]. However, consistent results are desirable. To ensure that the same co-occurrence matrix always yields the same map, three transformations are applied after optimization:

- **Translation:** The solution is translated to be centered at the origin.
- **Rotation:** Principle component analysis is applied in order to maximize variance on the horizontal dimension.
- **Reflection:** If the median of \(x_{1,1}, ..., x_{n,1}\) is larger than 0, the solution is reflected in the vertical axis. If the median of \(x_{1,2}, ..., x_{n,2}\) is larger than 0, the solution is reflected in the horizontal axis.

### 3.3. Data Cleanup

The initial data included terms that were either redundant or that were irrelevant.

- The research topics included topics unrelated to software testing, as the initial sample was gathered using a broad search string. For example, studies were included on software-based testing of students in a classroom or the use of software simulations to test hardware-based systems such as power generation systems. Additional topics are either too broad or generic to be considered as specific research topics. These include broad terms like “software testing” or “test suite”, as well as research-related terms such as “case study” or “empirical study”.
• Multiple terms can be used to refer to the same research topic, country, or researcher, and can be streamlined into a single term. For example, “coverage criterion” and “adequacy criterion” refer to approximately the same concept. In many cases, the same term appears in a singular and plural form, e.g., “test case” and “test cases”. In the data on national research communities, countries are referred to that no longer exist, such as “West Germany”. An author may also be referred to in multiple forms. For example, “Lionel Briand” and “Lionel C. Briand” are the same person.

To handle irrelevant and redundant terms in all networks, we performed an iterative manual cleaning process. First, we first removed irrelevant topics from the research topic map (the author and national research community maps have no “irrelevant” entries, just redundant ones). The authors collectively discussed each potentially irrelevant term and came to a consensus on whether it was irrelevant or not. We removed these from the map, as well as any studies that were connected to that topic. We then removed the terms considered too broad to stand as dedicated research topics. In this case, we did not remove the studies listing those terms as topics, as long as they had additional topics that remained in our set.

After removing irrelevant terms, we merged redundant terms in all three maps into a single term. We discussed each term and its alternatives, and came to a consensus on which term to use in all cases. We then replaced the merged terms with the final term for each study and recreated the maps. We performed this process multiple times until we were satisfied that redundant terms did not remain. In the case of countries, we used the modern name of the country where the authors were based. In the case of authors, we only merged entries when we were certain that they referred to the same authors.

### 4. Results and Discussion

In the following subsections, we answer our research questions based on mapping the connections between research topics (Section 4.1), national research communities (Section 4.2), and individual researchers (Section 4.3). Finally, we offer advice to researchers interested in making use of this data (Section 4.4).
4.1. Research Topics, Clusters, and Themes

We obtain our list of research topics from the keywords supplied by researchers when they publish a study. To produce our final list of research topics, we (a) filtered the initial list of research topics to remove all topics listed as a keyword in fewer than 20 studies, (b) merged duplicate entries (e.g., “coverage criteria” and “coverage criterion”), and (c) removed irrelevant or generic terms (e.g., “software testing”). These steps were repeated iteratively, and yielded a final list of 406 research topics, which are mapped into 11 clusters based on how they are connected by the sampled studies.
We analyze this map by identifying the most popular individual topics (Section 4.1.1), examining how the connected topics form clusters (Section 4.1.2), how topics are linked across clusters (Section 4.1.2), identifying the overarching themes of each cluster (Section 4.1.2, summarized in Section 4.1.3), and examining the topics and themes that have emerged and grown in popularity over the past five years (Section 4.1.4).
4.1.1. Popular Research Topics

We begin by identifying the most 15 popular individual research topics in software testing, sorted by the number of studies (and percentage of the total sample) that report that topic as a keyword. These topics are listed in Figure 3, and are explained below:

1. **Automated Test Generation (1068 publications, or 2.14% of the sample):**
   The use of tools to generate full or partial test cases [48].

2. **Regression Testing (701; 1.41%):** A practice where test cases are re-executed when code changes to ensure that working code still operates correctly [49].

3. **Mutation Testing (596; 1.20%):** A practice where synthetic faults are seeded into systems to assess the strength or sensitivity of test cases [50].

4. **Test Automation (567; 1.14%):** Tools and practices that enable the automation of test execution and related build processes [51].

5. **Model-based Testing (552; 1.11%):** The use of behavioral models to analyze the system, to design or generate test cases, or to judge the results of testing [48].

6. **Genetic Algorithm (519; 1.10%):** An optimization algorithm that models how populations evolve over time [52]. Genetic algorithms are often used to automate tasks, e.g., test generation.

7. **Fault Injection (477; 0.96%):** Injection of synthetic faults into a system [53]. Mutation testing is a specific type of fault injection.

8. **Software Quality (445; 0.89%):** Means to define, measure, and assure the quality of software [54]. Quality is a broad concept, encompassing both correctness and aspects such as performance, availability, or scalability.

9. **Simulation (442; 0.89%):** The simulated execution of an embedded system. Research may focus on how to perform simulation [55], how to test in simulation [56], or how to obtain more realistic results from simulations [57].

10. **Software Reliability (440; 0.88%):** Means to define, measure, and assess the “trustworthiness” of software over a period of time [1]. Reliability is one aspect of quality, and can be considered as the “how quality changes over time” [58].

11. **Test Case Prioritization (418; 0.84%):** Automated techniques that select a subset of tests for execution [59].
12. **Verification (366; 0.73%)**: Techniques that assess whether software possesses a property of interest, often used to assess system correctness according to a formal specification [1]. Testing is the most common verification technique, but many forms of verification exist.

13. **Coverage Criteria (362; 0.73%)**: Measurements used to assess the strength of a test suite, often based on how the test suite exercises source code elements [60].

14. **Combinatorial Testing (349; 0.70%)**: A technique for generating or selecting test input, based on coverage of representative values for input variables [5].

15. **Machine Learning (326; 0.65%)**: Algorithms that make inferences from patterns detected in data. May be used as part of automation [61], predictive modeling [62], or evaluation [63], among other purposes.

The number of studies is based on our sample, and is not an exhaustive count. Rather, this is an approximation of the popularity of each topic. As shown in Figure 3, both the average and median percentage of studies assigned a topic are far below the percentage of studies related to any of the top 15 topics, indicating their importance to the field.

Many of the most popular topics relate to automation. Testing activities often require extensive human effort. Automation of aspects of test creation and execution offers great promise for increasing the quality and efficiency of the testing process. Many of the remaining topics relate to assessments of the effectiveness of testing or guidance for test creation (mutation testing, fault injection, coverage criteria) or means of assessing and assuring the quality of the system.

