

# Guided Debugging of Auto-Translated Code Using Differential Testing

SHENGNAN WU, School of Computer Science, Fudan University, China

XINYU SUN, School of Computer Science, Fudan University, China

XIN WANG, School of Computer Science, Fudan University, China

YANGFAN ZHOU, School of Computer Science, Fudan University, China

Large Language Models (LLMs) hold great promise in the task of code translation. However, the lack of explainability complicates the identification of the inevitable translation errors. In this paper, we propose tHint, a debugging tool to locate translation errors in auto-translated code. The core idea of tHint is that correctly translated, the source and translated code should present the same functionalities, giving the same output for the same input. Hence, lines in the translated code responsible for output differences are possibly translation errors. First, tHint employs fuzzing to generate diverse test cases that thoroughly explore the translated code. Then, tHint relies on a heuristic algorithm to pinpoint translation errors from coverage information and differential testing execution results of those test cases. This heuristic algorithm is designed to leverage both the statistics and the expertise of developers. Comprehensive experiments with real code show its effectiveness. It reduces 71% lines developers need to review during debugging and increases the likelihood of the LLM fixing translation errors in a single query by 59%. Developers generally consider it satisfactory and helpful.

CCS Concepts: • **Software and its engineering** → **Software testing and debugging**; Source code generation; *Software maintenance tools*.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Trans-compiler, Debugging, Differential testing

## ACM Reference Format:

Shengnan Wu, Xinyu Sun, Xin Wang, and Yangfan Zhou. 2018. Guided Debugging of Auto-Translated Code Using Differential Testing. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 22 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

## 1 Introduction

Code translation, *i.e.*, translating code from one programming language to another, has long been considered critical yet very challenging. It is fundamental to many real-life software engineering tasks including legacy code handling [Feathers 2004], code migration [Aggarwal et al. 2015] and code reuse [Krueger 1992]. Recently, large language models (LLMs) have proven to be promising in code translation [Huang et al. 2023; Eniser et al. 2024]. Besides the impressive performances, simplicity also promotes the adoption of LLMs in code translation. LLMs require only prompt engineering, in

---

Authors' Contact Information: Shengnan Wu, School of Computer Science, Fudan University, Shanghai, China, snwu19@fudan.edu.cn; Xinyu Sun, School of Computer Science, Fudan University, Shanghai, China, sunxy23@m.fudan.edu.cn; Xin Wang, School of Computer Science, Fudan University, Shanghai, China, xinw@fudan.edu.cn; Yangfan Zhou, School of Computer Science, Fudan University, Shanghai, China, zfy@fudan.edu.cn.

---

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

*Conference acronym 'XX, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY*

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

contrast to traditional approaches relying on human-constructed rules, supervised algorithms, and code pairs for training. As a result, LLMs are increasingly adopted in code translation. For example, IBM presents the Watsonx Code Assistant<sup>1</sup> to translate Cobol to Java, and a series of commercial LLM based translation tools<sup>2</sup> can be accessed easily via network services.

However, LLMs make translation errors [Yang et al. 2024; Pan et al. 2024], despite efforts of enhancing the translation quality [Weisz et al. 2022; Szafraniec et al. 2023]. This leads to a buggy and non-equivalent code translation. Recent studies show that only 2.1% to 47.3% in 1700 code snippets can be correctly translated by the LLM [Pan et al. 2024]. Correct code translation relies on finding equivalent API combinations cross language and data type inference, which is inherently hard [Rozière et al. 2020]. In addition, the hallucination [Samek et al. 2017] of LLMs also adds to the difficulties of precise translation. Errors are generally inevitable in code translation by LLMs.

Translation errors can be handled by first pinpointing their locations and then preparing fixes, *i.e.*, a typical debugging process. However, debugging has long been considered challenging [Brooks 1974]. Debugging auto-translated code by LLMs is even more difficult due to the lack of model explainability. Developers usually have to execute the code several times to collect information about code behavior [Agrawal 1991; Auguston et al. 2002] analyzed by their expertise and experiment with their fixes for several times. This practice is undoubtedly human effort intensive and time-consuming. Hence, an automatic approach to locate translation errors is of critical importance. Nevertheless, designing such an approach is quite difficult. The source and translated codes are with different sets of APIs and grammar, let alone different implementations of the same functionality. So directly comparing the translated code and source by text or AST will be ineffective for locating translating errors.

