

## Clarifications and Errata September 2025 Technical Test Analyst for CTAL-TTA

**P44 Q4** is missing option e) *The organization's logo is not used with the correct aspect ratio and color scheme.* The question instruction should be: 'Select TWO options' to be consistent with the answer, requiring two options.

**Answer** should include e) *is not a correct option. Verifying details of the organization's log is the Test Analyst's responsibility, working with the organization's marketing department.*

**P85 Q2** Option c) in the question should be 2, 4, 5, 6.

**P86 Q4** Answer is on page 95. The text, '*There is no assumption that .... to have been assumed*' should be deleted.

## Support Questions

### Counting Elses +1

**Page 54.** Starts with 'In some simple situations where code includes one or more *Elses* as part of the conditional logic and no complex logic....' This should have included 'nested conditionals' as an example of complex logic.

The following should replace the above sentence:

'Counting ELSE statements can help identify branches, and by using simple logic, the number of test cases required. However, it does not alone determine the exact number of test cases needed when the logic is complex, such as nested conditionals, complex conditionals, or multiple conditions, early returns, switch/case, and exception/error handling.'

**P64 Q1** does contain nested loops. TC3 is not required. **P72** The answer should be b) 3.

Delete TC3 from the table and **P73** delete the first sentence 'In this scenario..... = 4'.

Correct the next line to a), c) and d).

### MC/DC general comments

Considering the details of the methods to support determining MC/DC testing.

The author previously considered including such information in the book and has now created supplementary text. Please find a separate file.

A good starting point can be creating a T/F table. This approach is used for the two methods, unique-cause (the second method in the attached file) and masking (the third method in the attached file), which most sources use. Unique-cause, which is preferred in critical scenarios. Although it is not as strict as unique-cause, masking meets the avionics DO-178C Level A MC/DC criteria and many other regulations. There is another less formal method.

Many sources, but not all, mix short-circuiting principles, particularly with the masking method, as there is some commonality in the idea that some conditions need not be evaluated. This can be confusing. In the attached file, in addition to the methods, I have included details on why short-circuiting should be considered separately. to MC/DC.

Considering the inclusion of information on creating MC/DC tests from the start in the book.

The reasons for not proceeding with this level of detail included:

An exam is unlikely to ask for MC/DC test cases to be designed from a scenario, but rather to analyze suggested test cases to see if they do provide MC/DC. The primary focus is on analyzing test cases provided, not creating them. In many cases, there is more than one set of test cases that would satisfy MC/DC, making it not possible to have a single correct answer.

Unique-cause and masking require T/F tables, and table construction would need to be explained in the book before moving to multiple condition testing, complicating the flow of the book.

The number of pages on MC/DC could be disproportionate to the number of points available in an exam for the associated questions.

The total number of pages in the book cannot exceed the maximum that can be bound using our current print-on-demand service.

### Further

**1. P87 Q5.A** There is a missing opening bracket after AND. The conditional statement should be:  
If is\_loyalty\_member AND (( purchase\_amount >100) OR is\_promotion\_active)

**2. P88 Q7** Option b) includes TC5, this should be TC7 which changes the third condition from TC4 and outcome.

**P98** Answer text line starting 'TC5 tests....' should be changed to 'TC3 test True, False, True with outcome changing to Yes'. The sentences below the table up to the line starting with a) should be deleted, as they duplicate the sentences above the table.

**3. P88 Q8** 'n/a' stands for 'not assessed' or 'not available'. This means the test cases designed, are for runtime behavior with short-circuiting occurring. The question asks for 100% MC/DC coverage of the given situation. If a code review is undertaken, 100% MC/DC coverage covers testing independently all conditions in their true and false values, 'n/a' does not apply. To clarify the question:

Above the table: After 'You have the following test cases for MC/DC' Add 'coverage of runtime behavior'.

Below the table: Add 'n/a' means 'not assessed'.

The question line should be changed to:

'In this situation, which of the following is true for MC/DC coverage?'

Remove 100%, although this is arguably true when qualified by 'In this situation' with run-time behavior and short-circuiting. However, removal of '100%' makes the question more straightforward.

### Additional

**P363 Exam 2 Q#6** Should start with 'You are testing the run-time behavior of software...'

Instead of 'Which is the minimum ....' replace with 'In this situation, there is short-circuiting. Which is the minimum set of test cases for MC/DC coverage?'

**P421 Exam 3 Q#6** Change intro question to 'You are tasked with testing run-time behavior. Short-circuiting occurs. Remove the '100%' from the following sentence.

We hope you find the details in this file and the attached file useful in preparation for the CTAL-TTA exam.

Please send any feedback you may have to the email contact [a] revisionary.co.uk. Feedback and other changes may be added to the website later. If you have any further points or suggestions, please get in touch.

Author C. Newbould via AiFlex Publishing UK.