---

**RQ1 (Research Topics and Themes)**: The most popular individual research topics include automated test generation, regression testing, mutation testing, test automation, model-based testing, genetic algorithms, fault injection, software quality, simulation, software reliability, test case prioritization, verification, coverage criteria, combinatorial testing, and machine learning.
4.1.2. **Topic Clusters and Research Themes**

To characterize the field of software testing, it is not enough to examine individual research topics. Few topics truly stand independently of the rest of the field, and by examining their connections, we can gain a better understanding of the context in which topics form, grow, and thrive. Therefore, our next step is to move beyond topics and attempt to identify broader *research themes* from the connections between topics.

Based on their connections, the 406 topics have been grouped into 11 clusters. In Figure 2, topics are colored by their cluster. Topics within a cluster co-occur as keywords more often in studies compared to topics in different clusters. The distance between two topics in the map approximately indicates how related the topics are. The closer two topics are, the stronger their relatedness. The strongest relations between topics are also represented by lines, with thicker lines indicating a stronger relationship (i.e., a higher degree of co-occurrence).

While the topics in a cluster are linked by their connections, not all topics within a cluster are linked to all other topics in that cluster. For example, cluster 9 contains topics “javascript” and “finite state machine”. These two topics are not directly linked—they rarely co-occur. However, they both co-occur often with other topics within the same cluster. There is an indirect connection between these two topics through topics they both co-occur frequently with.

These connections reveal rich and varied mappings between the many research topics in the software testing field. In order to holistically characterize this field, we next examine each cluster in order to identify cohesive research themes that describe the topics within the clusters. The identified set of research themes offers a evidence-based structure for the field of software testing, informed by the underlying connections between the topics that make up the field.

To identify these themes, we collectively examined the topics in each cluster and their connections. We proposed themes or categories that could describe a large number of the connected topics in each cluster. These proposals were either chosen collaboratively by the authors during discussion, or proposed by one author and agreed upon in discussion with the other authors.
Smaller clusters tend to cohere to a single theme—possibly with one or more clear subthemes—while larger clusters tend to break down into multiple independent themes and additional subthemes. Not all topics in a cluster cohere to the identified themes. However, the themes capture a majority of the connected topics. It is important, however, to examine both the high-level themes and the low-level topics to come to a full understanding of a particular area of research.

In order to provide a clearer examination, we discuss the topics, clusters, and themes starting from the smallest cluster and moving into larger clusters. We refer to clusters using the ID numbers assigned by VOSviewer. Therefore, Cluster 11 is the smallest cluster, and Cluster 1 is the largest.

**Cluster 11 (4 Topics): Test Oracles**

This cluster centers around **test oracles**. An oracle is a component of a test case that issues a verdict based on expectations of correct behavior [61]. The remaining topics
in relation to a specific type of oracle, metamorphic relations. Metamorphic relations are a specific type of test oracle, describing properties of related input and the resulting output (e.g., \( \sin(\pi - x) = \sin x \)) [64]. They hold promise as part of automation, as they can be applied to many inputs.

Test oracles affect many aspects of testing, leading to their segregation into their own cluster. As shown in Figure 4, test oracles are part of test design (leading to connections with quality, coverage criteria, unit testing, test automation, and model-based testing). They are needed to detect sensitive faults (mutation testing). They also require significant human effort to create, leading to an interest in automating their creation (automated test generation, machine learning).

**Cluster 10 (16 Topics): Model-Based Testing**

This cluster is focused on **model-based testing**, including model transformation, conformance testing, and specific types of models (e.g., timed automata). It also includes the Unified Modeling Language—a family of model formats, including use cases, activity, and sequence diagrams. In Figure 5, we show connections between
model-based testing and other topics. Model-based testing is used extensively in development of embedded and real-time systems. Models can be used to generate test cases. Models are also often analyzed as part of verification, safety, and security analyses, as models are simpler to analyze than full systems. There is interest in automating model extraction, leading to association with machine learning. State machine models are also often used during GUI testing, as they can capture the possible actions that users can take on different screens.

**Cluster 9 (18 Topics): Web Application Testing, GUI Testing**

This cluster has two primary themes—**web application testing** and **GUI testing**. Topics related to web application testing include specific technologies (e.g., JavaScript) and testing tools (e.g., Selenium). In Figure 6, we show major connections between web applications and other topics. There is a strong interest in automating test generation and test execution, as well as regression testing, for web applications. There are also connections to security assurance, and an interest in mutation testing as a way to benchmark testing approaches.

This cluster also includes the topic “finite state machine”, as GUIs are often modeled as state machines when testing. Many of the major connections for GUI testing
to other topics are the same as for web applications—including a strong focus on test automation, automated test generation, and regression testing.

**Cluster 8 (19 Topics): Evolution and Maintenance (Regression, Prioritization)**

This cluster focuses on software evolution and maintenance and the related sub-themes of regression testing and test prioritization. Research in software evolution focuses on controlling and maintaining quality as the system changes. This theme includes topics such as change impact analysis and program comprehension, and techniques such as information retrieval. In Figure 7(a), we show the connections between software maintenance and other topics. Maintenance has implications on multiple aspects of testing, such as costs, quality, and quality measurement. Maintenance needs affect the tasks performed during test automation, and how those tasks are performed.

Regression testing is performed throughout evolution and maintenance [65]. Regression testing is a popular topic, and as shown in Figure 7(b), has connections to many topics. There is an interest in automated generation of regression tests, in use of clustering to select tests, in use of fault localization and debugging to identify issues—among other connections.

In many situations, including regression testing, there is a desire to execute only a relevant subset of a test suite to save time or resources [59]. The second subtheme encompasses techniques created for this purpose, including test case prioritization, test suite reduction, and test suite minimization. As shown in Figure 7(c), test case prioritization is intended to be applied without human effort, so most of the connections relate to automation and means to inform automation (e.g., machine learning, fault localization, and coverage criteria).

**Cluster 7 (28 Topics): Automated Test Generation (Program Repair)**

Automated test generation is a major focus in testing research [10], as the manual effort to create test cases is a major hindrance to sufficiently testing complex systems. Many of the individual topics in this cluster relate to algorithms for performing generation (e.g., genetic algorithms, simulated annealing), specific generation problems (e.g., combinatorial testing), or optimization targets for generation (e.g., branch coverage).
(a) Topics associated with software maintenance.

(b) Topics associated with regression testing.

(c) Topics associated with test case prioritization.