Even so, the source and translated code should present the same functionalities if correctly translated, giving the same outputs with the same input. This inspires us to locate translation errors by differential testing: lines in the translated code causing output differences are closely related to translation errors. Following this idea of differential testing, two challenges remain unsolved. Firstly, a set of test cases, both valid and comprehensively exploring the behavior of the translated code is needed (challenge 1). If not fully explored, translation error related lines may be missed. Hence, techniques like randomized generation are inapplicable. Secondly, while the fail or pass result of one test case in differential testing indicates whether translation errors exist, it does not pinpoint their exact location. Since the source and translated code are in different programming languages with varying code structures, directly comparing code coverages in the translated code and source code of the same test case is ineffective for localizing translation errors. Therefore, a novel localization algorithm is needed (challenge 2).

To this end, we present *trans-compiler Hint* (tHint), an automatic approach to locate translation errors in auto-translated code. The core idea is to find lines causing output differences in the translated code, which are closely related to translation errors. tHint first leverages a fuzzing tool *i.e.*, AFL++ [Fioraldi et al. 2020], to generate test cases in a coverage-guided way, which solves the challenge of comprehensive test case generation (challenge 1). Next, tHint introduces a heuristic-based algorithm to locate translation errors using the execution results of test cases (challenge 2). This algorithm combines two key elements: statistics and developer expertise. Specifically, it calculates the conditional probability of each line being incorrectly translated, based on the coverage information from both passing and failing test cases in differential testing. At the same time, it incorporates insights from developers' past debugging experiences to identify lines more likely to be mistranslated. Finally, tHint provides those localized lines to the debugger,

---

<sup>1</sup>Watsonx Code Assistant: <https://www.ibm.com/products/watsonx-code-assistant>

<sup>2</sup>CodeConvert: <https://www.codeconvert.ai/r-to-python-converter>

in the form of a debugging suggestion. This debugging suggestion is expected to facilitate fixing translation errors both manually and by LLMs.

Extensive experiments have demonstrated the effectiveness of tHinteR. When developers manually debug translated code without the assistance of other automated tools, tHinteR reduces the number of lines they need to examine by an average of 71%, guiding them to focus on areas where translation errors are more likely to occur. When developers use LLMs to debug translated code, tHinteR increases the likelihood of the LLM fixing translation errors in a single query by 59%. It also enhances the perceived quality of the changes made by the LLM by 13%. Developers generally consider tHinteR to be helpful and effective.

The contributions are summarized below:

- We present an automatic approach to locate translation errors and provide debugging suggestions for auto-translated code. It formulates the task of locating translation errors as a differential testing task. This formulation can shed light on similar future work.
- We design a novel localization algorithm that identifies translation errors from the execution results of test cases. The algorithm pinpoints errors using conditional probabilities and insights from developers' past debugging experiences. This can serve as a reference for designing other bug localization algorithms.
- We implement tHinteR and will later release it as an open-source tool. Extensive studies using both subjective and objective metrics illustrate its effectiveness. tHinteR significantly facilitates debugging by directing both human and LLM attention to areas more likely to contain translation errors.

## 2 A Motivating Example

This section presents an incorrectly translated code snippet and preliminary explorations of debugging it. During our dataset construction, which will be elaborated in the evaluation section, a GPT-3.5 based translation tool was implemented to translate Python solutions from LeetCode<sup>3</sup> to C++. The Python solution of Question No.5 defines a class *Solution* with two methods, *expand* and *longestPalindrome*. The *longestPalindrome* method uses Manacher's algorithm to find the longest palindromic substring in a given string *s*. In this method, a *join* function is used to insert a # between every character in the string *s* to ensure an odd number of length. In the return line, a step parameter is given so the longest palindromic substring can be sliced out. The translated C++ code only presents two major differences, leading to incorrect translation. Firstly, in the *longestPalindrome* method two #s are appended at the beginning and end of the strings, instead of between every character. Secondly, in the return line, no step parameter is used. The Python code and C++ code are shown in Figure 1.

We conducted a preliminary debugging experiment and presented the mentioned code pair to five developers (P1-P5). They possessed different levels of proficiency in Python and C++, from beginners to experts. The results revealed the challenging nature of debugging auto-translated code. No participants had successfully fixed the translation errors during the experiment (30 minutes). They all expressed significant difficulty during debugging.

