

Automated Testing of API Mapping Relations

Hao Zhong
Laboratory for Internet Software Technologies
Institute of Software
Chinese Academy of Sciences, China
zhonghao@nfs.iscas.ac.cn

Suresh Thummalapenta and Tao Xie
Department of Computer Science
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, NC 27695-8206, USA
{sthumma,txie}@ncsu.edu

ABSTRACT

Application Programming Interface (API) mapping relations describe the relation between API invocations of one language and their mapped API invocations that **have similar functionalities** in another language. With API mapping relations, migration tools can translate API client code from one language into another language. Still, some mapped API invocations have different behaviors since they produce different outputs given the same inputs. These different behaviors introduce defects in translated code silently since they do not introduce compilation errors. It is desirable to detect these differences for improvement of migration tools, but it is challenging to detect such differences **since** it requires comparing various behaviors of mapped invocations. In this paper, we propose an approach, called TeMaAPI (Testing Mapping relations of APIs), that detects different behaviors of mapped API invocations via testing. In particular, TeMaAPI generates adequate test cases that targets at visiting all feasible paths and invocation sequences. Based on our approach, we implement a tool and conduct evaluations on 5 migration tools. The results show that TeMaAPI effectively detects many different behaviors of mapped API invocations. We analyze the detected differences, and conclude 8 findings and implications. These findings and implications help improve existing migration tools and are also helpful for programmers to understand the differences of API invocations between Java and C# **before migration**.

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the inception of computer science, many programming languages (*e.g.*, Cobol, Fortran and Java) have been introduced to serve specific requirements¹. For example, Cobol is introduced specifically for developing business applications. In general, software companies or open source organizations often release their applications in different languages to survive in competing markets and to address various business requirements such as platform independence. **A recent study [11] shows that nearly one third applications exist in different languages. A natural way to implement a application in a different language is to translate from existing**

¹<http://hop1.murdoch.edu.au>

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

Copyright 20XX ACM X-XXXXX-XX-X/XX/XX ...\$10.00.

```
01: package java.lang::System{
02:   class java.lang.String :: System:String{
03:     method valueOf(Object) pattern = @1.ToString();
04:     ...}}
```

Figure 1: An example API Mapping relation in Java2CSharp.

```
Java Code
05: Object obj = ...
06: String value = java.lang.String.valueOf(obj);
C# Code translated by Java2CSharp
07: Object obj = ...
08: String value = obj.ToString();
```

Figure 2: Original Java and its translated C# code.

applications. For example, Lucene.Net is declared to be translated from Java Lucene in its website². For another example, the Neo-Datis object database is also being translated from Java to C# as declared by its website³.

In general, translating applications manually from one programming language, referred to L_1 , to another language, referred to as L_2 , is a tedious and error-prone task, since real-world applications often include thousands of lines of code. To reduce manual effort, programmers use existing automatic translation tools such as JLCA⁴ or develop their own translation tools. For example, Salem *et al.* [2] translated the BLUE financial system of the ICT company from Java to C# using the JLCA tool. On the other hand, programmers of db4o⁵ developed their own translation tool, called sharpen⁶, for translating db4o from java to C#. The primary goal of these tools is to translate an application in one language to another language such that both versions exhibit the same behavior.

Automatic translation tools use mappings among API invocations from L_1 to L_2 , referred to as *API mapping relations*, as a basis for translating applications. Figure 1 shows an example API mapping relation from the API method `String.valueOf()` in Java (L_1) to `String.ToString()` in C# (L_2). Figure 2 shows original Java code and its equivalent C# code translated using an automatic translation tool, called Java2CSharp⁷. These API mapping relations play an important role in preserving the same behavior between the original and translated applications. We hereby use notations App_1 and App_2 to represent applications in languages L_1 and L_2 , respectively. Any inconsistencies among these mapping relations could result in different behaviors between App_1 and App_2 applications.

Writing API mapping relations that exhibit the same behavior in both L_1 and L_2 is quite challenging, since existing languages

²<http://lucene.apache.org/lucene.net/>

³<http://wiki.neodatis.org/>

⁴<http://tinyurl.com/2c4coln>

⁵<http://www.db4o.com>

⁶<http://tinyurl.com/22rsnsk>

⁷<http://j2cstranslator.sourceforge.net/>

```

09: public abstract class Configuration {
10: protected void setUpStringMappings() {
11:     mapMethod("java.lang.String.valueOf",
               runtimeMethod("getStringValueOf"));
12: ... } }

C# Code translated by sharpen
13: Object obj = ...
14: String value = getStringValueOf(obj); ...

15: public static string GetStringValueOf(object value) {
16:     return null == value? "null": value.ToString();
17: }

```

Figure 3: An example API mapping relation in sharpen.

such as Java or C# provide a large number of API invocations. Furthermore, API methods with similar names and structures can have different behaviors in different languages. Despite the large number of API invocations, El-Ramly *et al.* [6] shows that it is essential to develop new methods for translating applications from Java to C#, although both these languages appears to be similar.

To illustrate the challenges, we next provide real examples that show the behavioral differences among API mappings defined in Java2CSharp. Consider the API mapping and translated code shown in Figures 1 and 2, respectively. Although the translated code does not include compilation errors, the translated code behaves different from the original code for certain inputs. For example, if `obj` in Line 5 is assigned to `null`, value in Line 6 is assigned to a string whose value is "null". In contrast, if `obj` in Line 7 is assigned to `null`, Line 8 throws `NullReferenceException`. To address this behavioral difference, another migration tool, called *sharpen*, uses a different API mapping relation shown in Lines 9 to 12 in Figure 3. Lines 13 to 17 show the translated C# code for the Java code shown in Figure 2. In particular, Line 16 ensures that the string "null" is assigned to `value` in Line 14 when a `null` value is assigned to `obj`. Although, *sharpen*'s API mapping relation addresses the issue with `null`, this relation still includes other behavioral differences. For example, assigning a `false` value to `obj` in Line 5 results in "false" value to be assigned to `value` in Line 6. However, assigning a `false` value to `obj` in Line 14 results in "False" value to be assigned to `value` in Line 14. If the string variable `value` is used in a case-sensitive comparison afterwards, the preceding difference could result in different outputs. These differences are relatively difficult to detect, since a programmer typically does not aware of the internal logic of the API method to construct appropriate test cases. These examples show the existence of behavioral differences among API mapping relations and shows the necessity of detecting such differences among API invocations.

There exist regression testing approaches [7, 13] that accept two versions of an application and detect behavioral differences between those versions. Although our current problem of detecting behavioral differences among API mapping relations can be considered as a form of regression testing problem, no existing approach can be used to detect such differences. The primary reason is that existing approaches require both the versions under consideration belong to the same language. However, in our context, both versions belong to different languages, making these existing approaches inapplicable. Therefore, to address these preceding issues, we propose a novel approach, called **TeMaAPI (Testing Mapping relations of APIs)**, that automatically generates tests that detect behavioral differences among API mapping relations.