Figure 7: Topics associated with key evolution and maintenance topics.
Several topics revolve around the closely-related subtheme of automated program repair, the generation of patches for faulty programs \cite{66}. This field shares techniques, such as genetic algorithms, and underlying analyses performed to enable generation, such as fault localization. As the most popular research topic identified in our analysis, automated test generation has connections to many topics in every other cluster.
Cluster 6 (30 Topics): Reliability (Performance Testing), Random Testing

This cluster has the primary themes of software reliability (with the subtheme of performance testing) and random testing. Research in software reliability encompasses efforts to define and measure reliability, as well as how to assess changes over time. Reliability is a broad concept, and can be discussed both in terms of whether the system operates without yielding incorrect output or crashing and its performance, availability, and scalability [1]. In Figure 8(a), we show connections between software reliability and other research topics. Reliability is strongly connected to system testing, as it is a concept generally applied to a complete system and not classes or subcomponents. Machine learning and software metrics are often used to predict aspects of reliability. Fault tolerance, too, is an aspect of reliability. Automated techniques, like genetic algorithms, have been used to generate tests to assess reliability and to refactoring aspects of the system’s design to improve reliability.

Performance testing refers to the use of testing to assess performance and scalability of a system under different operating conditions [67]. This is one way to judge the reliability of software. As can be seen in Figure 8(b), performance testing is often applied to cloud-based software, as such software tends to have strict performance requirements—often serving thousands of concurrent users. Performance testing is intended often an automated process, e.g., as part of continuous integration.

Random testing refers to the generation of random input for various purposes [48]. Random testing is utilized in many research topics and application areas. It is part of this cluster because random testing is a common way to assess reliability. Input generated by randomized approaches (including adaptive random testing, statistical testing, and partition testing) can be used to efficiently assess reliability or performance. As random testing has widespread applications, we classify it as a separate theme rather than a subtheme of reliability.

Cluster 5 (32 Topics): Test Creation Guidance (White-Box Testing, Black-Box Testing, Mutation Testing, Security Testing)

This cluster focuses on guidance for test suite creation, breaking down into four subthemes based on how a tester might approach test suite creation—e.g., their goals,
the information they would use in selecting test input, and how they assess test strength.

The first subtheme is **white-box testing**, or test creation based on the structure of the source code [60]. White-box testing is guided by coverage criteria—checklists
of goals based on the execution of particular source code elements (e.g., branches, Boolean decisions). This subtheme includes information used in suite creation (e.g., control and data flow), measurements of test strength (coverage criteria, MC/DC), and automated generation techniques focused on these measurements (fuzzing, concolic execution). The second subtheme is the common counterpart of white-box testing, black-box testing, or test creation based on requirements and other documented information about software correctness [68]. This is a smaller subtheme, but still an important one.

The third subtheme is mutation testing, where synthetic faults (mutants) are seeded into a system [50]. Mutants can be used as targets for test creation—e.g., a test case might be created to detect a specific type of mutation (a mutation operator)—or as a measurement for assessing test cases (the mutation score).

As can be seen in Figure 9(a), coverage criteria are a focus of automated test generation, as well as test case prioritization and regression testing. Criteria offer measurements that can serve as natural optimization goals for automation. Coverage criteria are a part of quality and reliability measurement as well. Similar connections exist for black-box testing and mutation testing, as both topics offer measurements that can judge test strength and that can enable automation.

The final subtheme in this cluster is security testing—the creation of test cases that assess the ability of a system to prevent or stop exploitation of vulnerabilities [69]. Topics in this subtheme relate to test creation practices, automated test generation (e.g., fuzzing), and human-driven testing (e.g., penetration testing). As shown in Figure 9(b), security testing is closely linked to automated test generation, web applications, model-based testing (as models can succinctly capture information about security), and combinatorial testing (which can be used to select important input).

Cluster 4 (35 Topics): Verification and Analysis (Concurrency, Fault Injection)

This cluster centers around verification—analyses performed to ensure that software possesses properties of interest [1]. Testing is an example of dynamic verification—input is executed against the running code and the output is used to analyze program correctness. There are many dynamic and static analyses, and the topics in this cluster
Figure 10: Topics associated with program analysis topics.
describe analyses of correctness, resilience, and other properties. As shown in Figure 10(a), verification is closely tied to reliability and quality, as formal analyses can show these expectations are met. Verification is closely tied to automation, as well as embedded systems—where verification techniques assess safety-critical systems. There are also links to techniques used to perform verification, such as symbolic execution and constraint solving.

We also observe two distinct subthemes. The first is concurrency, describing programs that execute over threads or processes operating in parallel. This subtheme encompasses topics and analyses such as parallelization, synchronization, and high performance computing. Concurrency has limited connections to topics in other clusters—primarily related to automated test generation or coverage criteria.

The second subtheme is fault injection. This is a research field where faults are inserted into code, and analyses are performed either to see if the fault can be detected or to examine how the fault affects execution. Topics in this category relate to types of faults (e.g., fault model, vulnerability, soft error), insertion and monitoring (e.g., fault injection, fault simulation), and assessment (e.g., fault tolerance). As shown in Figure 10(b), fault injection has strong connections to embedded systems, an area where fault injection is heavily utilized. There is also a connection to machine learning, as anomaly detection techniques are used to detect injected faults [70].

Cluster 3 (48 Topics): Machine Learning (Applications, Data, Techniques)

This cluster focuses on machine learning and predictive modeling in software testing and quality assurance. Machine learning techniques can predict an outcome given past data, or for explain why certain phenomena occur. It is used often in testing research for both of these purposes. We can break the topics into this cluster down into three related subthemes.

The first is the applications of machine learning. Some of the major application areas for ML include defect prediction (predicting whether code contains a fault), mining software repositories (using the metadata in repositories to understand how developers test), predicting testability of code, intrusion or anomaly detection, or assessing reusability of tests or code components.
The second subtheme is **the data used by machine learning**. This includes source code metrics, complexity metrics, defect metadata, energy consumption, and failure metadata, among others. Finally, the third subtheme focuses on **the utilized machine learning techniques**. This includes neural networks, deep learning, clustering, support vector machines, feature selection, linear regression, and other ML techniques.

Figure 11 illustrates the connections between machine learning and other topics. There are connections to quality and reliability as they offer metrics that can be used as part of prediction or knowledge discovery. Automated test generation often makes use of ML [71, 67]. ML techniques are also used as part of test case prioritization, security analysis, and fault injection analysis. There are also connections to specialized system domains such as image processing or natural language processing, where targeted testing approaches have been proposed.

Cluster 2 (58 Topics): Test Types, Test Automation, Processes and Risk (Model-Driven Development), Requirements Engineering
This is a large cluster, and contains several distinct themes. While some of these themes are not closely related, they are linked by connections between the individual underlying topics. The first of these themes is test case types. This includes different testing practices and levels of granularity that testing can take place at—e.g., unit, integration, acceptance, and exploratory testing—as well as topics and technologies related to these practices. This theme also encapsulates the emerging subtheme of mobile testing. Mobile testing is not as well-established as web testing, but is clearly growing as a distinct research area. In the future, it may emerge as a major research theme—as its own cluster, or perhaps a part of one of the clusters that the underlying topics are connected to.

