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

Software companies or open source organizations often release
their applications in different languages to address business re-
quirements such as platform independence. To produce the same
applications in different languages, existing applications already in
one language such as Java are translated to applications in a dif-
ferent language such as C#. To translate applications from one lan-
guage (L_1) to another language (L_2), programmers often use au-
tomatic translation tools. These translation tools use Application
Programming Interface (API) mapping relations from L_1 to L_2 as
a basis for translation. It is essential that API elements (*i.e.*, classes,
methods, and fields of API libraries) of L_1 and their mapped API
elements of L_2 (as described by API mapping relations) exhibit
the same behaviors, since any inconsistencies among these map-
ping relations could result in behavioral differences and defects
in translated applications. Therefore, to detect behavioral differ-
ences between mapped API elements described in mapping rela-
tions, and thereby to effectively translate applications, we propose
a novel approach, called *TeMAPI* (**Te**sting **M**apping relations of
APIs). In particular, given a translation tool and a test-generation
tool, TeMAPI automatically uses the test-generation tool to gener-
ate test cases that expose behavioral differences between mapped
API elements from mapping relations described in the translation
tool. To show the effectiveness of our approach, we applied our
approach on five popular translation tools. The results show that
TeMAPI effectively detects various behavioral differences between
mapped API elements. We summarize detected differences as eight
findings and their implications. Our approach enables us to pro-
duce these findings that can improve effectiveness of translation
tools, and also assist programmers in understanding the differences
between mapped API elements of different languages.

Categories and Subject Descriptors D.2.5 [*Testing and Debug-
ging*]: Testing tools; I.2.2 [*Automatic Programming*]: Program
transformation; D.2.13 [*Reusable Software*]: Reusable libraries;
D.3.3 [*Language Constructs and Features*]: Frameworks

General Terms Testing, API mapping relation

Keywords Language conversions, API libraries, Behavioral dif-
ferences

1. Introduction

Since the inception of computer science, many programming lan-
guages (*e.g.*, Cobol, Fortran, or Java) have been introduced to serve
specific requirements[1]. For example, Cobol is introduced specif-
ically for developing business applications. In general, software
companies or open source organizations often release their appli-
cations in different languages to survive in competing markets and
to address various business requirements such as platform indepen-
dence. An empirical study [16] shows that nearly one third applica-
tions have multiple versions in different languages. A natural way
to implement an application in a different language is to translate
from an existing application. For example, Lucene.Net was trans-
lated from Java Lucene according to its website[2]. As another exam-
ple, the NeoDatis object database was also translated form Java to
C# according to its website[3]. During translation, one primary goal
is to ensure that both applications exhibit the same behavior.

As existing applications typically use API libraries, it is essen-
tial to understand API mapping relations of one programming lan-
guage, referred to as L_1, to another language, referred to as L_2,
when translating applications from L_1 to L_2. Researchers [25, 28]
pointed out that it is hard to use API elements, and our previous
work [37] shows that mapping relations between API elements of
different languages can also be complicated. In some cases, pro-
grammers may fail to find an existing API element that has the
same behavior in the other language. For example, Figures 1 and
2 show two methods implemented in db4o[4] of its Java version and
its C# version, respectively. When translating the Java code shown
in Figure 1 to C#, programmers of db4o may fail to find an ex-
isting C# class that has the same behaviors with the `ByteArray-
InputStream` class in Java, so they implement a C# class with the
same name to fix the behavioral difference. Behavioral differences
of mapped API elements (*i.e.*, classes, methods, and fields of API
libraries) may occur in many places. To reduce translation effort,
programmers of db4o developed their own translation tool, called
Sharpen[5], for translating db4o from Java to C#. For API transla-
tion, Sharpen systematically replaces all API elements in Java with
equivalent elements in C# to ensure that translated C# applications
have the same behaviors with the original Java ones.

In practice, as pointed out by Keyvan Nayyeri[6], one of the most
common problems is that translated code does not return expected
outputs, partially because behavioral differences of mapped API el-

---

[1] http://hopl.murdoch.edu.au

[2] http://lucene.apache.org/lucene.net/

[3] http://wiki.neodatis.org/

[4] http://www.db4o.com

[5] http://developer.db4o.com/Blogs/News/tabid/171/
entryid/653/Default.aspx

[6] http://dotnet.dzone.com/print/26587

```
01: private long readLong(ByteArrayInputStream is){
02:  ...
03:  l += ((long) (is.read())) << i;
04:  ...}
```

Figure 1. A method in the Java version of db4o.

```
05: private long ReadLong(ByteArrayInputStream @is){
06:  ...
07:  l += ((long)(@is.Read())) << i;
08:  ...}
```

Figure 2. A method in the C# version of db4o.

ements are not fully fixed. For example, when JLCA[7] translates the `java.lang.String.indexOf(int)` method from Java to C#, it generates a warning message: "Method `java.lang.String.indexOf` was converted to `System.String.IndexOf`, which may throw an exception". Still, the report does not describe where such an exception is thrown or how to deal with that exception. As programmers typically do not know where such behavioral differences occur, it is difficult for programmers to fix such differences in advance, and thus defects can be introduced in translated applications. To prevent those defects, it is desirable to detect behavioral differences between mapped API elements in different languages. However, existing approaches [14, 15, 22] solve different problems, and cannot detect such differences effectively since these existing approaches require that both the versions under consideration belong to the same language. In our context, the versions under consideration belong to different languages, making these existing approaches inapplicable.

To address the preceding issue, we propose a novel approach, called TeMAPI (**Te**sting **Ma**pping relations of **API**s), that generates test cases to detect behavioral differences among API mapping relations automatically. In particular, TeMAPI accepts two inputs: a translation tool under analysis and a test-generation tool for generating test cases. Given a translation tool that translates applications from one language L_1 to the other language L_2, TeMAPI generates various test cases to detect behavioral differences among the API mapping relations by effectively leveraging the test-generation tool. TeMAPI next executes translated test cases to detect behavioral differences.

TeMAPI addresses four major technical challenges in effectively detecting behavioral differences. (1) It is challenging to directly extract API mapping relations from translation tools. The primary reason is that often translation tools either use different formats for specifying API mapping relations or do not explicitly describe these mapping relations. For example, Java2CSharp[8] uses mapping files, Sharpen hardcodes relations in source files, and closed source translation tools such as JLCA typically hide mapping relations in binary files. To address this issue and to be independent of the translation tool under analysis, TeMAPI analyzes translated code for extracting those relations. (2) Interfaces of two mapped API elements can be different, and one API element can be translated to multiple API elements. For example, JLCA translates the `java.net.DatagramSocket.receive(DatagramPacket)` method in Java as shown in Figure 3 to multiple C# elements as shown in Figure 4. To address this issue, TeMAPI uses a technique, called wrapper methods (Section 3.1), that abstracts interface differences among mapped API elements and provides a common interface to effectively apply test-generation tools. (3) Using a basic technique such as generating 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, TeMAPI leverages two existing state-of-the-art test-generation techniques: random [23] and dynamic-symbolic-execution-based [11, 19, 31] ones. (4) API elements are typically quite large in size, and it is difficult to check all outputs, posing a test oracle barrier. To overcome the barrier, TeMAPI uses return values of wrapper methods or exceptions being thrown as test oracles. We describe more details of our approach to address these challenges in subsequent sections.

In this paper, although we present our approach for detecting behavioral differences among mapping relations of different languages, our approach is general and can be applied to other software engineering problems where an API needs to be replaced with another API without changing the behavior of an application (*e.g.*, library upgrades [18] or migrating from one library to another library [21]).

This paper makes the following major contributions:

- A novel approach, called TeMAPI, that automatically generates test cases to detect behavioral differences among API mapping relations.

- A tool implemented for TeMAPI and three evaluations on five popular translation tools. Unlike untranslated code elements, behavioral differences introduce no compilation errors to be detected, and can lead to defects in translated applications silently. The evaluation results show the effectiveness of our approach in detecting behavioral differences of mapped API elements between different languages.

- The first empirical comparison on behavioral differences of mapped API elements between the J2SE and .NET frameworks. As shown in Section 4, the comparison reveals 8 behavioral differences between mapped API elements in existing translation tools. We analyze these findings, and conclude their implications that are valuable to vendors of translation tools for improving their tools, programmers who use translation tools for being aware of such differences in advance, and developers of API libraries for implementing more translatable APIs.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents an illustrative example. Section 3 presents our approach. Section 4 presents our evaluation. Section 6 discusses issues of our approach. Section 5 presents capabilities of existing translation tools to translate real projects and discusses importance of our major findings. Section 7 presents related work. Section 8 concludes.

2. Example

We next explain our TeMAPI approach with an illustrative example. In particular, TeMAPI accepts a translation tool and a test-generation tool as inputs. TeMAPI includes two major steps in detecting behavioral differences among API elements described in mapping relations of the translation tool. In this section, we use JLCA (a Java-to-C# translation tool) as an example translation tool, and the `java.io.ByteArrayInputStream` class in Java as an example API element to illustrate these two steps.

