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1. Adding re-entrant monitors to a concurrent component-based programming language increases the uncertainty regarding the observable behavior at the component’s interface.

2. Although mock object testing rather has a focus for practical applications it is possible and useful to give this testing approach a formal basis.

3. If unit tests are to be conducted by software developers then the test specification language should consist of the target programming language extended by additional specification statements.

4. It is arguable whether software developers should write their own unit tests.

5. In an object-oriented setting it does not make sense to distinguish unit and integration testing.

6. For testing object-oriented units one should prefer an interaction-based to a state-based testing approach.

7. A lot of unit tests seem to be practically of no use but are written only to fulfill unit testing guidelines or coding rules.

8. If all software products had to be formally verified then probably the most complex application available would be a text-oriented calculator.

9. Randomness is just an illusion caused by our limited perception.