Figure 12 illustrates connections between unit testing and other research topics. Many of these topics relate to automated test generation, as unit tests are often a target for generation. There are connections to specific automated generation techniques (search-based, symbolic execution), and goals of automated generation (branch coverage, mutation testing). There are connections to open source software, which often makes use of unit testing, and to Java, due to the popular JUnit framework. There
are also connections to other themes within this cluster, such as test automation—unit tests are designed to be executable—and process—as unit testing is an agile practice. Similar connections exist for test case types such as integration testing. Human-driven practices, such as exploratory testing, lack connections to automated test generation. However, even these topics have links to test automation and model-based testing, as researchers seek to automate or support aspects of these practices.

The second theme is **test automation**, encompassing practices and technologies that enable the automated execution of test cases as part of continuous integration [72]. Topics in this theme relate to execution, automation, and tool support. Test automation is one of the most popular research topics in testing, and has connections with all other clusters—with heavy connections to automated test generation.

The third theme is **development processes and risk management**. The organization, management, and practices of a development team have a major impact on quality [1]. Significant attention has been paid to the relationships between process, testing practices, and the resulting quality. This theme focuses heavily on agile development and agile testing, test-driven development, and topics related to risk management. This theme also includes the topics of software quality and quality assurance, as quality is the focus of many of the proposed practices. This theme has connections to test automation through topics such as devops, which prescribes practices that enable and take advantage of automation. Figure 13 illustrates connections between agile development
and other research topics. Many connections link to topics within this cluster, but there are also links to external topics related to quality and usability. There is also a link to regression testing, which is an agile practice.

This theme has a subtheme of **model-driven development**—a development process based on the use of models to perform analysis, to serve as the basis for the source code, and to drive test case creation [73]. This subtheme is related to, but also separate from, the earlier theme of model-based testing, which focused on technical aspects of modelling. Rather, this subtheme focuses on process and practices that make use of these technologies, and there are connections between the two areas.

Finally, there is a fourth theme of **requirements engineering**. Requirements are a primary source of information on intended system behavior, and verification assesses conformance of the code to the requirements. This theme focuses on requirements topics and traceability of test cases to the requirements. Requirements engineering, naturally, has a strong connection to the topic of verification. It is also strongly connected to automated test generation and test case prioritization, as requirements can offer information that is used in both practices.

**Cluster 1 (118 Topics): System Testing (Quality Attributes, Embedded Systems, Specialized Domains and Technologies)**

The final cluster is the largest, containing almost 25% of the research topics. It is the least cohesive, and contains many general testing concepts. However, we can categorize many of these topics under a core theme of **system testing**—test cases that apply input to an external interface of a system [1]. In the previous cluster, we described a theme centered around test case types (e.g., unit testing). System testing is often grouped with these topics. However, as many testing practices and specialized problem domains specifically target the system-level, system testing is a broad enough concept to serve as an independent research theme⁶.

Figure 14(a) shows connections between system testing and other topics. System testing is a unifying topic in this cluster, linking many other topics. It connects with

---

⁶Several other themes relate to system-level testing practices or domains tested at the system level, e.g., web, GUI, and performance testing. Those themes encompass enough topics to stand independently.
GUI testing—a form of system testing—and automated test generation. It also links with notions of quality and reliability, which are typically defined at the system-level.

Our first subtheme centers around **quality attributes**. These are non-functional...
Figure 15: Topics associated with quality attribute topics.
properties of a system that are assessed as part of quality assurance [74]. This includes usability, performance evaluation, dependability, robustness, interoperability, accessibility, sustainability, and other aspects of quality. These attributes are largely independent of each other, as can be seen for usability and software performance in Figure 15. Usability topics are largely contained within this cluster, except for a connection to agile development, which emphasizes usability. Performance is linked to including fault injection, benchmarking, and software quality.

The second subtheme is **embedded system testing**. Embedded systems are self-contained systems with software and hardware elements [75]. Such systems require specialized testing approaches, accounting for hardware—e.g., sensors, micro-controllers, and robotics—non-deterministic real-time behavior, and noisy, time-based input. This is the largest subtheme in this cluster, as embedded system testing is a well-established and active field. Figure 14(b) shows connections between embedded software and other research topics. The connections outside of this cluster primarily relate to automated generation, test automation, and analyses performed on embedded systems (e.g., fault injection). There is also a connection with model-based testing, as models are often used in embedded system development.

The final subtheme encompasses **specialized system domains and technologies** that have not attracted enough research to emerge standalone themes or subthemes (like embedded, GUI, mobile, or web testing). This includes domains such as open source software, image processing, databases, virtual reality, and operating systems. It also includes specific technologies that inspire their own testing approaches such as XML, Java, and Android. Each domain has its own connections to topics in this and other clusters. As expected, many share connections to automated test generation and test automation, as these are major research concerns in most domains.

4.1.3. **Summary of Themes**

Based on the sampled studies, we identified a total of 406 research topics, which form 11 clusters based on their co-occurrence in the sampled studies. We have examined these clusters in order to map the field of software testing into a set of research themes and subthemes. Following this process, we have identified a total of 16 research
Figure 16: Overview of research themes.
themes, with 18 additional subthemes. Figure 16 outlines these themes, colored by the cluster they emerged from.

**RQ1 (Research Topics and Themes):** Research in software testing can be divided into 16 themes: automated test generation, creation guidance, evolution and maintenance, machine learning and predictive modeling, model-based testing, GUI testing, processes and risk, random testing, reliability, requirements, system testing, test automation, test case types, test oracles, verification and program analysis, and web application testing.

This themes offer a taxonomy of testing research topics, informed by the underlying structure of the field and the actual connections between individual research topics. New themes will emerge in the future, subthemes may grow into their own independent fields, and new connections will emerge between research topics. However, at a glance, Figure 16 can be used to understand the current state of the field of software testing.

4.1.4. Emerging Topics and Themes

Figures 2 and 16 offer an overview of the topics and themes that make up the field of software testing. This field is not a static one. Some topics and themes have emerged over time, and new topics, themes, and connections will emerge in the future. Therefore, we are interested in identifying the topics and themes that have emerged or grown in importance since June 2015 (approximately five years before the date the sample of studies was taken).

In Figure 17, we present the map of research topics, colored by the average publication date. Topics that are closer to yellow in color are those with a more recent average publication date. The closer to the present day, the more active the topic is in contemporary software testing research. An interactive version of this map can be accessed by selecting the “Overlay” visualization after opening the topics20 map and network files.