In particular, TeMaAPI generates test cases on one version App_1 of the application (in a language) and translates those tests into the other language L_2 . TeMaAPI next applies translated test cases on the other version App_2 to detect behavioral differences. TeMaAPI addresses two major technical challenges in effectively detecting behavioral differences. (1) Using a naive technique such as gener-

ating test cases with `null` values may not be significant in detecting behavioral differences among API mapping relations. Since we focus on object-oriented languages such as Java or C#, to detect behavioral differences, generated test cases need to exercise various object states, which can be achieved using method-call sequences. To address this issue, TeMaAPI leverages two existing state-of-the-art test generation techniques: random [16] and dynamic-symbolic-execution-based [8, 12, 20]. (2) Generating test cases on App_1 and applying those test cases on App_2 may not exercise many behaviors of API invocations in App_2 , thereby related defects cannot be detected. To address this issue, TeMaAPI uses a round-trip technique that also generates test cases on App_2 and applies them on App_1 . We describe more details of our approach and how we address these challenges in subsequent sections.

This paper makes the following major contributions:

- A novel approach, called TeMaAPI, that automatically generates test cases that detect behavioral differences among API mapping relations. Given a translation tool, TeMaAPI detects different behaviors of its all API mapping relations automatically. It is important to detect these different behaviors, since they can introduce defects in translated code silently.
- Test adequacy criteria proposed for generating sufficient test cases to test API mapping. TeMaAPI targets at generating adequate test cases that can reveal all behaviors of mapped API invocations to test their mapping relations.
- A tool implemented for TeMaAPI and three evaluations on 5 migration tools that include 3 Java-to-C# tools and 2 C#-to-Java tools. The results show that various factors such as null values, string values, input ranges, different understanding, exception handling, static values, cast statements, and invocation sequences can lead to different behaviors of mapped API invocations. Based on the results, we further analyze the implications of these factors for programmers and for migration tool developers.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents our test adequacy criteria. Section 3 illustrates our approach using an example. Section 4 presents our approach. Section 5 presents our evaluation results. Section 6 discusses issues of our approach. Section 7 presents related work. Finally, Section 8 concludes.

2. TEST ADEQUACY CRITERIA

As stated by Andrews *et al.* [3], a test adequacy criterion is a predict, and a test suite is adequate with respect to a criterion only if all defined properties of the criterion are satisfied by the test suite. In this paper, we define two test adequacy criteria for API mapping relations as follows.

Path criterion. Given an API invocation inv in a language L_1 , and its mapped API invocations $\psi(inv)$ in a language L_2 , a adequate test suite should cover all internal paths of inv . This criterion ensures that $\psi(inv)$ in L_2 return the same values with inv in L_1 with respect to all paths of inv .

Sequence criterion. Given API invocations inv_1, \dots, inv_m in a language L_1 and its mapped API invocations $\psi(inv_1, \dots, inv_m)$ in a language L_2 , a adequate test suite should cover all states of obj with respect to the field criterion. This criterion ensures that $\psi(inv_1, \dots, inv_m)$ in L_2 return the same values with inv_1, \dots, inv_m in L_1 with respect to all call sequences of inv_1, \dots, inv_m .

TeMaAPI targets at generating test cases that satisfy both the path criterion and the sequence criterion for testing API mapping relations.

3. EXAMPLE

We next illustrate the basic steps to detect the different behaviors of a mapping relation in Java2CSharp as discussed in Section 1.

Translating Generated client code. First, TeMaAPI generates a client code method for each API method in each API field of the `java.lang.String` class. For example, the generate client code for the `valueOf(Object)` method is as follows:

```
public java.lang.String testvalueOf64sm0(Object m0) {
    return java.lang.String.valueOf(m0); }
```

After that, we use Java2CSharp to translate generated client code from Java to C#.

Removing translated client-code methods with compilation errors. A migration tool typically cannot deal with all API invocations, so some translated client-code methods can have compilation errors. TeMaAPI parses translated code, and removes all client-code methods with compilation errors. The remaining client-code methods are testable since no compilation errors are left.

In this example, the translated C# `testvalueOf64sm` method is as follows:

```
public System.String TestvalueOf64sm(Object m0) {
    return m0.ToString(); }
```

This method contains no compilation errors since Java2CSharp covers the mapping relation of the `valueOf(Object)` method in Java as shown in Figure 1.

Generating and executing test cases to reveal different behaviors. TeMaAPI leverages various techniques to generate test cases for remaining client-code methods. For example, TeMaAPI extends Pex [20], so that it records all inputs and output of each searched path. In this example, for the `TestvalueOf64sm` method in C#, one recorded input is a boolean value, and the corresponding output is "False". Based on the input and output, TeMaAPI generates a JUnit test case as follows:

```
public void testvalueOf64sm0(){
    sketch.Test_java_lang_String obj =
        new sketch.Test_java_lang_String();
    boolean m0 = false;
    Assert.assertEquals("False", obj.testvalueOf64sm(m0));
}
```

This JUnit test case fails since the `testvalueOf64sm` method in Java returns "false" instead of "False". Thus, TeMaAPI detects a different behavior between the `valueOf(Object)` method in Java and its mapped C# API methods defined by Java2CSharp.

4. APPROACH

Given a migration tool between Java and C#, TeMaAPI generates various test cases to reveal different behaviors of the tool's API mapping relations. Figure 4 shows the overview of TeMaAPI. It is able to test not only mapping relations of a single API invocation but also mapping relations of multiple API invocations.

4.1 Translating Generated client code

Given a migration tool, TeMaAPI first extracts its translatable API invocations. It is challenging to extract such invocations directly from migration tools for two factors: (1) different migration tools may follow different styles to describe API mapping relations. For example, as shown in Section 1, the API mapping relations of Java2CSharp are described in its mapping files, but the API mapping relations of sharpin are hard-coded in its source files. (2) commercial migration tools typically hide their API mapping relations in binary files. Due to the two factors, TeMaAPI does not extract API mapping relations directly from migration tools, but chooses to




Figure 4: Overview of TeMaAPI

analyze translated code of migration tools. In particular, TeMaAPI generates a client-code method for each API invocation and analyzes translated results for translatable API invocations. We do not use migration tools to translate existing projects for two considerations: (1) existing projects typically contain quite a small set of API invocations, so many API mapping relations may be not covered; (2) a single method of an existing project may invoke multiple API methods, so it may be difficult to analyze which methods are not mapped. TeMaAPI relies on the reflection technique [14] provided by both Java and C# to generate client code for translation.

Static fields. Given a public static field f of a class C whose type is T , TeMaAPI generates a getter as follows:

```
public T TestGet|f.name||no|() { return C.f; }
```

If f is not a constant, TeMaAPI generates a setter as follows:

```
public void TestSet|f.name||no|(T v) { C.f = v; }
```

Non-static fields. Given a public non-static field f of a class C whose type is T , TeMaAPI generates a getter for each constructor $C(T_1 p_1, \dots, T_n p_n)$ of C as follows:

```
public T TestGet|f.name||no|(T1 c1, ..., Tn cn) {
    C obj = new C(c1, ..., cn);
    return obj.f; }
```

If f is not a constant, TeMaAPI generates a setter as follows:

```
public void TestSet|f.name||no|(T1 c1, ..., Tn cn) {
    C obj = new C(c1, ..., cn);
    obj.f = v; }
```

In the preceding code, " $|f.name|$ " denotes the name of f , and " $|no|$ " denotes the corresponding number of generated client-code method.