2.1 Synthesizing and Analyzing Wrappers.

TeMAPI first synthesizes Java wrapper methods for public methods and fields of the example class, and then uses JLCA to translate synthesized wrapper methods to C#. TeMAPI next compares source code of the synthesized wrapper methods with the

---

[7] JLCA is a Java-to-C# translation tool developed by Microsoft. The website of JLCA is http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/magazine/cc163422.aspx

[8] Java2CSharp is a Java-to-C# translation tool developed by ILOG (now IBM). The website of Java2CSharp is http://j2cstranslator.sourceforge.net/

```
09: DatagramSocket socket = ...;
10: DatagramPacket package = ...;
11: socket.receive(package);
```

Figure 3. Sample code in Java.

```
12: UdpClient socket = ...;
13: IPEndPoint remoteIpEndPoint = ...;
14: try{
15:   byte[] data_in = socket.Receive(ref remoteIpEndPoint);
16:   PacketSupport tempPacket =
            new PacketSupport(data_in, data_in.Length);
17:   tempPacket.IPEndPoint = remoteIpEndPoint;
18: } catch (System.Exception e){...}
19: PacketSupport package = tempPacket;
```

Figure 4. Translated C# code by JLCA.

compilation-error-free translated wrapper methods to extract translatable API elements of the example class. In particular, our example class in Java has five fields, two constructors, and eight methods besides inherited ones[9]. A class can have more than one constructor, and a translation tool may not translate all its constructors. Therefore, to address this issue, TeMAPI includes different constructors in its synthesized wrapper methods instead of simply pushing the receiver object as a parameter of wrapper methods. For example, TeMAPI first identifies `ByteArrayInputStream(byte[])` constructor as translatable, and synthesizes the wrapper method for the `skip(long)` method as follows:

```
public long testskip24nm(long m0, byte c0[]){
  ByteArrayInputStream obj = new ByteArrayInputStream(c0);
  return obj.skip(m0);
}
```

TeMAPI next uses JLCA to translate synthesized wrapper methods from Java to C#. A translation tool typically cannot include mapping relations for all the API elements between two languages, so translated wrapper methods can have compilation errors. TeMAPI parses translated wrapper methods and filters out all methods with compilation errors. For example, below is the translated `testskip24nm` method in C#:

```
public virtual long testskip24nm(long m0, sbyte[] c0){
  MemoryStream obj
    = new MemoryStream(SupportClass.ToByteArray(c0));
  MemoryStream temp_BufferedStream = obj;
  Int64 temp_Int64 = temp_BufferedStream.Position;
  temp_Int64 = temp_BufferedStream.Seek(m0,
    System.IO.SeekOrigin.Current) – temp_Int64;
  return temp_Int64;
}
```

TeMAPI does not remove this method, since it does not result in compilation errors.

2.2 Generating and Translating Test Cases.

TeMAPI leverages two existing state-of-the-art test-generation tools Pex [31] and Randoop [23] for generating test cases that detect behavioral differences. In our approach, we use Pex and Randoop, since both these test-generation tools are popular and are shown to be effective in detecting serious defects in industrial code bases. Furthermore, Pex is effective in generating data for primitive types and Randoop is effective in generating method sequences by combining method calls randomly, complementing each other.

When leveraging Pex, TeMAPI uses synthesized wrappers to generate test cases. A major advantage of our synthesized wrapper method is that the synthesized wrapper method and the translated

[9] http://download.oracle.com/javase/6/docs/api/
java/io/ByteArrayInputStream.html

wrapper method have the same interface, irrespective of method calls within the wrapper method. Therefore, TeMAPI detects behavioral differences between mapped API elements by generating test cases on one language version of wrapper methods and applying those test cases on the other language version. In particular, TeMAPI extends Pex [31] to generate test cases for each remaining C# wrapper method. For each wrapper method of the example class, Pex attempts to explore all feasible paths among method calls within the wrapper methods and generates inputs and outputs that exercise various paths. Based on the inputs and the output for each path, TeMAPI generates a Java test case to check whether an original wrapper method returns the same value as its translated one or throws mapped exceptions. For example, TeMAPI generates the following Java test case based on inputs generated by Pex for one feasible path (in the C# wrapper method) that throws exceptions (see Section 3.2 for the details of generating Java test cases).

```
public void testskip24nm36(){
  try{
     Test_java_io_ByteArrayInputStream obj
      = new Test_java_io_ByteArrayInputStream();
     long m0
      = java.lang.Long.valueOf("2147483648").longValue();
     byte[] c0 = new byte[0];
     obj.testskip24nm(m0,c0);
     Assert.assertTrue(false);
  }catch(java.lang.Exception e){
     Assert.assertTrue(true);
  }
}
```

This Java test case fails, since given the preceding inputs, the `skip(long)` method in Java does not throw any exceptions, whereas the translated C# code does. Thus, TeMAPI detects a behavioral difference between the `skip(long)` method in Java and its translated C# API elements by JLCA.

When using Randoop [23] to generate test cases, TeMAPI does not generate invocation sequences from wrappers directly, since each wrapper method includes a fixed simple invocation sequence. Instead, TeMAPI limits the scope of Randoop to only translatable methods while generating invocation sequences. For example, a generated Java test case is as follows:

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

The test case gets passed, since Java allows access to a stream even if the stream is closed. TeMAPI next uses JLCA to translate the generated Java test case from Java to C#. Since the Java test case uses only translatable API elements, JLCA translates the test case to a C# 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;
  AssertTrue(var5 == 1);
}
```

In contrast to the Java test case, the C# test case gets failed, since C# does not allow such access to the stream and throws `ObjectDisposedException`. TeMAPI thus detects a behavioral difference with invocation sequences. This example motivates our basic idea of generating test cases in one language and translating those test cases to another language for detecting differences among API mapping relations.

3. Approach

We next describe our TeMAPI approach that accepts two tools as inputs: a translation tool under analysis and a test-generation tool. TeMAPI effectively leverages the test-generation tool to generate test cases that detect behavioral differences of API mapping relations defined by the translation tool. TeMAPI addresses two major issues in detecting behavioral differences of API mapping relations. First, it is challenging to extract API mapping relations defined by the translation tool. The primary reason is that often translation tools either use different formats for specifying API mapping relations or do not explicitly describe these mapping relations. In the latter case, API mapping relations are hard coded within the source code of translation tools such as Sharpen. To address this issue and to be independent of the translation tool under analysis, TeMAPI does not extract API mapping relations directly from translation tools. Instead, TeMAPI analyzes translated code for extracting those relations. In particular, TeMAPI constructs *wrapper* methods for each API element in a language and translates those wrapper methods to another language to extract the API mapping relations. Section 3.1 presents more details on how wrapper methods are constructed from API elements. These wrapper methods also help identify the API elements that can be translated by the translation tool under analysis, since often translation tools translate only a limited set of API elements [37].

Second, exposing behavioral differences among API elements that are defined by API mapping relations poses testability issues. For example, the interface of an API method in one language could be different from the interface of its mapped API method, or an API method in one language can be translated to multiple API methods in the other language, resulting in controllability issues. On the other hand, generating test oracles is also challenging, resulting in observability issues. TeMAPI addresses these issues by using wrapper methods as an abstraction. In particular, these wrapper methods expose a common interface for API elements that are defined by API mapping relations, thereby addressing controllability issues. Furthermore, to address observability issues, TeMAPI uses return values of wrapper methods or exceptions being thrown as test oracles. We next describe more details on how wrapper methods are constructed and later describe how TeMAPI leverages two existing state-of-the-art test-generation tools Pex [31] and Randoop [23] for generating test cases that detect behavioral differences[10].

3.1 Synthesizing and Analyzing Wrappers

Given a translation tool under analysis, TeMAPI first extracts its API mapping relations. To deal with different formats of translation tools as described in Section 1, TeMAPI does not extract API mapping relations directly from translation tools, but analyzes translated code for such relations. TeMAPI includes a wrapper generator that generates wrappers for API elements in both Java and C#. For static fields and static methods, the two wrapper generators of TeMAPI use the following rules to synthesize wrapper methods. In the synthesized code below, "|f.name|" denotes the name of a field f; "|m.name|" denotes the name of a method m; and "|no|" denotes the id of the synthesized wrapper method.

Static fields. Given a public static field `T f` of a class `C`, TeMAPI synthesizes a getter as follows:

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

If `f` is not a constant, TeMAPI synthesizes a setter as follows:

```
public void testSet|f.name||no|sfs(T p){ C.f = p; }
```

---

[10] TeMAPI is general and any other test-generation tool such as Java PathFinder [1] can be easily leveraged to generate test cases thanks to the abstraction provided by our wrapper methods.

Static methods. Given a public static method `Tr m(T1 p1,..., Tn pn)` of a class `C`, TeMAPI synthesizes a wrapper method as follows:

```
public Tr test|m.name||no|sm(T1 p1,..., Tn pn){
  return C.m(p1,..., pn);
}
```

When TeMAPI synthesizes wrapper methods for non-static fields or methods, TeMAPI takes constructors into considerations.

Non-static fields. Given a public non-static field `T f` of a class `C`, TeMAPI synthesizes a getter using each constructor `C(C1 c1,..., Cn cn)` of `C` as follows:

```
public T testGet|f.name||no|nfg(C1 c1,..., Cn cn){
  C obj = new C(c1,..., cn);
  return obj.f;
}
```

If `f` is not a constant, TeMAPI synthesizes a setter as follows:

```
public void testSet|f.name||no|nfs(T p, C1 c1,...,
                                         Cn cn){
  C obj = new C(c1,..., cn);
  obj.f = p;
}
```

Non-static methods. Given a public non-static method `Tr m(T1 p1,...,Tn pn)` of a class `C`, TeMAPI synthesizes a wrapper method using each constructor `C(C1 c1,..., Cn cn)` of `C` as follows:

```
public Tr test|m.name||no|nm(T1 p1,..., Tn pn, C1 c1,
                                      ..., Cn cn){
  C obj = new C(c1,..., cn);
  return obj.m(p1,..., pn);
}
```

TeMAPI groups all synthesized wrapper methods for one API class C to one synthesized class. When synthesizing, TeMAPI ignores generic methods, since many translation tools cannot handle generics. Furthermore, when synthesizing wrappers for C# API classes, TeMAPI ignores `unsafe` methods, `delegate` methods, and methods whose parameters are marked as `out` or `ref` besides generic methods. Java does not have these corresponding keywords, so existing translation tools typically do not translate the preceding methods. After wrapper methods are synthesized, TeMAPI uses the translation tool under analysis to translate wrapper methods to the other language.

Our synthesized wrappers are quite simple in their structures. Therefore, existing translation tools are typically able to translate their structures correctly, when two languages are not fundamentally different. We further discuss the translation between those languages with fundamental differences in Section 6. Still, even when two languages are not fundamentally different, some translated wrappers can have compilation errors, since existing translation tools cannot translate some API elements. We use *safe wrappers* to refer to the wrappers that are translated without compilation errors. To identify safe wrappers, TeMAPI extends Visual Studio and Eclipse's Java compiler for C# and Java code, respectively. Comparing source code of safe wrappers with source code of synthesized wrappers, TeMAPI extracts one-to-one mapping relations of API classes for the tool under analysis. For example, by comparing the first statements of the two `testskip24nm` methods in Java and in C# as shown in Section 2, TeMAPI extracts the mapping relation between the `ByteArrayInputStream` class in Java and the `MemoryStream` class in C# defined by JLCA. Through analysis, TeMAPI also extracts translatable API methods for the translation tool under analysis. In the preceding example, TeMAPI adds `BufferedInputStream(InputStream)` constructor and the `skip(long)` method in Java to translatable API

Name	Version	Provider	Description
Java2CSharp	1.3.4	IBM (ILOG)	a Java-to-C# translation tool
JLCA	3.0	Microsoft	a Java-to-C# translation tool
Sharpen	1.4.6	db4o	a Java-to-C# translation tool
Net2Java	1.0	NetBean	a C#-to-Java translation tool
converter	1.6	Tangible	a C#-to-Java translation tool

Table 1. Subject tools

methods of JLCA, since their corresponding wrapper methods are translated from Java to C# without compilation errors.