Sixty-eight research topics have an average publication date more recent than June 2015 (16.75% of the research topics). A recent date implies one of two things about a
topic: (1) this is a new topic that has only emerged recently, or (2), this is a topic that has existed for longer than five years, but that is receiving significantly more attention in recent years. Figure 18 links these topics to their respective research theme.

We classified these active topics into themes based on their associations to the other topics in their cluster, assigning a theme from those previously derived from that cluster. If the theme was not obvious, we examined the topics that co-occur with the topic in question and chose a theme based on these co-occurrences. In a small number of cases, we assigned a term to multiple themes if it clearly fit with both. For example, “devops” is highly associated with both the process and test automation themes, so we listed it with both.

We did not assign topics to themes derived from other clusters. For example, “big data” appears in cluster 6, and not with machine learning topics in cluster 3. We examined the topic, and saw an association with “mapreduce”, which was associated
Figure 18: Individual research topics with an average publication date newer than June 2015, along with their associated research theme.
with “cloud computing”. There is significant research on reliability of cloud systems, explaining the placement of big data with this cluster and our assignment to this theme.

**Growing and emerging themes:** There has been growth in almost all of the identified research themes. New topics have emerged, and established topics have received renewed interest. From Figure 18, we can make several observations:

- Many of the growth areas map to shifts in the prevalent technologies. This can be seen in growing interest in web application testing, relating to technologies (JavaScript), testing tools (Selenium), and testing techniques.
- There is a similar emergence in mobile applications, in both the subtheme of mobile testing in cluster 2 (android, mobile testing) and specific technologies in cluster 1 (android, mobile applications, smartphone).
- Machine learning has advanced many fields in the past five years. Unsurprisingly, it is also one of the largest growth areas in testing. The topic of machine learning has an average publication date of October 2016, and topics have emerged related to applications of ML in testing, data used in ML, and specific ML techniques. “Deep learning” is one of the newest topics (average date in September 2018). Topics related to machine learning have also emerged in reliability (big data) and model-based testing (specification mining).
- Topics have also emerged targeting learning and AI-based systems. From the embedded systems and “other domains” themes, we see topics related to autonomous vehicles, computer vision, image processing, and augmented reality. All of these will require their own specialized testing approaches. For example, autonomous vehicles are embedded systems, but add additional elements of nondeterminism that require new testing approaches. This area, in particular, may grow into its own independent subtheme in the future.
- There is growing interest in energy consumption of software and testing focused on profiling energy usage. This is connected to mobile applications, and a shift to portable devices that rely on batteries. This also reflects growing interest in sustainability and the environmental impact of software.
- Automated program repair has emerged as a growing area of interest. Techniques
in this subtheme generate patches to automatically fix program faults. The number of topics in this subtheme is still small, but the core topic itself has one of the newest average publication dates (March 2017), and its connected topics also have relatively recent average publication dates (see Figure 19).

- Fuzzing and search-based approaches (swarm intelligence, ant colony optimization) have emerged as prevalent test generation techniques. Fuzzing, notably, has seen application in general and security-focused testing themes (see Figure 20). Security topics are also active and growing.

**RQ2 (Emerging Topics and Themes):** Emerging topics and themes relate to or incorporate web and mobile applications, machine learning and AI—including autonomous vehicles—energy consumption, automated program repair, or fuzzing and search-based test generation.
Themes without growing or emerging topics: There are multiple reasons why a topic could have an older average date of publication. It could be (a) a topic in decline, (b) a
well-established topic with steady—but not growing—activity, or (c), a topic that had a “boom” period in the past and a comparatively lower level of activity in recent years.

Two themes—and three additional sub-themes—lack research topics with an average publication date within the past five years. None of these themes are “dying”. However, they have also not seen a notable growth in popularity or the emergence of new topics in this time. Briefly, we examine these areas:

- Traditional random testing has been supplanted, to some extent, by semi-random approaches. As shown in Figure 21, search-based software testing and fuzzing are growing in popularity. Both fields use sampling heuristics instead of applying purely random generation, retaining some of the benefits of random testing (e.g., scalability) while potentially yielding more effective results.

- Topics in requirements and black-box testing, as well as many of the connected topics, have older average publication dates. This indicates a lack of growth. Agile processes favor lightweight requirements (e.g., user stories) over formal and complex requirements. This may have led to a shift in attention towards other sources of information for test creation.

- Regression testing and prioritization remain major research fields—prioritization narrowly falls short of our cut-off, with an average publication date in December 2014. They are not experiencing a visible growth in activity, but also do not show strong signs of stagnation either. Connections to active topics suggest that researchers are applying new approaches (e.g., new machine learning techniques) to test prioritization or performing research in regression testing and prioritization in emerging product domains.

\textbf{RQ2 (Emerging Topics and Themes):} The themes of random testing, requirements-based testing, regression testing, and test prioritization have not substantially grown in popularity over the past five years.
4.2. Collaboration Between National Research Communities

Figure 22 illustrates how research communities of particular countries collaborate internationally. An interactive version of this map can be accessed by opening the country20 files from the data package or at https://greg4cr.github.io/other/2021-TestingTrends/countries.html.

In this map, we include all countries where researchers have published at least 20 studies in our sample. In total, our map contains 79 countries, grouped into six clusters. In Figure 23, we list the ten counties whose communities have published the most studies. We also list the average and median percentage of studies published by national research communities.
**RQ3 (International Collaboration):** The national research communities that have published the most studies are the United States (15,421 studies, or 30.97% of the sample), China (6,430; 12.91%), Germany (3,018; 6.06%), India (2,550; 5.12%), United Kingdom (2,272; 4.56%), Italy (1,952; 3.92%), Canada (1,925; 3.87%), France (1,891; 3.80%), Brazil (1,289; 2.59%), and Japan (1,260; 2.53%).

All ten of these national research communities have contributed over the average and median. The difference between average and median is influenced by the United States, which has contributed over twice as many studies as Chinese researchers—the second highest contributor.

These countries are generally prosperous, with the necessary governance and economic conditions to have formed a viable software industry and academic programs in computer science or software engineering. These are countries where researchers have the opportunity to collaborate with local, national, or international researchers and software developers—and where those developers and researchers are willing and able to collaborate.
To understand how these communities collaborate internationally, we can cluster countries according to the connections between the authors of the sampled studies. The distribution of countries into clusters is as follows:

- **Cluster 1**: Australia, Bangladesh, China, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Lithuania, Malaysia, Nigeria, Philippines, Singapore, South Africa, South Korea, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Thailand, USA, Vietnam
- **Cluster 2**: Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland, Ukraine
- **Cluster 3**: Algeria, Canada, Egypt, France, Iran, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates
- **Cluster 4**: Austria, Cyprus, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Romania, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom
- **Cluster 5**: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, Spain, Uruguay
- **Cluster 6**: Israel

Before we detail our observations on collaboration patterns, it is worth noting that—like with research topics—a cluster does not solely determine the collaborators of researchers in particular countries. Consider, for example, France in Cluster 3. Researchers in France do not solely collaborate with researchers in the other countries in Cluster 3—in fact, they collaborate with every other cluster. However, France and the other national research communities in Cluster 3 do collaborate disproportionately, resulting in their grouping as a distinct cluster.