Static methods. Given a public static method $m(T_1 p_1, \dots, T_n p_n)$ of a class C whose return type is T_m , TeMaAPI generates a client-code method as follows:

```
public Tm Test|m.name||no|(T1 m1, ..., Tn mn) {
    return C.m(m1, ..., mn); }
```

Non-static methods. Given a public non-static method $m(T_1 p_1, \dots, T_n p_n)$ of a class C whose return type is T_m , TeMaAPI generates a client-code method for each constructor $C(T_v p_v, \dots, T_t p_t)$ of C as follows:

```
public Tm Test|m.name||no|(T1 m1, ..., Tn mn,
                          Tv cv, ..., Tt ct) {
    C obj = new C(cv, ..., ct);
    return obj.m(m1, ..., mn); }
```

In the preceding code, " $|m.name|$ " denotes the name of $m(T_1 p_1, \dots, T_n p_n)$.

TeMaAPI put all generated client code methods for one API class C into one generated class. For a Java-to-C# tools, TeMaAPI generates client code in Java as shown by the solid line in Figure 4, and for a C#-to-Java tools, TeMaAPI generates client code in C# as shown by the dotted line in Figure 4. When generating methods, TeMaAPI ignores generic API methods for simplicity. Besides, it ignores `unsafe` and `delegate` API methods and API methods whose parameters are marked as `out` or `ref` when generating C# methods. Java does not have corresponding keywords, so there are typically not mapped. After TeMaAPI generate client-code methods, we translate them using a migration tool under experiments.

After generated code is translated, TeMaAPI parses translated code and removes translated methods with compilation errors. For Java code, TeMaAPI extends Eclipse’s Java compiler to extract methods with compilation errors. For C# code, TeMaAPI extracts the list of compilation errors through the automation and extensibility interfaces of Visual Studio. Using remained methods, TeMaAPI tests single API invocations (Section 4.2). From remained methods, TeMaAPI also analyzes the list of translatable API invocations for a given migration tool. Using the list, TeMaAPI further tests API invocation sequences (Section 4.3).

4.2 Testing Single API Invocations

Pex [20] is a white-box test generation tool for .Net based on dynamic symbolic execution. Basically, Pex repeatedly executes a method under test, so that it explores all feasible paths of the method. To reduce the efforts to explore paths, Pex leverage various search strategies. For example, Xie *et al.* [23] propose a search strategy called Fitnex that uses state-dependent fitness values to guide path exploration of Pex.

TeMaAPI extends Pex, so that it generates test cases that satisfy the path criterion defined in Section 2. In particular, for each translated C# client code method, TeMaAPI records the inputs and the corresponding output when Pex searches each path. Based on recorded inputs and outputs, TeMaAPI generates JUnit test cases to ensure each mapped API invocations produce the same output give the same inputs. For example, TeMaAPI records that given a integer whose value is 0, the output of the `TestvalueOf57sm` method in C# is “0”. Based on the preceding input and output, TeMaAPI generates a JUnit test case for the `testvalueOf57sm` method in Java as follows:

```
public void testvalueOf57sm7(){
    sketch.Test_java_lang_String obj =
        new sketch.Test_java_lang_String();
    int m0 = 0;
    Assert.assertEquals("0", obj.testvalueOf57sm7(m0));}
```

This JUnit test case runs successfully, and the result ensures that the `testvalueOf57sm` method in Java has the same output with the `TestvalueOf57sm` method in C# given the same input.

We find that when Pex searches a path with some specific inputs, the method under test throws exceptions. For example, TeMaAPI records that if the input of the `TestvalueOf61sm` method in C# is null, the method throws `NullPointerException`. TeMaAPI also generates a JUnit test case to ensure the `testvalueOf61sm` method in Java also throws a mapped exception. To generate the JUnit test case, TeMaAPI first finds the corresponding exceptions in Java by analyzing translated client code with generated code. For example, TeMaAPI finds that the `NullPointerException` class in C# is mapped to the `NullPointerException` class in Java with respect to the API mapping relations of Java2CSharp, so it generates a JUnit test case as follows:

```
public void testvalueOf61sm3(){
```

Name	Version	Provider	Description
Java2CSharp	1.3.4	IBM (ILOG)	Java to C#
JLCA	3.0	Microsoft	Java to C#
sharpen	1.4.6	db4o	Java to C#
Net2Java	1.0	NetBean	C# to Java
VB & C# to Java converter	1.6	Tangible	C# to Java

Table 1: Subject tools

```
try{
    sketch.Test_java_lang_String obj =
        new sketch.Test_java_lang_String();
    java.lang.Object m0 = null;
    obj.testvalueOf61sm(m0);
}catch(java.lang.NullPointerException e){
    Assert.assertTrue(true);
    return;
}
Assert.assertTrue(false); }
```

This JUnit test case fails since the `testvalueOf61sm` method does not throw any exceptions given a null input. From this failed JUnit test case, TeMaAPI detects the different behavior between the `testvalueOf61sm` method in Java and the `TestvalueOf61sm` method in C#. Since the two methods call only one API method, TeMaAPI thus detects the different behavior between the `valueOf` (Object) in Java and its mapped C# method.

4.3 Testing Invocation Sequences

Randoop [16] is a test generation tool for Java. It randomly generates test cases based on already generated test cases in a feedback-directed manner. As stated by Tillmann and Halleux [20], the key difference between Pex and Randoop lies in that Pex generates test cases for a single method whereas Randoop generates test cases that involve multiple methods.

TeMaAPI extends Randoop, so that it generates test cases that satisfy the sequence criterion defined in Section 2. As described in Section 4.1, TeMaAPI is able to extract translatable API invocations of a given migration tool. TeMaAPI restricts the search scope of Randoop, so that it generates JUnit test cases use translatable API invocations. Since generated JUnit test cases use only translatable API invocations of a given migration tool, the migration tool can translate these JUnit test cases in Java into NUnit test cases automatically. We find that some JUnit test cases generated by Randoop fail or produce errors. Before translating, TeMaAPI removes all such JUnit test cases, so all JUnit test cases run successfully. If a translated NUnit test case fails or produces errors, the test case may indicate different behaviors of API invocation sequences.

5. EVALUATIONS

We implemented a tool for TeMaAPI and conducted evaluations using our tool to address the following research questions:

1. How effectively can existing migration tool translate API invocations (Section 5.1)?
2. How effectively can our approach detect different behaviors of single API invocations (Section 5.2)?
3. How effectively can our approach detect different behaviors of multiple API invocations (Section 5.3)?

