## Framework Evaluation - ASM vs. BCEL in static analysis setting

For my experiment, I used 27 open-source Java applications of different sizes. As shown in the table below. The size of each application is mentioned in terms of types and bytecode instructions including the accompanied external libraries\*. I intentionally left the analysers to parse external libraries to run on the largest possible number of bytecode instructions. In the table, the number of all visited methods and the count of interface method invocations are declared. In the last column, the speed ratio of ASM vs BCEL based on the time cost of both analysers on each run is computed. Finally, I concluded that for my static analysis, ASM is in average 3.65 times faster than BCEL. All of my static analyses were done on an Intel Core i7-3630QM machine with 16 GB of memory running x64 Windows 7 Professional. The time cost logged for each experiment run does not include the time spent on file stream reading (i.e., reading the benchmark program from disk, extract the .class files in each .jar or .zip file and provide the parser a raw java.io.InputStream).

Static analysis Analysed Interface all ASM Speed Analysed Bytecode method vs BCEL Benchmark visited instructions invocatio Types methods BCEL (ASM count) perf4j-0.9.16 87 9,648 707 278 32 281 778.13% 374 695.74% Commons-io-2.4 110 20,716 1,169 173 47 cglib-2.2.2 228 22,957 1,288 615 63 421 568.25% 34,346 2,534 737 95 581 511.58% Slf4j-1.7.5 358 515 commons-lang-3-3.1 153 49,844 2,358 591 78 560.26% 2,277 105 434.29% sablecc-3.2 286 61,596 864 561 bce1-5.2 383 61,617 2,911 1,208 156 702 350.00% fidocadj 173 61,904 1,162 177 80 530 562.50% Jmock-2.6.0 685 99,066 4,411 1,471 188 797 323.94% 154 116,889 2,149 1,073 531 470.97% javacc-5.0 93 592 122,898 1,389 861 397.69% Proguard-4.11 5,643 173 1,343 Hamcrest-1.3 1,532 263,294 10,327 7,562 313 329.07% findbugs-1.3.9 1,735 286,709 11,233 7,411 375 1,454 287.73% pmd-5.1.0 1,288 294,051 9,536 5,921 453 1,327 192.94% 10,624 5,674 1,472 291.49% Saxon-9.1.0.8 1,141 353,997 376 swt 897 398,503 10,453 335 297 1,331 348.15% 20,971 truezip 3,188 587,575 6,157 578 1,911 230.62% tomcat-8 3,217 954,463 30,434 18,873 954 3,168 232.08% 41,266 3,222 243.86% Groovy-all-1.8.6 3,715 997,227 23,022 937 fanchallenge-1.3.3 5,595 1,088,556 39,713 13,153 1,046 2,872 174.57% Aspectj-1.7.4 5,376 1,764,277 56,219 35,936 1,093 5,242 379.60% 8,221 2,151,198 65,603 24,476 1,476 5,162 249.73% jdownloader.zip Hibernate-4.3.4 21,204 3,005,295 159,479 165,895 3,058 10,500 243.36% 322,524 Sonarqube-4.1.2 43,957 8,786,271 169,210 5,866 18,893 222.08% 9,618,575 355,034 137,111 6,023 23,276 jdk1.7.0 10 44,665 286.45% jboss**-as-7.1.1.fmal** 60,741 10,698,548 457,764 278,613 7,910 31,123 293.46% 11,545 34,103 80,856 13,770,171 568,554 443,147 195.39% eclipse\_rcp\_kepler\_sr2 3.65 Avg

<sup>\*</sup>To save space I did not include a description on each application.