Examining Figure 22 and the list of countries immediately reveals that researchers tend to interact with researchers in their immediate geographic neighborhood. This trend can be seen within a majority of the clusters. Cluster 1 contains a large number of countries in central or southern Asia or its surroundings, such as China, India, and Vietnam. Cluster 2 contains several European nations, with a focus on eastern Europe. Cluster 3 contains several Middle Eastern countries. Cluster 4 largely contains western Europe nations. Finally, Cluster 5 is largely focused on South and Central America.
Figure 24: Interactions between France and other Cluster 3 countries.

Figure 25: Interactions between Iran and other countries.
This is a natural result. Universities and industry in neighboring countries may have shared interests, historical or cultural connections, and greater physical or temporal ease in collaborating on research. This was particularly true before the emergence of mature software support for remote meetings or asynchronous work in the past decade. In addition, researchers in smaller or less economically prosperous countries may find greater success in working with collaborators in nearby countries with larger or better-funded software industries and universities than they would in their local environment.

Geographic neighborhood is not the sole determinant of collaboration patterns. For example, France falls into Cluster 3 and Spain falls into Cluster 5—while the rest of Europe is split across Clusters 2 and 4. This is also demonstrated by the United States not being clustered with its neighbors—Canada and Mexico—and Israel forming its own cluster. Other factors also influence how researchers collaborate internationally.

Cluster 3, in particular, offers important lessons in how collaborations form. This cluster is largely focused on the Middle East and its immediate surroundings—containing countries such as Egypt, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates. Many of these countries are geographic neighbors, but there are also some notable inclusions to
this cluster that are not part of the geographic neighborhood—France and Canada—and specific exclusions that are illustrative.

France and Canada have strong cultural and linguistic ties—particularly in Quebec, where French is the primary language. While the sampled articles were written in English, this cultural link may encourage collaboration for several reasons. First, there may be strong ties between particular institutions that provide explicit or implicit incentives to form collaborations. For example, two institutions may have a research partnership or student exchange programs. Second, cultural and linguistic ties may result in movement of researchers between the two regions. For example, students have a tendency to go to particular countries when choosing where to complete a Ph.D or when they attain a post-doctoral or professor position. When these researchers move, they still maintain ties to their previous location—including their collaborators.

Colonialism or other historic ties also may influence research collaborations between countries. For example, France held direct control or influence over Algeria, Egypt, Morocco, and other countries in Cluster 3. Even though this is no longer the case today, this historical connection may influence collaboration today—for instance, leading to institutional connections or influencing patterns movement of individual researchers. This can be seen from the interactions between France and other Cluster 3 countries in Figure 24. An observation can also be made from the inclusion of Spain in Cluster 5—a cluster largely focusing on South or Central American nations. Spain held many of these countries as colonies, leading to lasting linguistic and cultural ties that still influence patterns of collaboration and movement today.

Political factors also influence how and when researchers collaborate. For example, legal restrictions in the United States and in Europe constrain collaboration with Iran. As a result, the western nation that Iranian researcher collaborate the most with is Canada. Canada is a common country for Iranians to move to for their graduate education [76], and the connections they build may result in long-term collaborations between researchers in the two countries. Notably, Iranian researchers also do not tend to collaborate with many of their geographic neighbors in Cluster 3, such as the United Arab Emirates or Saudi Arabia (see Figure 25). This may reflect the political and cultural divide within the region.
Political factors also may explain why two geographic neighbors are specifically excluded from Cluster 3—Iraq and Israel. Israel, in particular, appears as its own “cluster”, as it cannot be grouped with any of the other clusters (see Figure 26). Israel has a contentious political relationship with its geographic neighbors, and this is reflected in the collaborations of researchers in Israel with those in other nations. Israeli researchers interact with French and Canadian researchers, but not with those in any of the Middle Eastern nations. Israeli researchers also work with those in a variety of other countries, but those collaborations span across all clusters and not disproportionately with any one cluster. As a result, Israel forms its own cluster.

Iraq also does not appear in Cluster 3 with other Middle Eastern nations. Rather, it appears in Cluster 1 due to its connections with the United States, Australia, and Malaysia. The unstable political situation in Iraq and the role of the United States in the country may influence the resulting research collaborations. For example, the Iraqi government offers a large number of scholarships for students to attend graduate school in the United States [77], influencing the movement of researchers.

| RQ3 (International Collaboration): | Collaborations between researchers in different countries are heavily influenced by the geographic neighborhood. However, cultural, historical, linguistic, and political connections also influence collaborations through their influence on the movement of researchers or by creating implicit or explicit incentives to collaborate. |

4.2.1. Emerging International Collaborations

Figure 27 presents the collaborations between national research communities, colored by the average year of publication. This allows us to examine which communities have begun to contribute more heavily to research in software testing in recent years. An interactive version of this map can be accessed by selecting the “Overlay” visualization after opening the country20 map and network files in VOSviewer.

This visualization allows us to understand which areas of the world have seen recent growth in their contributions to software testing literature. We focus on the countries
with an average year of publication within the past five years (June 2015 or later). This could indicate either the emergence of new national communities or the recent, rapid growth in productivity of existing communities.

The countries that have emerged in this period include (marked with their cluster):

- **2017**: Indonesia, Philippines (1); Ecuador, Peru (5)
- **2016**: Iraq, Vietnam (1); Kazakhstan (2); Morocco, Qatar (3); Colombia (5)
- **2015**: Bangladesh, Nigeria (1); Tunisia (3); Luxembourg (4); Costa Rica (5)

The primary areas of growth have been in Clusters 1 (in southeast Asia and Africa), 3 (Africa and the Middle East), and 5 (South America). In general, many of these countries are less economically developed than those in, e.g., Europe (Clusters 2 and 4). Their software industries and universities may not be as well established, or resources may not have been available for researchers until recent years. The emergence of these countries indicates that software testing research is not restricted to the highly-developed nations, and new perspectives from the researchers in these countries will
Researchers in emerging countries may collaborate with those in more established nations. For the South American countries in Cluster 5, there is some variance in who these partners are, but two are particularly common—Brazil and Spain. In South America, Brazil has a large and well-established community of software engineering researchers. As geographic neighbors, collaboration with this community may offer
benefits. All four of the emerging South American countries speak Spanish as their primary language, and there are strong cultural and historic ties to Spain. This will naturally lead to collaboration.