Table 1 shows the subject tools in our evaluation. Column “Name” lists the names of subject tools. In the rest of the paper, we call “VB & C# to Java converter” as converter for short. Column “Provider” lists their companies. Although all these tools are developed by commercial companies, Java2CSharp, sharpen, and Net2Java are all open source. Column “Description” lists the main functionalities of subject tools. We choose these tools as subjects since we find that many programmer recommend these tools in various forums.

Type	No	Java2CSharp		JLCA		sharpen	
		M	%	M	%	M	%
sfg	16962	237	1.4%	3744	22.1%	47	0.3%
sfs	0	0	n/a	0	n/a	0	n/a
nfg	832	0	0.0%	121	14.5%	26	2.2%
nfs	823	0	0.0%	79	9.6%	0	0.0%
sm	1175	97	8.3%	198	16.9%	26	2.2%
nm	175400	3589	2.0%	39536	22.5%	1112	0.6%
Total	195192	3923	2.0%	43678	22.4%	1185	0.6%

Table 2: Translation results of Java to C# tools

All evaluations were conducted on a PC with Intel Qual CPU @ 2.83GHz and 1.98M memory running Windows XP.

5.1 Translating Generated Client Code

For Java to C# tools, we use TeMaAPI to generate client-code methods for J2SE 6.0⁸. As described in Section 4.1, TeMaAPI ignores all generic API methods. Table 2 shows the translation results. Column “Type” lists the types of generated methods. In particular, “sfg” denotes getters of static fields; “sfs” denotes setters of static fields; “nfg” denotes getters of non-static fields; “nfs” denotes setters of non-static fields; “sm” denotes static methods; “nm” denotes non-static methods; and “Total” denotes the sums of all methods. Column “Number” lists numbers of corresponding types of methods. Columns “Java2CSharp”, “JLCA”, and “sharpen” list the translation results of corresponding migration tools. For these columns, sub-column “M” lists the number of translated methods without compilation errors, and sub-column “%” lists the percentage from translated method without compilation errors to corresponding generated methods.

From the results of Table 2, we find that it is quite challenging for a migration tool to cover all API invocations. One challenge lies in that API invocations are quite large in size. Although JLCA can translate 43678 generated methods, it covers only 22.4% of total generated methods. The other challenge lies in that many API invocations of different languages cannot be accurately mapped. For example, as pointed out by our previous work [26], one API method in one language may be mapped to several API methods in another language. We find that all the three migration tools have techniques to deal with many-to-many mapping relations. In particular, Java2CSharp and sharpen develop their own assemblies and map some API invocations to their implemented assemblies instead of standard C# API invocations. For example, Java2CSharp maps the `java.lang.Class.forName(String)` method in Java to the `ILOG.J2CsMapping.Reflect.Helper.GetNativeType(String)` method in C#, and the latter method is provided by Java2CSharp. JLCA does not implement additional assemblies, but generate additional source code to hide different behaviors. For example, TeMaAPI generates one method for the `java.awt.Dialog.add(Component, int, Frame)` method:

```
public Component testadd79nm(Component m0,int m1,Frame c0){
    java.awt.Dialog obj = new java.awt.Dialog(c0);
    return obj.add(m0,m1);
}
```

JLCA translates the preceding method as follows:

```
public virtual Control testadd79nm(Control m0, int m1,
                                Form c0){
    Form obj = SupportClass.DialogSupport.CreateDialog(c0);
    Control temp_Control;
    temp_Control = m0;
    obj.Controls.Add(temp_Control);
    if (m1 != -1)
        obj.Controls.SetChildIndex(temp_Control, m1);
}
```

⁸<http://java.sun.com/javase/6/docs/api/>

Type	No	Net2Java		converter	
		M	%	M	%
sfg	3223	1	0.0%	3	0.1%
sfs	8	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
nfg	117	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
nfs	115	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
sm	996	22	2.2%	387	38.9%
nm	190376	4	0.0%	6	0.0%
Total	194835	27	0.0%	396	0.2%

Table 3: Translation results of C# to Java tools

```
return temp_Control;
}
```

To translate one API invocation from Java to C#, JLCA adds the `tmp_Control` local variable and generates the `SupportClass` class where more API invocations are introduced.

Although all the three migration tools take the different behaviors of mapped API invocations seriously, they do not cover all differences of API mapping relations. For example, when JLCA translates generated code, it generates a report with 1265 warning messages for different behaviors of API mapping relations. One warning message is “Method ‘java.lang.String.indexOf’ was converted to ‘System.String.IndexOf’ which may throw an exception”. Still, JLCA leaves these differences to programmers, and the report does not tell programmers when such an exceptions is thrown.

For C# to Java migration tools, we use TeMaAPI to generate client-code methods for the .Net framework client profile⁹. As described in Section 4.1, besides generic methods, TeMaAPI also ignores methods whose parameters are marked with `out` or `ref`. Table 3 shows the translation results. Columns of Table 3 are of the same meanings with the columns of Table 2. TeMaAPI generates almost the same size of methods as it generates for J2SE 6.0. From the results of Table 2, we find that both the two tool translate only quite a small portion of API invocations. As described in the wikipedia¹⁰, C# provides many features that Java does not have (e.g., partial class, reference parameters, output parameters, and named arguments). We suspect that a C# to Java migration tool needs take more effects on these issues, so many mapping relations of API invocations are not addressed yet.

Comparing the translation results between Java-to-C# tools and C#-to-Java tools, we find that Java-to-C# tools cover much more API invocations. To fully explore the translation results of Java-to-C# tools, we present the results of the package level in Table 4. Column “Name” lists the names of Java packages. To save space, we omit the prefixes such as “java.”, “javax.”, and “org.” if it does not introduce ambiguity. We also use short names for some packages. In particular, we use “acc.” to denote the `javax.accessibility` package, “man.” to denote the `javax.management` package, “java.sec.” to denote the `java.security` package, and “javax.sec.” to denote the `javax.security` package. We also omits 12 packages that are not covered by all the three tools (e.g., the `javax.rmi` package). Other columns of Table 4 are of the same meanings with the columns of Table 2. From the results of Table 4, we find that all the three migration tools cover the `java.io` package, the `java.lang` package, the `java.util` package, and the `java.net` package. The four packages may be quite important for most Java programs. Almost for all packages, JLCA covers more API invocations. In particular, JLCA covers GUI-related packages such as the `java.awt` package and the `javax.swing` package. As a result, JLCA can translate some Java programs with GUI interfaces whereas the other two tools cannot.