```
public void testappend175nm122(){
  Test_java_lang_StringBuffer obj =
      new Test_java_lang_StringBuffer();
  Object m0 = new Object();
  StringBuffer out = obj.testappend175nm(m0);
  Assert.assertEquals(16, out.capacity());
  Assert.assertEquals(13, out.length());
}
```

3.2 Generating and Translating Test Cases

TeMAPI leverages two state-of-the-art test-generation tools (Pex and Randoop) to generate test cases.

Using Pex. We next describe how TeMAPI generates test cases that detect behavioral differences with Pex. Pex uses a technique, called dynamic symbolic execution [11, 19], for systematically exploring the code under test and generates test cases that exercise various paths in the code under test. In particular, TeMAPI applies Pex on safe wrappers in C# language, since Pex handles .NET code.

When generating test cases on wrappers in C# using Pex, TeMAPI captures return values of wrapper methods or exceptions being thrown and uses them as test oracles in generated test cases. In particular, if an explored path of a wrapper method in C# returns a value without any exceptions, TeMAPI generates a Java test case to ensure that the corresponding wrapper method in Java also returns the same value. When generating such test cases in Java, TeMAPI refers to the extracted mapping relations of API elements (Section 3.1) to translate C# values into Java values. In a few cases, values of some primitive types can cause compilation errors. Therefore, TeMAPI replaces them with corresponding method invocations. For example, the `long m0 = 2147483648` statement causes a compilation error with a message: "The literal 2147483648 of type `int` is out of range". Here, TeMAPI uses a method invocation to replace this statement in the `testskip24nm` test case. Pex includes some heuristics for generating data factories for non-primitive types. For these non-primitive types, TeMAPI refers to extracted mapping relations of API elements to translate them. To check equivalence of outputs, TeMAPI checks whether their values are equal for primitive types and arrays, and checks whether each pair of mapped fields is equal for objects. For example, TeMAPI records that given an empty object, the `testappend175nm` wrapper method in C# returns a `StringBuilder` object whose `Capacity` field is 16 and `Length` field is 13, so TeMAPI derives a test case for the corresponding Java wrapper method as follows:

This test case fails, since here the `capacity()` method returns 34 and the `length()` method returns 24. Thus, TeMAPI detects two behavioral differences between the `java.lang.StringBuffer` class in Java and its translated class in C#.

We notice that when Pex explores a path with some specific inputs, the method under exploration throws exceptions. For example, during exploring the `testvalueOf61sm` wrapper method in C#, TeMAPI records that given a `null` input, the method throws `NullReferenceException`, so TeMAPI derives a test case to ensure that the corresponding Java wrapper method also throws a mapped exception. To derive the test case, TeMAPI finds the

corresponding exceptions in Java by analyzing translated wrapper methods with synthesized ones. In this example, TeMAPI finds that the `NullReferenceException` class in C# is mapped to the `NullPointerException` class in Java with respect to the API mapping relations of Java2CSharp, so TeMAPI derives a Java test case as follows:

```
public void testvalueOf61sm3(){
  try{
      Test_java_lang_String obj =
          new Test_java_lang_String();
      java.lang.Object m0 = null;
      obj.testvalueOf61sm(m0);
      Assert.assertTrue(false);
  }catch(java.lang.NullPointerException e){
      Assert.assertTrue(true);
  }
}
```

This test case gets failed since the `testvalueOf61sm` method in Java does not throw any exceptions given a null input. From this failing test case, TeMAPI detects the behavioral difference between the `java.lang.String.valueOf(Object)` method in Java and the `System.Object.ToString()` method in C#, since the two wrapper methods invoked by the two preceding test cases are for these two API methods. When the translation tool under analysis is from C# to Java, wrapper methods generated for C# are used for deriving C# test cases for Java code.

Using Randoop. Despite of its benefits to detect behavioral differences, a wrapper method cannot help effectively generate test invocation sequences, since it has fixed invocation sequences (*e.g.*, a constructor first and then the public method). To address this issue, TeMAPI extends Randoop [23] for Java to generate invocation sequences in Java for all translatable API methods of a translation tool under analysis. Randoop randomly generates test cases based on already generated test cases in a feedback-directed manner. In particular, when using Randoop to generate test cases, TeMAPI limits its search scope to translatable API methods. Each generated test case by Randoop has multiple `assert` statements. TeMAPI runs generated test cases, and removes all failing test cases. TeMAPI next uses the translation tool under analysis to translate generated Java test cases to the other language C#. If translated code has the same behaviors, translated test cases should also get passed. If not, TeMAPI detects behavioral differences. Randoop-generated Java test cases also include `assert` statements to assert behaviors of Java code. Thus, TeMAPI does not need to generate assertion statements as it does with Pex. Section 4.3 shows such detected behavioral differences that are related to invocation sequences (*e.g.*, the `test423` test cases).

4. Evaluations

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

1. How many API elements can be translated by existing translation tools (Section 4.1)?

2. How many behavioral differences are effectively detected with Pex (Section 4.2)?

Type	Num	Java2CSharp		JLCA		Sharpen	
		M	%	M	%	M	%
getters of static fields	16,962	237	1.4%	3,744	22.1%	47	0.3%
setters of static fields	0	0	n/a	0	n/a	0	n/a
getters of non-static fields	832	0	0.0%	121	14.5%	0	0.0%
setters of non-static fields	823	0	0.0%	79	9.6%	0	0.0%
static methods	1,175	97	8.3%	198	16.9%	26	2.2%
non-static methods	175,400	3,589	2.0%	39,536	22.5%	1,112	0.6%
Total	195,192	3,923	2.0%	43,678	22.4%	1,185	0.6%

Table 2. Translation results of wrapper methods for Java-to-C# tools

Type	Num	Net2Java		converter	
		M	%	M	%
getters of static fields	3,223	1	0.0%	3	0.1%
setters of static fields	8	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
getters of non-static fields	117	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
setters of non-static fields	115	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
static methods	996	4	0.4%	6	0.6%
non-static methods	190,376	94	0.0%	387	0.2%
Total	19,4835	99	0.1%	396	0.2%

Table 3. Translation results of wrapper methods for C#-to-Java tools

3. How many behavioral differences are effectively detected with Randoop (Section 4.3)?

4. How many behavioral differences are detected with and without TeMAPI's internal techniques (Section 4.4)?

Table 1 shows subject tools in our evaluations. Column "Name" lists names of these tools. We use *converter* to denote the "VB & C# to Java converter" for short. Java2CSharp, Sharpen, and Net2Java are open source tools, and JLCA and converter are closed source tools. Column "Version" lists versions of subject tools. Column "Provider" lists companies of these tools. Column "Description" lists main functionalities of these tools. We choose these tools as subjects, since they are popular and many programmers recommend these tools in various forums.

All evaluations were conducted on a PC with Intel Qual CPU @ 2.83GHz and 2G memory running Windows XP. More details of our evaluation results are available at `https://sites.google.com/site/asergrp/projects/temapi`.

4.1 Translating Synthesized Wrappers

This evaluation focuses on the effectiveness of our approach to extract API mapping relations from both open source tools and closed source tools. The results are useful for subsequent steps, and also to show the effectiveness of existing translation tools. For Java-to-C# tools, TeMAPI first synthesized wrapper methods for all classes of J2SE 6.0[11]. Most classes in J2SE support both generic programming and non-generic programming (*e.g.*, `java.util.ArrayList`). During synthesis, our approach focuses on only non-generic programming as described in Section 3.1. Table 2 shows the translation results. Column "Type" lists types of synthesized methods, and Row "Total" denotes the sum of all methods. Column "Number" lists numbers of wrapper methods for each type. Columns "Java2CSharp", "JLCA", and "Sharpen" list translation numbers of translated wrapper methods without compilation errors for each tool, respectively. For these columns, sub-columns "M" and "%" list numbers and percentages of translated wrapper methods without compilation errors, respectively. The results show that all translation tools are able to translate many non-static

methods, some static methods, and some getters of static fields, but only JLCA is able to translate some getters/setters of non-static fields. Although these tools support mapping relations for only some APIs, these supported APIs are the most commonly used, and these tools' significant utility/popularity are reflected by their high download counts.

Even if an API element is translated, it can be translated to API elements with behavioral differences. To reveal such differences, for C#-to-Java translation tools, TeMAPI first synthesized wrapper methods for all the classes of .NET framework client profile[12]. As described in Section 3.2, besides generic methods, TeMAPI also ignored `unsafe` methods, `delegate` methods, and methods whose parameters are marked with `out` or `ref`. TeMAPI synthesized almost the same size of wrapper methods as it synthesized for J2SE. Table 3 shows the translation results. We find that both tools translate only a small number of API elements. One primary reason could be that C# provides many features such as partial classes, reference parameters, output parameters, and named arguments, that are not provided by Java[13]. We suspect that a C#-to-Java translation tool needs to deal with these issues, so many mapping relations of API elements are not addressed yet.

Tables 2 and 3 show that the Java-to-C# tools are able to translate much more API elements compared to the C#-to-Java tools. To give more insights, we next present more details at the package level regarding the translation results of Java-to-C# tools in Table 4. Column "Name" lists names of Java packages. To save space, we omit 12 packages that are not translated by all the three tools (*e.g.*, the `javax.rmi` package). Table 4 shows that all the three translation tools can translate the `java.io`, `java.lang`, `java.util`, and `java.net` packages. These four packages seem to be quite important for most Java programs. Column "Number" lists numbers of synthesized wrapper methods. Columns "Java2CSharp", "JLCA", and "Sharpen" list translated wrapper methods without compilation errors. Almost for all these packages, JLCA translates more API elements than the other two tools.

---

[11] `http://java.sun.com/javase/6/docs/api/`

[12] `http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ff462634.aspx`

[13] `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Comparison_of_Java_and_C_Sharp`

Name	Num	Java2CSharp		JLCA		Sharpen	
		M	%	M	%	M	%
java.awt	29,199	0	0.0%	8,637	29.6%	0	0.0%
java.bean	1,768	20	1.1%	14	0.8%	0	0.0%
java.io	3,109	592	19.0%	1,642	52.8%	43	1.4%
java.lang	5,221	1494	28.6%	2,377	45.5%	791	15.2%
java.math	1,584	101	6.4%	232	14.6%	0	0.0%
java.net	1,990	52	2.6%	482	24.2%	10	0.5%
java.nio	536	30	5.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
java.rmi	1,252	0	0.0%	707	56.5%	0	0.0%
java.security	2,797	50	1.8%	702	25.1%	0	0.0%
java.sql	3,495	20	0.6%	183	5.2%	0	0.0%
java.text	1,068	96	9.0%	321	30.1%	0	0.0%
java.util	9,586	1,372	14.3%	1,879	19.6%	341	3.6%
javax.accesibility	237	1	0.4%	25	10.5%	0	0.0%
javax.activation	538	0	0.0%	165	30.7%	0	0.0%
javax.crypto	625	0	0.0%	263	42.1%	0	0.0%
javax.management	5,380	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
javax.naming	3,565	0	0.0%	1,365	38.3%	0	0.0%
javax.security	1,435	0	0.0%	619	43.1%	0	0.0%
javax.sound	515	0	0.0%	56	10.9%	0	0.0%
javax.swing	102,389	10	0.0%	21,364	20.9%	0	0.0%
javax.xml	4,188	34	0.8%	580	13.8%	0	0.0%
org.omg	8,937	0	0.0%	1,578	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 wrapper methods for Java-to-C# tools at package levels


Figure 5. Distribution of found unique behavioral differences with Pex

4.2 Generating and Translating Test Cases with Pex

To detect behavioral differences through wrappers, TeMAPI leverages Pex to explore safe wrappers. For Java-to-C# translation tools, these methods are translated C# wrapper methods without compilation errors (as shown in Table 2), and for C#-to-Java translation tools, these methods are synthesized C# wrapper methods that can be translated to Java without compilation errors (as shown in Table 3). During exploration, when Pex generates inputs that exercise a feasible path in the wrapper method, TeMAPI records the inputs and the resulting output of that path. Based on these inputs and outputs, TeMAPI generates Java test cases to ensure that synthesized wrapper methods and translated wrapper methods return the same outputs given the same inputs. Since testing GUI related API elements requires human interactions, we filter out these elements (*i.e.*, the `awt` package and the `swing` package). In addition, when Pex explores methods without return values, TeMAPI ignores paths that do not throw any exceptions, since it cannot generate Java related test cases. We discuss this issue in Section 6.

Table 5 shows the results of executing generated Java test cases. Column "Name" lists names of translation tools. Column "Number" lists numbers of generated Java test cases. Columns "E-Tests" and "A-Tests" list numbers of exception-causing and assertion-failing test cases. For the two columns, sub-columns "M" and "%" list numbers and percentages of these test cases. Table 5 shows that only about half of the generated Java test cases are passed. Among the five tools, Sharpen includes the lowest number of "E-Tests" and "A-Tests". It seems that programmers of Sharpen put great efforts to fix behavioral differences. The percentage of JLCA is also relatively low. The results are comparable, since JLCA translates much more API elements than the other tools. In total, about 50% of test cases are failed. These results show the effectiveness of TeMAPI, since these test cases represent behavioral differences, and also reveal where to improve existing translation tools (See Section 6 for details).

For Java2CSharp, JLCA, and Sharpen, we further present their testing results at 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 Java test cases, and sub-column "%" lists percentages of failing test cases (including exception-causing and assertion-failing). Table 6 shows that for the `java.sql` and `java.util` packages, all tools suffer from relatively high percentages of failing test cases, and for the `java.lang` and `java.math` packages, all tools include relatively low percentages of failing test cases. This result may reflect that some packages between Java and C# are more similar than the others, so they can be more easily translated. We also find that for the `java.text`, `javax.xml`, and `org.xml` packages, JLCA includes the lowest percentage of failing test cases among the five tools. The result indicates that a translation tool can achieve better translation results if its developers carefully prepare API mapping relations.

Tables 5 and 6 show that behavioral differences between mapped API elements are quite common, since a high percentage of generated Java test cases are failed. To better understand behavioral differences between mapped API elements, we inspected

Name	Number	E-Tests		A-Tests	
		M	%	M	%
Java2CSharp	15,458	5,248	34.0%	3,261	21.1%
JLCA	33,034	8,901	26.9%	6,944	21.0%
Sharpen	2,730	662	24.2%	451	16.5%
net2java	352	40	11.4%	261	74.1%
converter	762	302	39.6%	182	23.9%
Total	52,336	15,153	29.0%	11,099	21.2%

Table 5. Testing results of generating C# test cases from Pex and translating them into Java code

3,759 failing Java test cases. For Net2Java and converter, we inspect all failing test cases, whereas for Java2CSharp, JLCA, and Sharpen, we inspect test cases generated for the `java.lang` package, due to a large number of failing test cases. As each input generated by Pex explores a unique path, each failing test case likely reflects one unique behavioral difference, and Figure 5 shows the results. We next present our findings ranked by percentages of failing test cases.

Finding 1: 36.8% test cases show the behavioral differences caused by `null` inputs.

We find that many Java API methods and their translated C# API methods have behavioral differences when `null` values are passed as inputs. In some cases, a Java API method can accept `null` values, but its translated C# API method throws exceptions. One such example is shown in Section 2 (*i.e.*, the `skip(long)` method). In other cases, a Java API method throws exceptions given a `null` input, but its translated C# API method can accept `null` values. For example, JLCA translates the `java.lang.Integer.parseInt(String,int)` method in Java to the `System.Convert.ToInt32(string,int)` in C#. If the inputs of the Java method are `null` and 10, it throws `NumberFormatException`, but given the same inputs, the C# method returns 0. We notice that translation tools can fix some differences caused by `null` inputs. For example, to fix the behavioral difference of `null` inputs for the `valueOf(Object)` method as shown in Section 3.2, Sharpen translates the method to its own method, and fixes the difference.

Implication 1: Although implementers of API libraries in different languages can come to agreements on functionalities of many API methods, behaviors for `null` inputs are typically controversial. Some translation tools such as Sharpen try to fix these differences, however, many such differences are still left to programmers as shown in our results. Therefore, programmers should be careful when inputs are `null`.

Finding 2: 22.3% test cases show the behavioral differences caused by stored `string` values.

We find that `string` values stored in fields between Java classes and their mapped C# classes are typically different. This difference ranks as the second, since each Java class has a `toString()` method and each C# class also has a `ToString()` method. Many translation tools map the two API methods, but the return values of the two methods are quite different in many cases. In addition, 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 in C#. On the other hand, exceptions in Java often provide only `null` messages. Overall, we find that none of the five tools fixes this difference.

Implication 2: Mapped `String` fields in different languages typically store different values, but existing translation tools do not fix those differences. Programmers should not rely on these values, since they are typically different across languages.

Finding 3: 11.5% test cases show the behavioral differences caused by different input domains.

We find that API methods in Java and API methods in C# can have different input domains, and some legal inputs in one language can become illegal after translation. For example, the `java.lang.Double.shortValue()` method in Java accepts values that are larger than 32,767. JLCA translates the Java method to the `Convert.ToInt16(double)` method in C#. The C# method throws `OverflowException` when values are larger than 32,767 since it checks whether inputs are too large. As another example, the `java.lang.Boolean.parseBoolean(String)` method in Java does not check for illegal inputs, and returns `false` given an illegal input such as "`test`". Java2CSharp translates it to the `System.Boolean.Parse(String)` method in C#. The C# method throws `FormatException` given the same input since it checks for illegal inputs.

Implication 3: Mapped API methods across languages may have different input domains, and a legal input can become illegal after translation. As pointed by Cook and Dage [6], API translation within a single programming language also has similar problems, and an updated API method can have different input ranges with an original one. Adopting their approach may help deal with different input domains across languages.

Finding 4: 10.7% test cases show the behavioral differences caused by different understandings.

We find that implementers of API libraries may have different understandings for mapped API methods in different languages. Two such examples are shown in Section 3.2 (*i.e.*, the `capacity()` method and the `length()` method). In some cases, such differences reflect different natures between languages. For example, we find that Java considers "\" as existing directories, but C# considers it not. In some other cases, we find that such differences can indicate defects in translation tools. For example, Java2CSharp translates the `java.lang.Integer.toHexString(int)` method in Java to the `ILOG.J2CsMapping.Util.IlNumber.ToString(int,16)` method in C#. Given an integer -2147483648, the Java method returns "80000000", but the C# method returns "\080000000". As another example, Java2CSharp translates the `Character.isJavaIdentifierPart(char)` method in Java to the `ILOG.J2CsMapping.Util.Character.IsCSharpIdentifierPart(char)` method in C#. Given an input "\0", the Java method returns `true`, but the C# method returns `false`. These two behavioral differences were confirmed as defects by developers of Java2CSharp after we reported the detected defects.

Implication 4: Implementers can have different understanding on functionalities of specific methods. Some such differences reflect different natures of different languages, and some other differences indicate defects in translation tools. Programmers should test their translated code carefully since this type of differences is difficult to figure out.

Name	Java2CSharp		JLCA		Sharpen	
	R	%	R	%	R	%
java.bean	17	82.4%	18	33.3%	0	n/a
java.io	4,155	67.8%	6,981	58.0%	33	39.4%
java.lang	3,480	37.5%	4,431	26.1%	1,753	29.3%
java.math	561	4.3%	1,629	1.5%	0	n/a
java.net	438	25.1%	3,941	47.8%	9	44.4%
java.nio	27	48.1%	0	n/a	0	n/a
java.rmi	0	n/a	884	32.6%	0	n/a
java.security	45	55.6%	828	35.6%	0	n/a
java.sql	260	88.1%	1,465	91.0%	0	n/a
java.text	566	61.5%	374	18.2%	0	n/a
java.util	5,519	60.8%	6,177	70.2%	935	62.4%
javax.accessibility	1	0.0%	25	16.0%	0	n/a
javax.activation	0	n/a	694	53.9%	0	n/a
javax.crypto	0	n/a	298	24.2%	0	n/a
javax.management	2	0.0%	0	n/a	0	n/a
naming	0	n/a	1,569	40.6%	0	n/a
javax.security	0	n/a	683	29.4%	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	1,842	36.3%	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 Table 5 at package levels for Java2CSharp, JLCA, and Sharpen

Finding 5: 7.9% test cases show the behavioral differences caused by exception handling.

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

Implication 5: Implementers of API libraries may design quite different exception handling mechanisms. This type of differences is quite challenging to fix for translation tools. Even if two methods are of the same functionality, programmers should notice that these methods may produce exceptions that are not mapped.

Finding 6: 2.9% test cases show the behavioral differences caused by static values.

We find that mapped static fields may have different values. For example, the `java. lang.reflect.Modifier` class in Java has many static fields to represent modifiers (*e.g.*, `FINAL`, `PRIVATE`, and `PROTECTED`). Java2CSharp translates these fields to the fields of the `ILOG.J2CsMapping.Reflect` class in C#. Although most values of the mapped fields are the same, 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, the `java.lang.Double.MAX_VALUE` field in Java is 1.7976931348623157E+308, but the `System.Double.MaxValue` field 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: Implementers of API libraries may store different values in static fields. Even if two static fields have the same names, programmers should be aware of that these fields can have different values. The results also reveal that data types between Java and C# can have different bounds. Programmers should be aware of this situation if they need highly accurate results.

The remaining 7.9% failing test cases are related to the API methods that can return random values or values that depend on time. For example, the `java.util.Random.nextInt()` method returns random values, and the `java.util.Date.getTime()` method returns the number of milliseconds since Jan. 1st, 1970, 00:00:00 GMT. As another example, each Java class has a `hashCode()` method, and each C# class has also a `GetHashCode()` method. Both the methods return the hash code for a object, so translation tools such as JLCA map the two methods. Since a hash code is randomly generated, the two methods typically return different values. For these methods, TeMAPI can detect behavioral differences of their inputs. For example, converter translates the `System.Random.Next(int)` method in C# to the `java.util.Random.nextInt(int)` method in Java. Given an integer value 0, the C# method returns 0, but the Java method throws `IllegalArgumentException` with a message: "n must be positive". However, since these methods return values randomly, we cannot conclude that they have behavioral differences even if their outputs are different. We discuss this issue further in Section 6.

4.3 Generating and Translating Test Cases with Randoop

To test behavioral differences involving invocation sequences, TeMAPI leverages Randoop to generate test cases, given the list of translatable API methods. In this evaluation, we focus on the Java-to-C# tools only, since the C#-to-Java tools translate only few API elements as shown in Table 2. For each Java-to-C# tool, TeMAPI first extracted the list of translatable API methods using the technique as described in Section 3.2. When generating test cases, TeMAPI extends Randoop, so that each generated test case uses only translatable API methods. Randomly generated invocation sequences may not reflect API usages in true practice, and we discuss this issue in Section 6. Among generated test cases, we translate only passing test cases from Java to C#.

Table 7 shows the results. Column "Method" lists sizes of translatable API methods for the three tools. Column "Java" lists the numbers of passing test cases in Java. Column "C#" lists numbers of translated test cases in C#. We notice that many Java test cases are not successfully translated to C# for two factors that are not general or not related with API migration: (1) to prepare in-

Name	Method	Java	C#	A-Tests	
				M	%
Java2CSharp	1,996	15,385	2,971	2,151	72.4%
JLCA	7,060	16,630	1,067	295	27.6%
Sharpen	586	13,532	936	456	48.7%
Total	9,642	45,547	4,974	2,902	58.3%

Table 7. Testing results of generating Java test cases from Randoop and translating them into C# code

Illegal inputs
String values
Different understandings
Exception handling
Null inputs
Not implement
Invocation sequences
Static values
Random

5.3%
4.0%
3.0%
3.0%
3.4%
2.0%
0.3%
34.0%
45.0%

Figure 6. Distribution of found behavioral differences with Randoop

puts of translatable API methods, Randoop introduces API methods that are not translatable; (2) the numbers of compilation errors can be magnified since Randoop produces many redundancies (Section 4.4 shows an example of produced redundancies). Our findings are as follows:

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

We find that Java API classes can have different inheritance hierarchies with their translated C# classes, and thus introduce compilation errors. For example, many compilation errors are introduced by type cast statements, and such an example is as follows:

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

Since the preceding two Java API classes are related through inheritance, the test case gets passed. JLCA translates the Java test case to a C# test case as follows:

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

Since the two translated C# classes have no inheritance relations, the translated C# test case has compilation errors.

Implication 7: It seems to be too strict to require that implementers of API libraries in different languages follow the same inheritance hierarchy, and it is also quite difficult for translation tools to fix this behavioral difference. Programmers should deal with this difference carefully.

Column "A-Tests" of Table 7 lists numbers and percentages of failing C# test cases. We find that JLCA achieves the lowest percentages among the five tools. For each tool, we further investi-

gated its first 100 failing test cases. Figure 6 shows the distribution of found behavioral differences with Randoop. We find that 93.6% failing test cases are due to the same factors described in Section 4.2: 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 inputs, 2.0% for values of static fields, and 0.3% for random values. When generating test cases, Pex explores feasible paths, whereas Randoop uses a feed-back random strategy. As a result, the distribution of Figure 5 is different from the distribution of Figure 6. The distribution of Figure 5 is more reasonable since each feasible path reflects a unique behavior, and each failing test case reflects a unique behavioral difference, whereas the distribution of Figure 6 is affected by redundancies in test cases generated by Randoop. Still, Randoop's random strategy helps find an additional behavioral difference as follows:

Finding 8: 3.4% test cases fail because of invocation sequences.

We find that random invocation sequences can violate specifications of API libraries. One type of such specifications is described in our previous work [36]: closed resources should not be manipulated. Java sometimes allows programmers to violate such specifications although return values can be meaningless. One such example is shown in Section 2 (*i.e.*, the test413 test case). Besides invocation sequences that are related to specifications, we find that field accessibility also leads to failures of test cases. For example, a generated Java test case is as follows:

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

JLCA translates the Java test case to a C# test case as follows:

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

In the preceding translated test case, the last statement throws InvalidOperation- Exception since a constant value is assigned to var0.

Implication 8: Legal invocation sequences can become illegal after translation. The target language may be more strict to check invocation sequences, and other factors such as field accessibility can also cause behavioral differences. In most cases, programmers should deal with the difference themselves.

The remaining 3.0% test cases get failed since translation tools such as Java2CSharp translate API elements in Java to C# API elements that are not implemented yet. For example, Java2CSharp translates the java.io.ObjectOutputStream class in Java to the ILOG.J2CsMapping.IO.IlObjectOutputStream class in C# that is not yet implemented, and such translations lead to NotImplementException. The evaluation in Section 4.2 does not detect this difference since the specific exception is not mapped.

Class	Method	Pex	Randoop	Combination	Percent
ParserAdapter	23	8	2	9	39.1%
AttributeListImpl	19	7	3	7	36.8%
AttributesImpl	31	15	11	18	58.1%
XMLReaderAdapter	23	8	2	9	39.1%
LocatorImpl	17	4	0	4	23.5%
DefaultHandler	26	4	0	4	15.4%
HandlerBase	23	4	1	5	21.7%
InputSource	15	4	0	4	26.7%
NamespaceSupport	15	5	2	6	40.0%
SAXException	15	5	1	5	33.3%
SAXParseException	19	6	1	6	31.6%
SAXNotSupportedException	15	5	1	5	33.3%
SAXNotRecognizedException	15	5	1	5	33.3%
Total	256	80	25	87	34.0%

Table 8. Results with and without TeMAPI's internal techniques

4.4 Significance of TeMAPI's Internal Techniques

TeMAPI leverages Pex and Randoop to generate test cases, and we refer to the two test-generation tools as the internal techniques of TeMAPI. To investigate the significance of TeMAPI's internal techniques, we use JLCA as the subject tool, and the `org.xml` package in Java as the subject package for detecting behavioral differences. For each class of the package, we compare the number of distinct translatable methods with behavioral differences when we use TeMAPI with and without its internal techniques, and Table 8 shows the results. Column "Class" shows the names of classes in Java that can be translated to C# by JLCA. Column "Method" lists the numbers of translatable methods of each class. These methods include inherited ones. Columns "Pex", "Randoop", and "Combination" list numbers of found distinct translatable methods with behavioral differences when TeMAPI uses only Pex, only Randoop, and both Pex and Randoop, respectively. With only Pex, 483 test cases were generated, and 132 test cases failed. With only Randoop, 1200 test cases were generated in Java, and all these test cases passed. After translation, all translated test cases in C# had no compilation errors, and 1168 C# test cases got failed. We inspected these failing test cases, and we found that test cases generated by Pex are more effective to reveal behavioral differences than test cases generated by Randoop, since for test cases, Pex explores feasible paths whereas Randoop generates randomly. Although more test cases were generated by Randoop fail than by Pex, these failing test cases do not reveal any new methods with behavioral differences since these failing test cases are redundant. For example, we found that 1151 test cases generated by Randoop all have the same invocation sub-sequence as follows:

```
SaxAttributesSupport var25 = new SaxAttributesSupport();
System.Int32 var26 = 1;
System.String var27 = var25.GetLocalName((int) var26);
Assert.IsTrue(var27 == null);
```

In this sub-sequence, JLCA translates the `AttributeListImpl.getName(int)` method in Java to the `SaxAttributesSupport.GetLocalName(int)` method in C#. The translation makes the assertion fail since the C# method does not return `null` given an empty attribute as the Java method does. Besides redundancies, each test case generated by Randoop uses many API elements, and each test case generated by Pex focuses on only one field or method within a synthesized wrapper method. As a result, it takes much more efforts to locate a method with behavioral differences from failing test cases generated by Randoop than by Pex.

From the results of Table 8, we find that Pex alone can detect most behavioral differences. However, the combination of the two techniques helps TeMAPI detect more methods with behavioral dif-

ference. Besides the behavioral differences that involve invocation sequences, we also find that Pex can fail to explore paths that are too complicated. Randoop complements Pex to generate test cases for detecting behavioral differences of such methods since Randoop generates test cases randomly. Column "%" lists percentages from "Combination" to "Method". We find that behavioral differences of mapped API methods are quite common since about one third methods have such differences.

4.5 Summary

In summary, we find that API elements are quite large in size, and translation tools typically can translate only a small portion of API elements. Although existing translation tools already notice behavioral differences of mapped API elements, many differences are not fixed. To detect behavioral differences, our approach combines random testing with dynamic-symbolic-execution-based testing, and achieves to detect more behavioral differences than with single techniques. Our approach enables us to present the first empirical comparison on behavioral differences of API mapping relations between Java and C#. We find that various factors (*i.e.,* `null` inputs, `string` values, ranges of inputs, different understanding, exception handling, static values, type cast statements, and invocation sequences) could lead to behavioral differences of mapped API elements between different languages.

4.6 Threats to Validity

The threats to external validity of our evaluation include the representativeness of the subject tools. Although we applied our approach on five popular translation tools, our approach is evaluated only on these limited tools. This threat could be reduced by introducing more subject tools in future work. The threats to internal validity include human factors for inspecting behavioral differences from failing test cases. To reduce these threats, we inspected those test cases carefully. The threat could be further reduced by involving more researchers to inspect detected differences.

5. Capabilities for Translating Real Projects

In Section 4, our results show the effectiveness of TeMAPI to detect behavioral differences of API mapping relations for existing translation tools. Still, the significance of our results can be reduced if existing translation tools cannot translate many code structures. In addition, our results also show that existing translation tools cover a small portion of API elements. Given such a small portion of covered API elements, existing tools may not cover adequate API mapping relations. The significance of TeMAPI can thus be further reduced in that it detects behavioral differences of only those

Name	Type	LOC	Description
numerics4j	libraries	8,920	a numeric library for root finding, statistical distribution, and *etc*.
PDFClown	libraries	24,285	a library for manipulating PDF files.
SimMetric	libraries	4,177	a library for calculating similarities between strings.
binaryNotes	toolkits	10,917	a toolkit for manipulating abstract syntax notations.
FpML	toolkits	17,339	a toolkit for manipulating FpML documents.
OpenFiniteStateMachine	toolkits	1,192	a toolkit for building finite state machines.

Table 9. Subject projects for translation

translatable API elements. However, some existing programming languages (*e.g.*, Java and C#) are quite similar in their structures, and our previous work [29] shows that programmers also typically use only a small portion of API elements in real projects. Considering the two points, we hypothesize that existing tools can translate most code structures and used API elements although these translation tool typically support only a small portion of API elements. To provide solid evidences to this hypothesis, we conduct more experiments to answer the research questions as follows:

1. To what degree can existing translation tools translate code structures in real projects without introducing compilation errors (Section 5.1)?

2. To what degree can existing translation tools translate API elements used in real projects without introducing compilation errors (Section 5.2)?

We selected six open source projects as subjects in these experiments. Table 9 lists the six subject projects. Column "Name" lists names of subjects. All the subjects have both Java versions and C# versions, so we can determine introduced defects by comparing translated files of translation tools with existing ones. Column "Type" lists types of subjects. To ensure the representativeness, our selected subjects cover two typical types of open source projects (*i.e.*, toolkits and libraries). In particular, toolkit projects have both user interfaces and programming interfaces, and libraries have only programming interfaces. Column "LOC" lists lines of code for all the subjects. The six subjects range from small sizes to large sizes. Column "Description" lists descriptions of these subjects. These subjects cover various functionalities such as calculating, modeling, and manipulating files.

For the Java version of each subject, we selected the five largest source files, and marked all their code lines with two types. For example, we marked the following code snippet as follows:

```
public ... decodeTag(InputStream stream) ... {//1A
  return null;//2N
}//3N
```

In the preceding code snippet, we use numbers to denote line numbers; "*N*" to denote lines whose translations need no API mapping relations; and "*A*" to denote lines whose translations need API mapping relations. In this example, to translate the first line of the preceding code snippet, a translation tool needs to understand the mapping relation between the `java.io.InputStream` class in Java and the corresponding C# class, whereas a translation tool does not need to understand API mapping relations to translate the second line and the third line. After we marked all the source files, we used the three Java-to-C# translation tools (*i.e.*, JLCA, Java2CSharp, and Sharpen) to translate all the subjects from Java to C#, and compared translated source files with existing C# files for code lines with defects. We next present our detailed findings.

5.1 Capabilities of Translating Code Structures

Table 10 shows the results to translate lines whose translations do not need API mapping relations. Column "File" lists file names

of all selected source files. Each group of files belongs to one individual subject in the same order with Table 9. For example, all the five files of the first group in Table 10 belongs to the numerics4j library. To save space, we use "Hypergeometric." to denote the `HypergeometricDistributionTest` class; "NegativeBinomial." to denote the `NegativeBinomialDistributionTest` class; "SmithWatermanGoto." to denote the `SmithWatermanGotohWindowedAffine` class; "FileFinite." to denote the `FileFiniteStateMachineModel` class; and "FileFiniteState." to denote the `FileFiniteStateMachineBaseModel` class. Column "NLOC" lists numbers of lines whose translations do not need API mapping relations. Columns "Java2CSharp", "JLCA", and "Sharpen" list results of corresponding translation tools. For the three columns, sub-column "B" denotes lines whose marks do not exist in translated code. A translation tool may ignore some comments, so corresponding marks do not exist in translated code. For example, we marked the Releases.java file as follows:

```
new SchemeDefaults (//25N
  new String [][] {//26A
  ...
  }//67N
  ...
``weeklyRollConventionSchemeDefault'' } }),//116N
```

After translation, we find that all the three translation tools removed all the comments between Line 26 and Line 67. Also, we notice that translation tools sometimes ignore lines when it fails to translate them. For example, we marked the following lines in the PERAlignedDecoder.java file:

```
public <T> T decode(...) throws Exception {//19A
  return super.decode(...);//20A
}//21N
```

JLCA translates the three lines as follows:

```
//UPGRADE_ISSUE: The following fragment of code could not
  be parsed and was not converted...
public < T > T decode(...) throws Exception
```

During translation, JLCA ignores Line 20 and Line 21. Except some rare cases (*e.g.*, the Releases.java file), translation tools typically ignores about 10% lines during translation. Sub-column "F" lists numbers of translated lines with compilation errors. In total, we find that Java2CSharp has the lowest numbers for this column, and JLCA has the highest numbers for this column. As explained by Microsoft[14], JLCA is retired with the J# programming language since 2005. As a result, it cannot translate many up-to-date code structures of Java. For example, as shown in the above code snippet from the PERAlignedDecoder.java file, JLCA cannot translate code structures that are related with generic programming. As another example, JLCA cannot translate the following line of code correctly.