Researchers in Costa Rica and Peru (see Figure 28(b) have strong collaborations with Brazil and Spain, as well as the United States and Canada. Researchers in Ecuador (see Figure 28) have stronger ties to Europe, including Spain, France, and the United Kingdom. Researchers in Colombia collaborate widely, but there are strong ties to both Brazil and Spain. Researchers in the emerging nations in Cluster 1 tend to interact widely. However, collaboration with the United States, China, France, and the United Kingdom is common (for example, see Indonesia in Figure 29(a)).

One entry that stands out in this list is Luxembourg, as the sole western European country in the emerging communities. Luxembourg is a small country. Its size means
that even small changes in the research landscape can be easily observed. In 2012, Lionel Briand formed a research group at the International Centre for ICT Security, Reliability, and Trust at the University of Luxembourg, focused on software verification (among other topics). This group employs a relatively large number of researchers. Due to the productivity of this group, and the small size of the country, this research group has shifted the average publication date for software testing research from this country. This can further be seen in Figure 29(b). Briand was formerly at the University of Oslo and Simula Research Lab in Norway, and maintained his collaborations after moving. As a result, there is a strong connection (note the thickness of the line) between Luxembourg and Norway.

RQ4 (Emerging International Collaborations): Research communities are emerging in southeast Asia, Africa, and South America. Researchers in these communities often collaborate with those in well-established countries (e.g., South American researchers often collaborate with Spanish researchers).

4.3. Collaboration Between Researchers

The studies in our sample were written by researchers with a total of 462 unique names. It is likely that some researchers share a common name. For example, a small set of family names are very common in China. As a result, it is difficult to establish that a name belongs to a single researcher, especially as our data set spans decades of publications. Therefore, we will not state a list of the “most prolific authors”, as we cannot ensure the accuracy of such a list.

Instead, we are interested in using the connections between researchers as a basis for making observations about collaboration patterns in software testing research. These 462 names have been grouped into 13 clusters. Examining these clusters reveals four primary factors that influence collaborations between researchers. The first two relate to factors that lead to the formation of clusters or sub-clusters of researchers. The second two relate to factors that link those clusters and sub-clusters.
Figure 30 illustrates the collaborations between researchers. An interactive version of this map can be accessed by opening the authors20 files from the data package or at https://greg4cr.github.io/other/2021-TestingTrends/authors.html.

Researchers collaborate heavily with other local researchers: The first cluster—by far the largest—is almost entirely made up of authors with traditional Chinese and Korean names. We make two observations about this cluster. First, this cluster illustrates the natural allure of local connections. China is a very large country with many universities and a well-established software industry. Researchers in China have many opportunities to collaborate without stepping outside of their local borders. South Korea is located just outside of this border, and also has well-established research programs, which also makes collaboration likely.

Second, although Chinese researchers have been conducting software engineering
research since the 1980s, their community was largely self-contained before ICSE—a major SE venue—was held in China in 2006 [78, 79]. Researchers in Cluster 1 certainly collaborate outside of their cluster. However, Chinese authors largely started publishing in top testing venues only in the past 15 years [79]. Before this point, researchers in China primarily worked with other Chinese researchers, often within their own university [78]. Outside collaboration is a relatively recent—though, now fast-growing—phenomenon.

Many of the other clusters also show that researchers tend to collaborate locally. Many of the researchers in Cluster 2, for example, are located in northern Europe. As we can better ensure the uniqueness of researcher names, we can also observe that this cluster contains small sub-clusters of researchers from individual institutions and research groups within those institutions in northern Europe. Among others, these institutions include the University of Luxembourg (e.g., Lionel Briand, Mike Papadakis), Chalmers and the University of Gothenburg (e.g., Robert Feldt, Richard Torkar), Delft University of Technology (e.g., Arie van Deursen, Annibale Panichella), KTH Royal Institute of Technology (e.g., Martin Monperrus, Benoit Baudry), and Simula Research Lab (e.g., Shaukat Ali).

Many of these institutions are located in a small physical range (Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden), making collaboration easier. These particular institutions also have large research groups dedicated to software testing. The researchers in these groups will naturally collaborate to accomplish goals that could not be accomplished alone. It is simpler to work with local researchers than to collaborate across the world. It is even simpler to collaborate locally. Almost all of the researchers in this cluster have collaborations outside of this cluster. However, it is natural that they would collaborate at a heavier rate locally.

Similar observations are clear in many of the other clusters. Particular geographic areas (United Kingdom, Italy) and research groups can be again seen in Cluster 3, e.g., the University of Sheffield (Phil McMinn, Rob Hierons, Gordon Fraser—who recently moved to the University of Passau, and Jose Migeul Rojas—who recently moved to the University of Leicester). Many of the researchers in Cluster 4 are South Korean. In particular, many are located at the Korea Advanced Institute of Science
and Technology (KAIST), which is a major contributor to software testing research. While researchers collaborate across the planet, natural clusters will form at a local level, depending on the density of testing researchers—i.e., within the local institution, the national community, or across neighboring nations.

**Researchers collaborate in particular topic areas:** The primary linking factor for many of the researchers in Cluster 3 is a particular research topic—search-based software testing. Most of these researchers also work on other topics, but search-based software testing is their primary focus area. They collaborate with other researchers on this topic heavily enough to form a distinct collaboration cluster.

Strong sub-communities can form within the broader research community around topics that are sufficiently popular if efforts are made to create an environment that fosters collaboration. Search-based software engineering is such a community. Prominent researchers in this community have created specialized workshops and meeting venues to discuss challenges, including the Symposium on Search-Based Software Engineering, the International Workshop on Search-Based Software Testing, and the Crest Open Workshops at University College London. The growth of interest in this research area can at least be partially attributed to the dedication of the members of the community to collaborating with each other and organizing dedicated events on the topic.

**RQ3 (International Collaboration):** Researchers tend to collaborate heavily with others in their own institution, national community, or in nearby countries. They also collaborate heavily on particular research topics, encouraged by community-building efforts such as dedicated workshops.

**The movement of researchers forges connections across borders:** The institutional sub-clusters in Cluster 2 are linked not purely by the convenience of working with their geographic neighbors, but by the movement of researchers. As noted earlier, Lionel Briand moved from Simula to the University of Luxembourg. This connection can be seen in this cluster by the connection between both institutions through Briand (see Figure 31(a)). Similarly, Annibale Panichella was a post-doctoral researcher in Luxembourg before taking a position in Delft. That move can be seen in this cluster as well,
in Figure 31(b). In most cases, these collaborations do not end with the movement of the researcher. They continue even as new, local collaborations form. Movement of researchers is a clear factor in the formation of collaborations. The ease of movement between countries in the European Union may help increase collaboration across borders, and not just institutions within a single nation.
Figure 32: Interactions between Gregg Rothermel and others.