⁹<http://tinyurl.com/252t2ax>

¹⁰<http://tinyurl.com/yj4v2m2>

Name	No	Java2CSharp		JLCA		sharpen	
		M	%	M	%	M	%
awt	29199	0	0.0%	8637	29.6%	0	0.0%
bean	1768	20	1.1%	14	0.8%	0	0.0%
io	3109	592	19.0%	1642	52.8%	43	1.4%
lang	5221	1494	28.6%	2377	45.5%	791	15.2%
math	1584	101	6.4%	232	14.6%	0	0.0%
java.net	1990	52	2.6%	482	24.2%	10	0.5%
nio	536	30	5.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
java.rmi	1252	0	0.0%	707	56.5%	0	0.0%
java.sec.	2797	50	1.8%	702	25.1%	0	0.0%
java.sql	3495	20	0.6%	183	5.2%	0	0.0%
text	1068	96	9.0%	321	30.1%	0	0.0%
util	9586	1372	14.3%	1879	19.6%	341	3.6%
acc.	237	1	0.4%	25	10.5%	0	0.0%
activation	538	0	0.0%	165	30.7%	0	0.0%
crypto	625	0	0.0%	263	42.1%	0	0.0%
man.	5380	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
naming	3565	0	0.0%	1365	38.3%	0	0.0%
javax.sec.	1435	0	0.0%	619	43.1%	0	0.0%
sound	515	0	0.0%	56	10.9%	0	0.0%
swing	102389	10	0.0%	21364	20.9%	0	0.0%
javax.xml	4188	34	0.8%	580	13.8%	0	0.0%
org.omg	8937	0	0.0%	1578	17.7%	0	0.0%
w3c.dom	83	0	0.0%	14	16.9%	0	0.0%
org.xml	897	49	5.5%	473	52.7%	0	0.0%

Table 4: Translation results of package level

5.2 Testing Single Invocations

To test different behaviors of single invocations, TeMaAPI leverages Pex to search internal paths for C# client-code methods. These methods include the translated C# methods without compilation errors as shown in Table 2 and the generated C# methods that can be translated into Java without compilation errors as shown in Table 3. When Pex searches those paths, TeMaAPI records the inputs and output of each iteration. Based on these inputs and outputs, TeMaAPI generates JUnit test cases to ensure that the generated methods and the translated methods produce the same outputs given the same inputs. As it requires human interactions to test GUI related API invocations, we filter out GUI related API invocations under the `awt` package and the `swing` package although JLCA is able to translate some GUI related API invocations. In addition, when Pex searches methods without return values, we ignore those paths that do not throw any exceptions since we cannot generate JUnit test cases for them. We discuss this issue in Section 6.

We run the generated JUnit test cases, and Table 5 shows the results. Column “Name” lists the name of migration tools. Column “JUnit” lists numbers of generated JUnit test cases. Columns “Error” and “Failure” list number of test cases that end with errors and failures, respectively. Sub-column “M” lists numbers of test cases. Sub-column “%” lists percentages from the numbers of corresponding test cases to the numbers of total generated test cases. From the results of Table 5, we find that totally only about half the generated JUnit test cases get passed. It turns out that TeMaAPI is quite effective to detect different behaviors of mapped API invocations since it searches every paths of methods under test. The results also reflect that the API mapping relations defined in JLCA and sharpen are more reliable than other tools since more test cases of the two tools get passed than other four tools.

For tools such as Java2CSharp, JLCA, and sharpen, we further present their testing results of the package level in Table 6. Column “Name” lists names of J2SE packages. For columns “Java2CSharp”, “JLCA”, and “sharpen”, sub-column “R” lists numbers of generated JUnit test cases, and sub-column “%” lists percentages from the test cases end with errors or failures to the total test cases.

Name	JUnit	Error		Failure	
		M	%	M	%
Java2CSharp	15458	5248	34.0%	3261	21.1%
JLCA	33034	8901	26.9%	6944	21.0%
sharpen	2730	662	24.2%	451	16.5%
net2java	352	40	11.4%	261	74.1%
converter	762	302	39.6%	182	23.9%
Total	52336	15153	29.0%	11099	21.2%

Table 5: Results of testing single invocations

From the results of Table 6, we find that for the `java.sql` package and the `java.util` package, all the tools suffer relatively high error/failure percentages, and for the `java.lang` package and the `java.math` package, all the tools achieve relatively low error/failure percentages. The results may reflect that some packages between Java and C# are more similar than others, so that they can more easily mapped. We also find that for package the `java.text` package, the `javax.xml` package, and the `org.xml` package, JLCA achieve lower error/failure percentages than other tools. The results indicate that a migration tool can achieve better translation results if they carefully prepare the mapping relations of API invocations.

Table 5 and Table 6 show that many generated JUnit tests do not get passed. To better understand different behaviors of mapped API invocations, we manually inspected 3759 JUnit test cases that end with errors or failures. In particular, for tools such as Java2CSharp, JLCA, and sharpen, we investigate the test cases for the `java.lang` package since TeMaAPI generates many test cases for the package as shown in Table 4. For tools such as Net2Java and converter, we inspect all their test cases since TeMaAPI test cases in small sizes for them. Our findings are as follows:

Finding 1: 36.8% test cases show the different behaviors caused by null inputs.

We find that Java API invocations and their mapped C# API invocations can have different behaviors when inputs are null values. In some cases, a Java API method can accept null values, but its mapped C# API method will throw exceptions given a null value. One such example is shown in Section 1. In other cases, a Java API method will throw exceptions given a null value, but its mapped C# API method can accept null values. For example, JLCA maps the `java.lang.Integer.parseInt(String, int)` method in Java to the `System.Convert.ToInt32(string, int)` in C#. TeMaAPI detects that when the inputs of the C# method are null and 10, its output is 0. Given the same inputs, the Java method throws a `NumberFormatException`.

Implication 1: Although programmers may come to agreements on functionalities of API invocations, the behaviors for null values are typically controversial. Programmers or migration tool should deal with null values carefully across Java and C#.

Finding 2: 22.3% test cases show the different behaviors caused by stored string values.

We find that string values between Java API invocations and their mapped C# API invocations are typically different. For example, each Java class has a `toString()` method inherited from the `java.lang.Object` class, and each C# class also has a `ToString()` method inherited from the `System.Object` class. Many migration tools map the two API methods, but the return values of the two methods are quite different in many cases. For another example, many API classes declare methods like `getName` or `getMessage`. These methods also return string values that can be quite different. In particular, we find that the `Message` fields of exceptions in C# often return `informative messages`. One such message is “Index was outside the bounds of the array” provided by the `System.IndexOutOfRangeException.Message` field. On the other hand, exceptions in Java often provide only null messages.

Name	Java2CSharp		JLCA		sharpen	
	R	%	R	%	R	%
bean	17	82.4%	18	33.3%	0	n/a
io	4155	67.8%	6981	58.0%	33	1.4%
lang	3480	37.5%	4431	26.1%	1753	29.3%
math	561	4.3%	1629	1.5%	0	n/a
java.net	438	25.1%	3941	47.8%	9	44.4%
nio	27	48.1%	0	n/a	0	n/a
java.rmi	0	n/a	884	32.6%	0	n/a
java.sec.	45	55.6%	828	35.6%	0	n/a
java.sql	260	88.1%	1465	91.0%	0	n/a
text	566	61.5%	374	18.2%	0	n/a
util	5519	60.8%	6177	70.2%	935	62.4%
acc.	1	0.0%	0	n/a	0	n/a
activation	0	n/a	694	53.9%	0	n/a
crypto	0	n/a	298	24.2%	0	n/a
man.	2	0.0%	0	n/a	0	n/a
naming	0	n/a	1569	40.6%	0	n/a
javax.sec.	0	n/a	683	45.9%	0	n/a
sound	0	n/a	66	36.4%	0	n/a
javax.xml	110	71.8%	628	45.9%	0	n/a
org.omg	0	n/a	1842	45.9%	0	n/a
w3c.dom	0	n/a	18	33.3%	0	n/a
org.xml	277	70.0%	483	27.3%	0	n/a

Table 6: Testing results of package level

Implication 2: String values including names are typically different between Java API invocations and their mapped C# API invocations. Programmers should not rely on these string values unless migration tools can hide the differences.