```
for(Field field : elementInfo.getFields(objectClass))
```

The translated code is as follows:

---

[14] http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/vjsharp/bb188593

File	NLOC	Java2CSharp				JLCA				Sharpen			
		B	F	S	%	B	F	S	%	B	F	S	%
Hypergeometric.	155	3	0	152	100.0%	19	0	136	100.0%	0	1	154	99.4%
NegativeBinomial.	144	5	0	139	100.0%	34	0	110	100.0%	0	0	144	100.0%
BinomialDistributionTest	149	4	0	145	100.0%	33	1	115	99.1%	0	1	148	99.3%
WeibullDistributionTest	118	5	0	113	100.0%	10	0	108	100.0%	0	0	118	100.0%
TrigonometricTest	141	32	0	109	100.0%	62	32	47	59.5%	0	61	80	56.7%
OpenTypeFont	960	66	47	847	94.7%	342	23	595	96.3%	1	46	913	95.2%
PrimitiveFilter	846	90	20	739	97.4%	326	30	493	94.3%	0	33	816	96.1%
Parser	670	52	11	607	98.2%	61	40	569	93.4%	0	18	652	97.3%
PdfName	382	6	2	374	99.5%	16	9	357	97.5%	0	0	382	100.0%
AppearanceCharacteristics	438	127	31	280	90.0%	16	26	396	93.8%	4	62	372	85.7%
TagLink	232	6	0	226	100.0%	27	17	188	91.7%	0	4	228	98.3%
SmithWatermanGoto.	164	7	0	157	100.0%	7	0	157	100.0%	0	3	161	98.2%
TagLinkToken	168	4	0	164	100.0%	3	5	160	97.0%	0	2	166	98.8%
TestMetrics	100	22	0	78	100.0%	16	9	75	92.6%	0	0	100	100.0%
SmithWaterman	117	6	0	111	100.0%	11	0	106	100.0%	0	3	114	97.4%
PERAlignedDecoder	394	9	26	359	93.2%	51	17	326	95.0%	17	55	322	85.4%
PERAlignedEncoder	367	16	10	341	97.2%	15	16	336	95.5%	17	28	322	92.0%
DecoderTest	204	8	32	164	83.7%	37	49	118	70.7%	14	30	160	84.2%
Decoder	324	1	34	289	89.5%	17	22	285	92.8%	8	54	262	82.9%
BERDecoder	297	5	26	266	91.1%	23	42	232	84.7%	6	61	230	79.0%
IrdRules	1,300	140	0	1,160	100.0%	322	0	978	100.0%	65	7	1,228	99.4%
FxRules	1,359	111	2	1,246	99.8%	362	0	997	100.0%	149	5	1,205	99.6%
CdsRules	1,229	114	0	1,115	100.0%	386	1	842	99.9%	55	11	1,163	99.1%
Releases	1,223	1,043	26	154	85.6%	1,161	0	62	100.0%	9	21	1,193	98.3%
Conversions	491	29	5	457	98.9%	24	1	466	99.8%	7	4	480	99.2%
FileFinite.	145	7	5	133	96.4%	2	21	122	85.3%	0	10	135	93.1%
FileFiniteState.	120	3	2	115	98.3%	0	23	97	80.8%	0	0	120	100.0%
ObjectFactor	39	2	0	37	100.0%	0	16	23	59.0%	1	5	33	86.8%
FiniteStateMachineBuilder	70	9	3	58	95.1%	0	2	68	97.1%	0	1	69	98.6%
FiniteStateMachine	27	5	0	22	100.0%	0	0	27	100.0%	0	0	27	100.0%
Total	12,376	1,937	282	10,157	97.3%	3,386	399	8,591	95.6%	353	526	11,497	95.6%

Table 10. Translation results for code structure lines

```
for(Field field: elementInfo.getFields(objectClass))
```

The line of code is not correctly translated, since JLCA cannot understand the latest code structure for the `for` statement. Sub-column "S" lists numbers of translated lines without compilation errors. Sub-column "%" lists percents of translated lines without compilation errors. This column is calculated as follows:

$$Translation\ percent = \frac{S}{S + F} \times 100\% \quad (1)$$

In this equation, we use "S" and "F" to denote corresponding sub-columns. In total, our results show that existing translation tools can translate most code structures in real projects in that more than 90% lines can be translated without introducing compilation errors. Given existing translation tools can translate most code structures from Java to C#, we further present the results for translating API elements.

5.2 Capabilities of Translating API elements

Table 11 shows the results to translate API elements. Column "ALOC" denotes numbers of lines whose translations need API mapping relations. Other columns of Table 11 are of the same meanings with the columns of Table 10. From the results shown in Table 11, we find that Sharpen does not have adequate API mapping relations to support translating API elements used in real projects, since the tool can translate only about half of lines. The other two tools such as Java2CSharp and JLCA can translate most API elements used in real projects, since the two tools can translate 94.0% and 84.4% lines. The results confirm our hypothesis that

existing translation tools can cover the most frequently used API elements, although existing translation tools typically have limited numbers of API mapping relations as shown in Table 2. It is a little surprise that Java2CSharp translate more lines than JLCA does, although Java2CSharp has far fewer API mapping relations. We investigate translated code, and find two related factors. One factor is that JLCA does not well support the latest code structures of Java as shown in Section 5.1. The limitation affects API translation. For example, a marked line in the PERAlignedDecoder.java file is as follows:

```
SortedMap<Integer,Field> fieldOrder =
        CoderUtils.getSetOrder(objectClass);//230A
```

JLCA translates the line as follows:

```
SortedMap < Integer, Field > fieldOrder =
        CoderUtils.getSetOrder(objectClass); //230A
```

Although JLCA has the mapping relation between the `Integer` class in Java and the corresponding mapped class in C#, the tool fails to translate the line, since it cannot translate generic code. The other factor lies that Java2CSharp covers more frequently used API elements than JLCA, although Java2CSharp does not cover as many API elements as JLCA does. For example, Java2CSharp has the mapping relations for many JUnit[15] APIs, whereas JLCA does not have. The top four files of the first group listed in Table 11 all use JUnit APIs. As a result, Java2CSharp translate the four files better than the other two translation tools including JLCA.

---

[15] http://www.junit.org

File	ALOC	Java2CSharp				JLCA				Sharpen			
		B	F	S	%	B	F	S	%	B	F	S	%
Hypergeometric.	37	0	0	37	100.0%	0	21	16	43.2%	4	20	13	39.4%
NegativeBinomial.	35	0	0	35	100.0%	0	16	19	54.3%	0	17	18	51.4%
BinomialDistributionTest	34	0	0	34	100.0%	0	15	19	55.9%	0	16	18	52.9%
WeibullDistributionTest	38	0	0	38	100.0%	3	12	23	65.7%	0	12	26	68.4%
TrigonometricTest	12	0	0	12	100.0%	0	0	12	100.0%	0	0	12	100.0%
OpenTypeFont	105	14	1	90	98.9%	21	29	55	65.5%	0	26	79	75.2%
PrimitiveFilter	165	8	63	94	59.9%	91	9	65	87.8%	0	49	116	70.3%
Parser	57	4	13	40	75.5%	3	18	36	66.7%	0	16	41	71.9%
PdfName	40	10	2	28	93.3%	13	5	22	81.5%	0	7	33	82.5%
AppearanceCharacteristics	7	2	1	4	80.0%	0	0	7	100.0%	0	0	7	100.0%
TagLink	118	3	0	115	100.0%	15	27	76	73.8%	0	9	109	92.4%
SmithWatermanGoto.	20	3	0	17	100.0%	6	0	14	100.0%	0	0	20	100.0%
TagLinkToken	71	4	0	67	100.0%	5	11	55	83.3%	0	4	67	94.4%
TestMetrics	60	3	0	57	100.0%	1	10	49	83.1%	0	1	59	98.3%
SmithWaterman	11	0	0	11	100.0%	0	0	11	100.0%	0	0	11	97.4%
PERAlignedDecoder	87	3	8	76	90.5%	27	17	43	71.7%	12	44	31	41.3%
PERAlignedEncoder	86	4	4	78	95.1%	21	12	53	81.5%	9	51	26	33.8%
DecoderTest	191	14	2	175	98.9%	33	87	71	44.9%	9	146	36	19.8%
Decoder	66	6	12	48	80.0%	1	25	40	61.5%	2	44	20	31.3%
BERDecoder	86	0	11	75	87.2%	30	14	42	91.1%	5	45	36	44.4%
IrdRules	386	10	0	376	100.0%	49	0	337	100.0%	7	264	115	30.3%
FxRules	290	10	0	280	100.0%	8	0	282	100.0%	7	241	42	14.8%
CdsRules	316	12	0	304	100.0%	40	2	274	99.3%	7	227	82	26.5%
Releases	33	24	0	9	100.0%	25	0	8	100.0%	7	4	22	84.6%
Conversions	438	20	18	400	95.7%	27	0	411	100.0%	11	173	254	59.5%
FileFinite.	45	14	9	22	71.0%	6	12	27	69.2%	0	11	34	75.6%
FileFiniteState.	46	7	1	38	97.4%	1	15	30	66.7%	0	7	39	84.8%
ObjectFactor	29	11	18	0	0.0%	0	20	9	31.0%	0	18	11	37.9%
FiniteStateMachineBuilder	17	5	1	11	91.7%	1	6	10	62.5%	0	12	5	29.4%
FiniteStateMachine	11	10	0	1	100.0%	1	8	2	20.0%	0	0	11	100.0%
Total	2,937	201	164	2,572	94.0%	428	391	2,118	84.4%	80	1,464	1,393	48.8%

Table 11. Translation results for API element lines

5.3 Summary

In summary, our results confirm that existing translation tools can translate most code structures and API elements used in real projects. Our results also highlight the importance to cover those most frequently used API elements. As shown in our results, Java2CSharp can translate even more API element lines than JLCA, since Java2CSharp has API mapping relations of some most frequently used API elements. Our results also confirm the importance of the results revealed by TeMAPI, since existing translation tools can translate most API elements, and TeMAPI reveals that about one third translated API elements may have behavioral differences with the original ones. These behavioral differences may remain in translated code and cause potential defects. The results revealed by TeMAPI can help detect and fix these defects in translated code.

5.4 Threats to Validity

The threats to external validity of experiments in this section include the representativeness of the subjects. Although we introduced six open source projects with two typical types, our results are based on only these projects. Other projects may have much more complicated code structures and use much more complicated APIs that are more difficult to translate. This threat could be reduced by introducing more subjects in future work.

6. Discussion and Future Work

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

6.1 Testing Translation of Programming Languages with Fundamental Differences

Some programming languages may have much more different code structures than Java and C# do, and existing translation tools between these programming languages may fail to translate some different code structures. Daniel *et al.* [7] propose an approach that tests refactoring engines by comparing their refactored results given the same generated abstract syntax trees. In future work, we plan to adapt their approach to test translation tools by comparing their translation results given the same code structures as inputs. As pointed out by Waters [33], when a source language is fundamentally different from its target language, programmers may even have to abstract a source program and to re-implement its target program from scratch. Still, API differences are important for programmers to avoid related defects when they re-implement a target program. Ravitch *et al.* [24] proposed an approach that can generate bindings to expose low-level languages to high-level languages. To detect such differences, we plan to adapt their wrappers to test mapped API elements between two fundamentally different languages in future work.

6.2 Improving Translation Tools and Detecting Related Defects

Our evaluation reveals that existing translation tools typically translate only a small number of API elements, and cannot fix many behavioral differences. Our previous work [37] can mine more mapping relations automatically, but mined mapping relations may also fail to fix specific behavioral differences. In future work, we plan to extend our previous work [37] for mining better mapping relations

that can fix these differences. In addition, to investigate whether found behavioral differences introduce defects in true practice, we plan to conduct empirical studies on existing translated applications, and to propose corresponding defect-detection techniques if such defects are found in future work.

6.3 Detecting More Behavioral Difference of Mapped API Elements

Although our approach detected many behavioral differences, it may fail to reveal all behaviors. To detect more behavioral differences, some directions seem to be promising: (1) we can rely on side effects or mock objects to test methods without return values; (2) to test API methods that return random values, we can check the distribution of their returned values; (3) other tools such as CUTE [19] and JPF [32] may help generate more test cases to reveal more behaviors; (4) our previous work [30] can generate more complicated method sequences. We plan to explore these directions in future work. In addition, our approach does not cover some types of API elements (*e.g.*, abstract classes and protected elements). To test these elements, we plan to extend our wrappers in future work (*e.g.*, generating a concrete wrapper class for each abstract class). In our project website, we released all synthesized and translated wrappers, so that other researchers can also employ other static/dynamic techniques to detect more behavioral differences.

7. Related Work

Our approach is related to previous work on areas as follows.

7.1 API Translation

To reduce efforts of language translation, researchers proposed various approaches to automate the process (*e.g.*, JSP to ASP [12], Cobol to Hibol [33], Fickle to Java [2], Cobol to Java [20], Smalltalk to C [35], and Java to C# [9]). Song and Tilevich [27] provided an enhanced specification to improve source-to-source translation approaches. El-Ramly *et al.* [9] point out that API translation is an important part of language translation, and our previous work [37] mines API mapping relations from existing applications in different languages to improve the process. Besides language migration, other processes also involve API translation. For example, programmers often need to update applications with the latest version of API libraries, and a new version may contain breaking changes. Henkel and Diwan [13] proposed an approach that captures and replays API refactoring actions to update the client code. Xing and Stroulia [34] 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 code when mapping relations of libraries are available. As another example, programmers may translate applications to use alternative APIs. Dig *et al.* [8] propose *CONCURRENCER* that translates sequential API elements to concurrent API elements in Java. Nita and Notkin [21] propose twinning to automate the process given that API mapping is specified. Kapur *et al.* [17] proposed Trident that allows programmers to refactor references for library migration. Our approach detects behavioral differences between mapped API elements, and the results help the preceding approaches translate applications with fewer defects.

7.2 Language Comparison

To reveal differences between languages, researchers conducted various empirical comparisons on various languages. Garcia *et al.* [10] present a comparison study on six languages to reveal their differences of supporting generic programming. Cabral and Marques [5] compare exception handling mechanisms between Java and .NET programs. Appeltauer *et al.* [3] compare 11 context-oriented programming languages (*e.g.*, Lisp) for their designs and performance. Rodriguez *et al.* [26] compared various generic libraries in Haskell. To the best of our knowledge, no previous work systematically compares behavioral differences of API elements from different languages. Our approach enables us to produce such a comparison study, complementing the preceding empirical comparisons.

8. Conclusion

Translated applications can exhibit behavioral differences from the original applications due to inconsistencies among API mapping relations. In this paper, we proposed an approach, called TeMAPI, that detects behavioral differences of mapped API elements via testing. For our approach, we implemented a tool and conducted three evaluations on five translation tools to show the effectiveness of our approach. The results show that our approach detects various behavioral differences between mapped API elements. We further analyze these differences and their implications. Our approach enables such findings that can help improve existing translation tools and help programmers better understand differences between different languages such as Java and C#.

References

[1] S. Anand, C. S. Pasareanu, and W. Visser. JPF-SE: A symbolic execution extension to Java pathfinder. In *Proc. TACAS*, pages 134–138, 2007.

[2] D. Ancona, C. Anderson, F. Damiani, S. Drossopoulou, P. Giannini, and E. Zucca. A provenly correct translation of Fickle into Java. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems*, 29(2): 13, 2007. ISSN 0164-0925.

[3] M. Appeltauer, R. Hirschfeld, M. Haupt, J. Lincke, and M. Perscheid. A comparison of context-oriented programming languages. In *Proc. COP co-located with 23rd ECOOP*, pages 1–6, 2009.

[4] I. Balaban, F. Tip, and R. Fuhrer. Refactoring support for class library migration. In *Proc. 20th OOPSLA*, pages 265–279, 2005.

[5] B. Cabral and P. Marques. Exception handling: A field study in Java and. Net. *Proc. 21st ECOOP*, pages 151–175, 2007.

[6] J. Cook and J. Dage. Highly reliable upgrading of components. In *Proc. 21st ICSE*, pages 203–212, 1999.

[7] B. Daniel, D. Dig, K. Garcia, and D. Marinov. Automated testing of refactoring engines. In *Proc. 6th ESEC/FSE*, pages 185–194, 2007.

[8] D. Dig, J. Marrero, and M. Ernst. Refactoring sequential Java code for concurrency via concurrent libraries. In *Proc 31st ICSE*, pages 397–407, 2009.

[9] 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.

[10] R. Garcia, J. Jarvi, A. Lumsdaine, J. G. Siek, and J. Willcock. A comparative study of language support for generic programming. In *Proc. 18th OOPSLA*, pages 115–134, 2003.

[11] P. Godefroid, N. Klarlund, and K. Sen. DART: Directed automated random testing. In *Proc. PLDI*, pages 213–223, 2005.

[12] A. Hassan and R. Holt. A lightweight approach for migrating Web frameworks. *Information and Software Technology*, 47(8):521–532, 2005.

[13] J. Henkel and A. Diwan. CatchUp!: capturing and replaying refactorings to support API evolution. In *Proce. 27th ICSE*, pages 274–283, 2005.

[14] L. Jiang and Z. Su. Automatic mining of functionally equivalent code fragments via random testing. In *Proc. 18th ISSTA*, pages 81–92, 2009.

[15] W. Jin, A. Orso, and T. Xie. Automated behavioral regression testing. In *Proc. 3rd ICST*, pages 137–146, 2010.

[16] T. Jones. *Estimating software costs*. McGraw-Hill, Inc. Hightstown, NJ, USA, 1998.

[17] P. Kapur, B. Cossette, and R. Walker. Refactoring references for library migration. In *Proc. OOPSLA*, pages 726–738, 2010.

[18] D. Kawrykow and M. P. Robillard. Improving API usage through automatic detection of redundant code. In *Proc. ASE*, pages 111–122, 2009.

[19] S. Koushik, M. Darko, and A. Gul. CUTE: a concolic unit testing engine for C. In *Proc. ESEC/FSE*, pages 263–272, 2005.

[20] M. Mossienko. Automated COBOL to Java recycling. In *Proc. 7th CSMR*, pages 40–50, 2003.

[21] M. Nita and D. Notkin. Using twinning to adapt programs to alternative APIs. In *Proc, 32nd ICSE*, pages 205–214, 2010.

[22] A. Orso, M. Harrold, D. Rosenblum, G. Rothermel, M. Soffa, and H. Do. Using component metacontent to support the regression testing of component-based software. In *Proc. ICSM*, pages 716–725, 2001.

[23] C. Pacheco, S. Lahiri, M. Ernst, and T. Ball. Feedback-directed random test generation. In *Proc. 29th ICSE*, pages 75–84, 2007.

[24] T. Ravitch, S. Jackson, E. Aderhold, and B. Liblit. Automatic generation of library bindings using static analysis. In *Proc. PLDI*, pages 352–362, 2009.

[25] M. Robillard. What makes APIs hard to learn? answers from developers. *IEEE Software*, pages 27–34, 2009.

[26] A. Rodriguez, J. Jeuring, P. Jansson, A. Gerdes, O. Kiselyov, and B. C. d. S. Oliveira. Comparing datatype generic libraries in Haskell. *Journal of Functional Programming*, to appear.

[27] M. Song and E. Tilevich. Enhancing source-level programming tools with an awareness of transparent program transformations. In *Proc. 24th OOPSLA*, pages 301–320, 2009.

[28] D. Thomas. The API field of dreams–too much stuff! its time to reduce and simplify APIs! *Journal of Object Technology*, 5(6):23–27, 2006.

[29] S. Thummalapenta and T. Xie. SpotWeb: Detecting framework hotspots and coldspots via mining open source code on the web. In *Proc. 23rd ASE*, pages 109–112, 2008.

[30] 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.

[31] N. Tillmann and J. De Halleux. Pex: white box test generation for. NET. In *Proc. 2nd TAP*, pages 134–153, 2008.

[32] W. Visser, K. Havelund, G. Brat, S. Park, and F. Lerda. Model Checking Programs. *Automated Software Engineering*, 10(2):203–232, 2003.

[33] R. Waters. Program translation via abstraction and reimplementation. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 14(8):1207–1228, 1988.

[34] Z. Xing and E. Stroulia. API-evolution support with Diff-CatchUp. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 33(12):818–836, 2007.

[35] 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.

[36] H. Zhong, L. Zhang, T. Xie, and H. Mei. Inferring resource specifications from natural language API documentation. In *Proc. 24th ASE*, pages 307–318, 2009.

[37] 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.