**Prolific researchers link sub-clusters of researchers together:** As noted, many of the researchers in Cluster 5 are located at KAIST in South Korea. The others in this cluster are largely from the United States. The connecting link is Gregg Rothermel, a prolific researcher. Rothermel has a history of collaboration with KAIST. He was a visiting professor at KAIST in 2011 and maintains research collaborations with researchers at the institution. In turn, many of the researchers in this cluster are linked through collaboration with Rothermel, as illustrated in Figure 32. Others are linked indirectly by their associations with Mary Jean Harrold, who was also a major testing researcher and the Ph.D. supervisor of Rothermel. Similar connections can be seen throughout this network of researchers. For example, a major connecting point between disparate sub-clusters in Cluster 6 is Myra Cohen.

Prolific researchers in software testing tend to collaborate with a large number of people, across the world. Naturally, then, these individuals are a connecting factor across otherwise separate communities. Such researchers can serve as a natural “matchmaker”, helping to foster new collaborations within the field.

**RQ3 (International Collaboration):** Connections between localized clusters or sub-clusters of researchers are formed through the movement of researchers and through the collaborations of prolific researchers.
4.4. Advice for Researchers

Both the high-level map and theme overview and the low-level network of connections between research topics can serve as inspiration for prospective and experienced testing researchers. We offer the following observations on how this data could serve as a starting point for new research directions and collaborations.

An introductory overview of the testing field: For researchers inexperienced in software testing, the high-level themes offer an immediate “snapshot” of the field that can be used to guide exploration of different research areas.

Understanding the context of a research topic: Researchers interested in a new topic can examine how that topic fits into the broader context of testing research.

- What topics are often associated with the topic of interest? This may illustrate the type of research often conducted on this topic, and natural areas of synergy between topics.

- Is interest in this topic growing, declining, or stable? The average date of publication in this topic may suggest the current level of interest.

Identifying new connections between topics: The absence of a connection between two topics may suggest new areas of research to explore—where there may be interesting challenges to solve.

Identifying collaborators and sources of collaboration: The maps of collaborations between national research communities and researchers may suggest sources of collaboration for new projects. In particular, the emerging national research communities should be highlighted. These research communities are emerging in areas of the world with young and growing software industries and academic programs. Researchers in these communities should be sought as collaborators, as they may bring fresh perspectives and offer interesting new challenges that are unknown to, or considered “solved” by, more established communities. Researchers in these communities may benefit as well from partnerships with researchers in established communities, who may have resources to offer.
5. Threats to Validity

**Conclusion Validity:** VOSviewer was used to perform visualization and analysis. The design of this tool and the visualizations it produces could potentially bias the observations made. However, this tool has been used in previous bibliometric studies (e.g., [30, 25]), and is considered to be relatively mature. We have made efforts in all cases to verify the assumptions behind the analyses performed.

**External Validity:** Our study examined publications examined in the Scopus database, potentially omitting relevant publication venues for software testing research. Currently, Scopus is the best available database for bibliometric studies, indexing content from 24,600 active titles and 5,000 publishers. Although some venues may not be indexed, many of the most important journals and conferences in the field are included. We believe that this is a sufficient and relevant sample to perform our study.

**Internal Validity:** We used based our analysis on publications retrieved from Scopus using the term “software testing”. This pool of papers did include publications unrelated to software testing, e.g., the use of software to test hardware or as part of student examination. We performed a manual process to remove unrelated keywords from the mapping. However, it is possible that some publications still remain that are unrelated to the studied research field. We believe that these are not enough to influence the high-level observations.

6. Conclusion

We have applied co-word analysis in order to characterize the topology of software testing research over four decades of research studies, based on the keywords provided by the authors of studies indexed in the Scopus database. These keywords represent targeted research topics within the field of software testing. The use of co-word analysis links publications through the identification of clusters of topics, connected by their co-occurrence on research studies.

---

7A list of covered journals and conferences can be found at [https://www.scopus.com/sources.uri](https://www.scopus.com/sources.uri).
Our analysis identifies topics that have attracted broad research interest, characterizes the periods in which such subjects have emerged—and, in some cases, when they have faded in importance—and makes clear the connections between those topics. A similar analysis of authors and the countries they come from enables a mapping of the researchers and their patterns of collaboration as well. We summarize the answers to each of our research questions, in turn:

**What are the key research topics in the field of software testing, and what themes can be observed from the connections between topics?**

- Research in software testing can be divided into 16 themes: automated test generation, creation guidance, evolution and maintenance, machine learning and predictive modeling, model-based testing, GUI testing, processes and risk, random testing, reliability, requirements, system testing, test automation, test case types, test oracles, verification and program analysis, and web application testing. An additional 18 subthemes underlie these high-level themes.

- The most popular individual research topics include automated test generation, regression testing, mutation testing, test automation, model-based testing, genetic algorithms, fault injection, software quality, simulation, software reliability, test case prioritization, verification, coverage criteria, combinatorial testing, and machine learning.

**What research topics and high-level themes have emerged and grown in popularity over the past five years?**

- Emerging topics and themes generally relate to web and mobile applications, machine learning and AI—including autonomous vehicles—energy consumption, automated program repair, or fuzzing and search-based test generation.

- The themes of random testing, requirements-based testing, regression testing, and test prioritization have not substantially grown in popularity over the past five years.
What observations can we infer about international collaborations in software testing research (between individual researchers and research communities in different countries)?

• The national research communities that have published the most studies in software testing are the United States, China, Germany, India, United Kingdom, Italy, Canada, Brazil, Japan, and France.

• Collaborations between national research communities are heavily influenced by the geographic neighborhood. Cultural, historical, linguistic, and political connections also influence collaborations through their influence on the movement of researchers or by creating implicit or explicit incentives to collaborate.

• Researchers tend to collaborate heavily with others in their own institution, national community, or in nearby countries. They also collaborate heavily on particular research topics, encouraged by community-building efforts such as dedicated workshops.

• Connections between localized sub-clusters of researchers are formed through the movement of researchers and through the collaborations of prolific researchers.

What research communities and collaborations have emerged or grown in strength over the past five years?

• Research communities are emerging in southeast Asia, Africa, and South America. Researchers in these communities often collaborate with those in well-established countries (e.g., South American researchers often collaborate with Spanish researchers).

We believe that these insights—and, more importantly, the underlying networks of research topics and collaborations—can inspire both current and future researchers in the field of software testing. We make our data available so that others may make additional observations or broaden the horizons of their own research and collaborations.
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