Finding 3: 11.5% test cases show the different behaviors caused by illegal inputs or inputs out of ranges.

We find that Java methods often do not check whether their inputs are legal or out of range, whereas C# methods typically do. For example, Java2CSharp maps the `java.lang.Boolean.parseBoolean(String)` method in Java to the `System.Boolean.Parse(String)` method in C#. Given a string whose value is “test”, the Java method return false without checking its format, whereas the C# method throws `FormatException` since it considers “test” as illegal inputs. For another example, the `java.lang.Double.shortValue()` method in Java accepts values that are larger than `Short.MAX_VALUE` (32767). JLCA maps the Java method to the `Convert.ToInt16(double)` method in C#, but the C# method throw `OverflowException` when values are larger than 32767.

Implication 3: Programmers should be aware of the different input ranges of API methods between Java and C#. As C# API methods typically check ranges of input, C# programmers may not check ranges of inputs themselves, and thus introduce potential defects in translated Java code.

Finding 4: 10.7% test cases show the different behaviors caused by different understanding or implementation.

We find that Java developers and C# developers may have different understanding or implementation for mapped API methods. For example, according to their documents, the `java.lang.StringBuffer.capacity()` method in Java returns “the current capacity of the String buffer”, and the `System.Text.StringBuilder.Capacity` field in C# can return “the maximum number of characters that can be contained in the memory allocated by the current instance”. JLCA maps the method in Java to the field in C#, and we find that in many cases they are of different values. For sample, given a string whose value is “0”, the `capacity()` in Java returns 0, but the `Capacity` field in C# is 16. We notice that some such differences may indicate defects in mapped methods. For example, Java2CSharp maps the `java.lang.Integer.toHexString(int)` method in Java to the `ILOG.J2CsMapping.Util.I1Number.To-`

`String(int,16)` method in C#. Given a integer whose value is -2147483648, the Java method returns “80000000”, but the C# method returns “\0800000000”. As the result of the Java method seems to be right, we suspect that the mapped C# method may have some defects to deal with the value.

Implication 4: Although programmers can come to agreement on functionalities of many API methods, they may have different understanding on functionalities of specific methods. Such differences may indicate defects in mapped API methods.

Finding 5: 7.9% test cases show the different behaviors caused by exception handling.

We find that two mapped API methods can throw exceptions that are not mapped. For example, when indexes are out of bounds, the `java.lang.StringBuffer.insert(int,char)` method in Java throws `ArrayIndexOutOfBoundsException`. Java2CSharp maps the methods to the `StringBuilder.Insert(int,char)` method in C# that throws `ArgumentOutOfRangeException` when indexes are out of bounds. As Java2CSharp maps `ArrayIndexOutOfBoundsException` in Java to `IndexOutOfRangeException` in C#, the mapped C# method may fail to catch exceptions when indexes are out of bounds.

Implication 5: Even if two methods are of the same functionality, they may produce exceptions that are not mapped. Programmers should be careful to deal with exception handling, unless migrations tools can hide the differences.

Finding 6: 2.8% test cases show the different behaviors caused by static values.

We find that mapped static fields may have different values. For example, the `java.lang.reflect.Modifier` class has many static fields to represent modifiers (e.g., `FINAL`, `PRIVATE` and `PROTECTED`). Java2CSharp maps these fields to the fields of the `ILOG.J2CsMapping.Reflect` class. Although most mapped fields of the two class are of the same values, we find that fields such as `VOLATILE` and `TRANSIENT` are of different values. In addition, we find that different values sometimes reveal different ranges of data types. For example, `java.lang.Double.MAX_VALUE` in Java is 1.7976931348623157E+308, and `System.Double.MaxValue` in C# is 1.79769313486232E+308. Although the difference is not quite large, it can cause serious defects if a program needs highly accurate calculation results.

Implication 6: Programmers should be aware of that static fields may have different values even if they has the same names. As these differences reveal that Java and C# may define different bounds for data types, programmers should also be aware of these different bounds if they need highly accurate results of extremely large or small calculation results.

The rest 7.9% test cases fail since API methods can produce random values. For example, the `java.util.Random.nextDouble()` method in Java generates random double values. For another example, each Java class has a `hashCode()` method inherited from the `java.lang.Object` class, and each C# class has a `GetHashCode()` inherited from the `System.Object` class. Both the two methods return a hash code for the current object, so migration tools such as JLCA map the two methods. For these methods, TeMaAPI can find their different behaviors of inputs. For example, converter maps the `System.Random.Next(int)` method in C# to the `java.util.Random.nextInt(int)` method in Java. Given a integer whose value is 0, the C# method return 0, but the Java method throws `IllegalArgumentException` with a message: “n must be positive”. However, as these methods generate outputs randomly, we cannot conclude they have different behaviors even if corresponding JUnit test cases all fail, and we discuss this issue in Section 6.

Name	API	JUnit	NUnit	Failure	
				M	%
Java2CSharp	1996	15385	2971	2151	72.4%
JLCA	7060	16630	1067	295	27.6%
sharpen	586	13532	936	456	48.7%
Total	9642	45547	4504	2813	62.5%

Table 7: Results of testing multiple invocations

5.3 Testing Multiple Invocations

To test different behaviors of API invocation sequences, TeMaAPI leverage Randoop to generate test cases that involve multiple API invocations. For each Java-to-C# tools, TeMaAPI first analyzes the translation results as shown in Table 2 for the list of translatable API invocations in Java. When generating test cases, TeMaAPI extends Randoop, so that each generated test case use only translatable API invocations. Randomly generated invocation sequences may not reflect API usages in true practice. We discuss this issue in Section 6. We find that Randoop can generate failure test cases or even test cases with compilation errors. TeMaAPI removes those test cases, so that the remaining test cases all get passed. After that, we use the corresponding migration tool to translate the remaining test cases from Java to C#. As the remaining JUnit test cases all get passed, translated NUnit test cases should also get passed.

Table 7 shows the results. Column “API” lists sizes of translatable API invocations. Column “JUnit” lists numbers of JUnit test cases that run successfully. Column “NUnit” lists numbers of NUnit test cases. We notice that many JUnit test cases are not successfully translated into NUnit test cases. We find that two factors that are not general or not related with API migration: (1) some generated JUnit test cases use classes defined by Randoop; (2) some code structures are complicated to translate, and we further discuss this issue in Section 6. Besides the two factors, we find one general factors for API translation.

Finding 7: Many translated test cases have compilation errors since Java classes and their mapped C# classes have different inheritance relations.