Firstly, one must first understand the Python code before fixing the translation errors. An average of 17 minutes was spent on code understanding. "I'd rather rewrite it. You have no idea of it unless you read the source code line by line", stated p5, a medium-level C++ and Python developer. Secondly, pinpointing translation errors based on only the source and translated code is also challenging. "Function signatures are the same, and structures of the two code snippets look similar. Where can I

<sup>3</sup>LeetCode is an online platform offering coding challenges to help developers improve their programming skills. It can be accessed by:<https://leetcode.com>

*begin?*" said p1, a beginner in C++. P4, a medium-level Python and C++ developer, noticed the two major differences but failed to recognize them as **translation errors**. "No #s are inserted between characters so no step parameter is used in slicing seems logical. I wouldn't suspect that.", said p4. P3, a developer with over 6 years of practice with both C++ and Python, is the only one who fixed the translation errors in the C++ code. "I just revised the C++ code line by line referring to the Python code." said p2. This line-by-line checking and revising process is so time-consuming that p2 took 34 minutes to debug a code snippet under 50 lines. All participants agree that suggestions highlighting potential translation errors would greatly facilitate the debugging process. "At least I get to know the place to start with, even if the information is imperfect." summarized p2, an experienced Python developer and a C++ beginner.

Listing 1. Python Solution

```
class Solution:
# Expand around the center and find the maximum
length of palindrome
def expand(self, s, left, right):
while left >= 0 and right < len(s) and s[
left] == s[right]:
left -= 1
right += 1
return (right - left - 2) // 2

# Find the longest palindromic substring
def longestPalindrome(self, s: str) -> str:
end, start = -1, 0
s = '#' + '#'.join(list(s)) + '#'
arm_len = []
right = -1
j = -1

for i in range(len(s)):
if right > i:
i_sym = 2 * j - i
min_arm_len = min(arm_len[i_sym],
right - i)
cur_arm_len = self.expand(s, i -
min_arm_len, i + min_arm_len)
else:
cur_arm_len = self.expand(s, i, i)
arm_len.append(cur_arm_len)
if i + cur_arm_len > right:
j = i
right = i + cur_arm_len
if 2 * cur_arm_len + 1 > end - start:
start = i - cur_arm_len
end = i + cur_arm_len

# Remove the special characters and return the
longest palindrome
return s[start+1:end+1:2]
```

Listing 2. Translated C++ Solution

```
class Solution {
public:
int expand(string s, int left, int right) {
//...basically same as the Python code...
}

string longestPalindrome(string s) {
int end = -1, start = 0;
s = "#" + s + "#";
vector<int> arm_len;
int right = -1;
int j = -1;

for (int i = 0; i < s.size(); ++i) {
int cur_arm_len;
if (right > i) {
int i_sym = 2 * j - i;
int min_arm_len = min(arm_len[i_sym]
, right - i);
cur_arm_len = expand(s, i -
min_arm_len, i + min_arm_len);
} else {
cur_arm_len = expand(s, i, i);
}
arm_len.push_back(cur_arm_len);
if (i + cur_arm_len > right) {
j = i;
right = i + cur_arm_len;
}
if (2 * cur_arm_len + 1 > end - start)
{
start = i - cur_arm_len;
end = i + cur_arm_len;
}
}
return s.substr(start + 1, end - start);
};
```

Fig. 1. A Python Solution of *Longest Palindrome Substring* and the Auto-translated C++ Version

Findings from the preliminary debugging experiment emphasize the importance of an debugging suggestion that highlights potential translation errors. Moreover, our exploration with Stack Overflow<sup>4</sup> illustrates that relying on manual replies from others is not a reliable way to obtain such suggestions.

We searched with the tag "[code-translation]", and found 387 discussions about debugging auto-translated code till 28th, May, 2024. Among them, 36 discussions received zero replies and 71 did not

<sup>4</sup>Stack Overflow is a popular Q&A platform where developers can ask and answer coding-related questions, sharing knowledge across the programming community. It can be accessed by: <https://stackoverflow.com>

receive satisfactory replies (indicated by the adoption of who posted the discussion). This indicates around one-third of incorrectly translated code did not receive effective debugging suggestions. Moreover, a frequent reply was advising "not translating but rewriting the code in another language", for "those translating tools are often unreliable". Usually, this advice would be responded to by stating unfamiliarity with the target programming language. This confirms our observation that developers who are not experts in both source-translated programming languages are more motivated to use translation tools. Hence, an automatic method to locate translation errors and provide a debugging suggestion accordingly is of crucial concern.

### 3 Methodology

This section presents the technique design of our proposed approach tHinte. tHinte locates translation errors and gives debugging suggestions accordingly. The core idea is to find lines in the translated code causing output differences from the source code. Those lines are closely related to translation errors, as they incur altered functionalities. tHinte takes the source code, translated code, and seeds, *i.e.*, example inputs of the translated code as input and the localized lines, in the form of a debugging suggestion, as the output. The overall workflow of tHinte is illustrated in Figure 2. tHinte includes three steps: 1) fuzzing based test case generation, 2) differential testing execution, and 3) translation error localization.