We find that Java API classes can have quite different inheritance relations with their mapped C# API classes, and thus introduce compilation errors. For example, a JUnit test case is as follows:

```
public void test87() throws Throwable{
    ...
    StringBufferInputStream var4=...;
    InputStreamReader var10=
        new InputStreamReader((InputStream)var4, var8);
}
```

JLCA translates the JUnit test case into a NUnit test case as follows:

```
public void test87() throws Throwable{
    ...
    StringReader var4=...;
    StreamReader var10=
        new StreamReader((Stream)var4, var8);
}
```

As the two Java classes are subclass and parent class, the Java test case runs successfully, whereas the two C# class have no such relations so translated C# method has compilation errors.

Implication 7: Programmers should use cast statements carefully since classes of two languages typically have different inheritance relations.

Column “Failure” lists failed NUnit test cases. We do not list numbers of test cases with errors since NUnit does not separate errors from failures as JUnit does. Sub-column “M” lists numbers

of test cases, and sub-column “%” lists percentages from failed test cases to total test cases.

From the results of Table 7, we find that JLCA achieves better results than other tools since its percentage is the lowest. For each tool, we further investigate the first 100 failed test cases, and we find that 93.3% failed test cases are accumulated by the found factors as shown in Section 5.2: 45.0% for ranges of parameters, 34.0% for string values, 5.3% for different understanding, 4.0% for exception handling, 3.0% for null values, 2.0% for values of static fields, and 0.3% for random values. We find that random strategy affect the distribution. For example, as invocation sequences are random, inputs of many methods are out of range or illegal. Java API methods typically do not check inputs, so generated JUnit run successfully, but translated NUnit test cases fail with various exceptions since C# API methods typically check inputs. Besides those found factors, we find additional two factors as follows:

Finding 8: 3.3% test cases fail because of invocation sequences.

We find that random invocation sequences can violate specifications of API libraries. One type of such specification is described in our previous work [28]: closed resources should not be manipulated. Java sometimes allow programmers to violate such specifications although the return values can be meaningless. For example, a generated JUnit test case is as follows:

```
public void test413() throws Throwable{
    ...
    ByteArrayInputStream var2=new ByteArrayInputStream(...);
    var2.close();
    int var5=var2.available();
    assertTrue(var5 == 1);
}
```

JLCA translates the preceding JUnit test case into a NUnit test case as follows:

```
public void test413() throws Throwable{
    ...
    MemoryStream var2 = new MemoryStream(...);
    var2.close();
    long available = var2.Length - var2.Position;
    int var5 = (int) available;
    UnitTool.assertTrue(var5 == 1);
}
```

In this example, Java allows programmers to access a stream even if the stream is closed, so the preceding JUnit test case run successfully. C# does not allow such accesses, so the preceding NUnit test case fails with `ObjectDisposedException`.

We also find that in some cases, single invocations get passed but their invocation sequences can fail. For example, a generated JUnit test case is as follows:

```
public void test423() throws Throwable{
    ...
    DateFormatSymbols var0=new DateFormatSymbols();
    String[] var16=new String[]...;
    var0.setShortMonths(var16);
}
```

JLCA translates the JUnit test case into a NUnit test case as follows:

```
public void test423() throws Throwable{
    ...
    DateTimeFormatInfo var0 =
        System.Globalization.DateTimeFormatInfo.CurrentInfo;
    String[] var16=new String[]...;
    var0.AbbreviatedMonthNames = var16;
}
```

The `var0.AbbreviatedMonthNames = var16` statement fails with `InvalidOperationException` since a constant value is assigned to `var0`.

Implication 8: When translating, programmers should check carefully whether they violate speculations of libraries and whether invocation sequences affect accessibility of fields.

The rest 3.0% test cases fail since mapped methods are not implemented. In particular, Java2CSharp maps API invocations in Java to C# API invocations that are not implemented yet. For example, Java2CSharp maps the `java.io.ObjectOutputStream` class in Java to the `ILOG.J2CsMapping.IO.IIOObjectOutputStream` class in C# that is not implemented yet, and such mapping relations lead to `NotImplementedException`. As this difference introduces no compilation errors, programmers should test translated projects carefully to ensure each API method is called.

5.4 Summary

In summary, we find that API invocations are quite large in size, and migration tools typically cover only a small set of API invocations. Although existing migration tools already notice different behaviors of mapped API invocations, many differences are left unsolved. In particular, TeMaAPI detects that various factors such as null values, string values, ranges of inputs, different understanding, exception handling, and static values can lead to different behaviors for single API invocations. The preceding factors can accumulate to different behaviors of multiple API invocations. Besides, TeMaAPI detects that other factors such as cast statements and invocation sequences can also lead to different behaviors of multiple API invocations.

5.5 Threats to Validity

The threats to external validity include the representativeness of the subject tools. Although we applied our approach on 5 widely used migration tools, our approach is evaluated only on these limited tools. Other tools may perform better in API migration. This threat could be reduced by more subject tools in future work. The threats to internal validity include human factors for determining factors of different behaviors. To reduce these threats, we inspected detected differences carefully. The threat could be further reduced by introducing more researchers to inspect detected differences.

6. DISCUSSION AND FUTURE WORK

We next discuss issues in our approach and describe how we address these issues in our future work.

Testing API methods with no return values or random return values. If an API method returns no values and throws no exceptions, TeMaAPI cannot generate any test cases for them to detect differences of their API mapping relations since it relies on comparing return values for detecting differences. We find that the FAQ of JUnit¹¹ also discusses a related issue. In this page, Dave Astels suggests to test side effects or to introduce mock objects for methods without return values. We plan to follow his advice in future work. In addition, we find that some API methods return random values, so we cannot conclude their mapped API methods have different behaviors even if corresponding JUnit test cases fail. To test such API methods, we plan to introduce other test oracles in future work. For example, we can generate many test cases and check whether mapped methods generate random values of the same **distribution**.

Extracting invocation sequences from existing compatibility kit. Although randomly generated invocation sequences reveal some different behaviors, these random invocation sequences may not reflect API usages in true practice. We notice that Java provides the Compatibility Kit (JCK)¹² to ensure the compatibility of Java pro-

vided by different vendors. Besides other **Java specifications**, JCK defines many typical invocation sequences of API methods with their inputs and expected outputs. In future work, we plan to extract invocation sequences from such compatibility kit, and detect different behaviors based on extracted invocation sequences.

Testing code structures for migration tools. We find that migration tools fail to translate some JUnit test cases since code structures are complicated. Developers of migration tools already notice some such code structures. For example, Java2CSharp lists some unsupported code structures in its website¹³. It may be desirable if some approaches can detect these complicated code structures, so that migration tools can improve their translation capabilities. Daniel *et al.* [5] propose an approach that tests refactory engines by comparing their refactored results given the same generated abstract syntax trees. The idea inspires our future work to testing code structures for migration tools by comparing the translation results given the same generated code snippets.

7. RELATED WORK

Our approach is related to previous work on two areas: language migration and library migration.

Language migration. To reduce manual efforts of language migration [17], researchers proposed various approaches [9, 15, 21, 22, 25] to automate the process. However, all these approaches focus on the syntax or structural differences between languages. Deursen *et al.* [21] proposed an approach to identify objects in legacy code. Their approach uses these objects to deal with the differences between object-oriented and procedural languages. As shown in El-Ramly *et al.* [6]’s experience report, existing approaches support only a subset of APIs for language migration, making the task of language migration a challenging problem. In contrast to previous approaches, our approach automatically mines API mapping between languages to aid language migration, addressing a significant problem not addressed by the previous approaches and complementing these approaches.

Library migration. With evolution of libraries, some APIs may become incompatible across library versions. To address this problem, Henkel and Diwan [10] proposed an approach that captures and replays API refactoring actions to update the client code. Xing and Stroulia [24] proposed an approach that recognizes the changes of APIs by comparing the differences between two versions of libraries. Balaban *et al.* [4] proposed an approach to migrate client code when mapping relations of libraries are available. In contrast to these approaches, our approach focuses on mapping relations of APIs across different languages. In addition, since our approach uses ATGs to mine API mapping relations, our approach can also mine mapping relations between API methods with different parameters or between API methods whose functionalities are split among several API methods in the other language.

Mining specifications. Some of our previous approaches [1, 18, 19, 27, 28] focus on mining specifications. MAM mines API mapping relations across different languages for language migration, whereas the previous approaches mine API properties of a single language to detect defects or to assist programming.

8. CONCLUSION

Mapping relations of APIs are quite useful for the migration tools, but these mapping relations also can introduce defects to translated code since mapped API invocations may have different behaviors. In this paper, we propose an approach, called TeMaAPI, that detects different behaviors of mapped API invocations via test-

¹¹<http://tinyurl.com/2ccs15q>

¹²<http://jck.dev.java.net>

¹³<http://tinyurl.com/27z7qrj>

ing. TeMaAPI targets at generating test cases that covers all feasible paths and invocation sequences to reveal different behaviors of both single invocations and invocation sequences. We implemented a tool and conducted three evaluations on five migration tools to show the effectiveness of our approach. The results show that our approach detects various differences between mapped API invocations. We further analyze these differences and their implications. The results can help improve existing migration tools and help programmers better understand differences of Java and C#.

9. REFERENCES

- [1] M. Acharya and T. Xie. Mining API error-handling specifications from source code. In *Proc. FASE*, pages 370–384, 2009.
- [2] S. Y. Al-Agtash, T. Al-Dwairy, A. El-Nasan, B. Mull, M. Barakat, and A. Shqair. Re-engineering BLUE financial system using round-trip engineering and Java language conversion assistant. In *SERP*, pages 657–663, 2006.
- [3] A. Andrews, R. France, S. Ghosh, and G. Craig. Test adequacy criteria for uml design models. *Software Testing, Verification and Reliability*, 13(2):95–127, 2003.
- [4] I. Balaban, F. Tip, and R. Fuhrer. Refactoring support for class library migration. In *Proc. 20th OOPSLA*, pages 265–279, 2005.
- [5] B. Daniel, D. Dig, K. Garcia, and D. Marinov. Automated testing of refactoring engines. In *Proc. 6th ESEC/FSE*, pages 185–194, 2007.
- [6] M. El-Ramly, R. Eltayeb, and H. Alla. An experiment in automatic conversion of legacy Java programs to C#. In *Proc. AICCSA*, pages 1037–1045, 2006.
- [7] R. B. Evans and A. Savoia. Differential testing: a new approach to change detection. In *Proc. 6th ESEC/FSE*, pages 549–552, 2007.
- [8] P. Godefroid, N. Klarlund, and K. Sen. DART: Directed automated random testing. In *Proc. PLDI*, pages 213–223, 2005.
- [9] A. Hassan and R. Holt. A lightweight approach for migrating Web frameworks. *Information and Software Technology*, 47(8):521–532, 2005.
- [10] J. Henkel and A. Diwan. CatchUp!: capturing and replaying refactorings to support API evolution. In *Proc. 27th ICSE*, pages 274–283, 2005.
- [11] T. Jones. *Estimating software costs*. McGraw-Hill, Inc. Hightstown, NJ, USA, 1998.
- [12] S. Koushik, M. Darko, and A. Gul. CUTE: a concolic unit testing engine for C. In *Proc. ESEC/FSE*, pages 263–272, 2005.
- [13] T. Kunal and T. Xie. Diffgen: Automated regression unit-test generation. In *Proc. 23rd ASE*, pages 407–410, 2008.
- [14] P. Maes. Concepts and experiments in computational reflection. In *Proc. OOPSLA*, pages 147–155, 1987.
- [15] M. Mossienko. Automated COBOL to Java recycling. In *Proc. 7th CSMR*, pages 40–50, 2003.
- [16] C. Pacheco, S. Lahiri, M. Ernst, and T. Ball. Feedback-directed random test generation. In *Proc. 29th ICSE*, pages 75–84, 2007.
- [17] H. Samet. Experience with software conversion. *Software: Practice and Experience*, 11(10), 1981.
- [18] S. Thummalapenta and T. Xie. Mining exception-handling rules as sequence association rules. In *Proc. 31th ICSE*, pages 496–506, May 2009.
- [19] S. Thummalapenta, T. Xie, N. Tillmann, P. de Halleux, and W. Schulte. MSeqGen: Object-oriented unit-test generation via mining source code. In *Proc. 7th ESEC/FSE*, pages 193–202, 2009.
- [20] N. Tillmann and J. De Halleux. Pex: white box test generation for .NET. In *Proc. 2nd TAP*, pages 134–153, 2008.
- [21] A. Van Deursen, T. Kuipers, and A. CWI. Identifying objects using cluster and concept analysis. In *Proc. 21st ICSE*, pages 246–255, 1999.
- [22] R. Waters. Program translation via abstraction and reimplement. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 14(8):1207–1228, 1988.
- [23] T. Xie, N. Tillmann, P. de Halleux, and W. Schulte. Fitness-guided path exploration in dynamic symbolic execution. In *Proc. 39th DSN*, pages 359–368, 2009.
- [24] Z. Xing and E. Stroulia. API-evolution support with Diff-CatchUp. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 33(12):818–836, 2007.
- [25] K. Yasumatsu and N. Doi. SPiCE: a system for translating Smalltalk programs into a C environment. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 21(11):902–912, 1995.
- [26] H. Zhong, S. Thummalapenta, T. Xie, L. Zhang, and Q. Wang. Mining API mapping for language migration. In *Proc. 32nd ICSE*, pages 195–204, 2010.
- [27] H. Zhong, T. Xie, L. Zhang, J. Pei, and H. Mei. MAPO: Mining and recommending API usage patterns. In *Proc. the 23rd ECOOP*, pages 318–343, 2009.
- [28] H. Zhong, L. Zhang, T. Xie, and H. Mei. Inferring resource specifications from natural language API documentation. In *Proc. 24th ASE*, pages 307–318, November 2009.