Fig. 2. Overview of tHinte

In the fuzzing based test case generation step, tHinte first generates test cases using coverage-guided fuzzing and then excludes invalid cases with a rule-based filter. This ensures that the test cases are valid and can comprehensively explore the behavior of the translated code. In the differential testing execution step, tHinte conducts differential testing and collects execution results of test cases, including coverage information for each test case. In the translation error localization step, tHinte leverages a localization algorithm, designed to incorporate both statistics and developers' expertise accumulated from past debugging experiences, to locate translation errors.

#### 3.1 Test Case Generation

In this step, tHinte generates test cases according to the translated code and seeds. These test cases should 1) explore the behavior of the translated code comprehensively and 2) be valid for the translated code. To explore the behavior of the translated code comprehensively, we leverage the fuzzing tool AFL++. Specifically, we first conduct instrumentation by AFL-clang so tHinte could carry out a coverage-guided generation process. Then AFL-fuzz will keep mutating the seeds

until the stop condition. An ideal condition would be that the generated test cases reach 100% line coverage. However, due to the existence of lines like header files, which will not be counted in the coverage calculation, 100% line coverage would be impractical. So we set the stop condition to 90% line coverage. Due to consideration of quick response, for corner cases where 90% are also time-consuming to achieve out of high complexity and huge exploring space or dead codes, AFL++ explores the code for one minute.

To guarantee the validity of the generated test cases, we validate them by a rule-based filter. Specifically, due to the consideration of maximizing coverage, the mutation of AFL-fuzz may incur special characters like ASCII in the test cases. This may cause validity issues to the translated code. This filter excludes special characters like ASCII, punctuation marks, and characters from minor natural languages. By our estimation, generally only less than 20 percent of generated test cases are excluded, so the coverage will not be compromised.

### 3.2 Differential Testing Execution

This step conducts differential testing and collects information needed in the localization of translation errors. Besides the pass or fail test results of test cases, line coverage of each test case is also collected. Firstly, we adopt two runtimes for the source and translated code to execute all test cases accessed from the test case generation step. Pass or fail of a test case is determined with the following oracle, which is essentially a consistency check. Given test cases  $X$  for a `< source, translated >` code pair  $t$ , the function  $S(X)$  represents the execution result/output of the source code induced by  $X$ . The function  $T(X)$  represents the execution result/output of the translated code induced by  $X$ . Formally, for any  $X$ , we define value of the test result  $y$  as follows:

$$y = \begin{cases} \text{Pass} & \text{if } S(X) == T(X), \\ \text{Fail} & \text{if } S(X) \neq T(X). \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

As instrumentation is conducted before compiling the translated code, execution results and coverage information will be logged during execution. Next we parse the log by LLVM-cov to obtain which lines are covered by each test case in the translated code. By this way, we get all the information needed for translation error localization. Examples of execution results, including line coverages, are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Examples of Execution Results.

Test case id	Lines covered in translated code	Execution results of source code	Execution results in translated code	Testing Results
3421	2, 7, 31, 62	abca	abcd	Fail
3422	5, 7, 31, 62	abcae	abcae	Pass

The number of test cases executed affects the performance of tHint. Less test cases executed decrease response time and lower the quality of generated suggestions. More test cases work oppositely. We leave this trade-off to users. By default tHint executes all test cases generated. Users can set it to a given number if a faster response is desirable in a specific usage context.

### 3.3 Translation Error Localization

In this step, tHint localizes translation errors from execution results of test cases. A heuristic-based localization algorithm, leveraging statistics and the expertise of developers is designed and used for locating translation errors. Specifically, it calculates the conditional probability of each line being incorrectly translated, based on the coverage information from both passing and failing test

cases in differential testing. At the same time, it refers to insights from developers' past debugging experiences to identify lines more likely to be mistranslated. Finally, it provides those localized lines, in the form of a debugging suggestion.

From the perspective of statistics, if coverage of certain lines in the translated code is strongly related to a **Fail** testing result, *i.e.*, different outputs from the source and translated code, these lines are possibly incorrectly translated. Hence we obtain two core heuristics based on statistics:

- **Heuristic 1:** If test cases covering certain lines in the translated code all achieve the **Fail** testing result, those lines are highly likely to be incorrectly translated.
- **Heuristic 2:** If covering a specific line in the translated code and reaching a **Fail** test result occurs more frequently than a random assumption (50%), this line is likely to be incorrectly translated.

Those two heuristics inspire us to calculate the conditional possibilities of each line being incorrectly translated, based on coverage as well as pass or fail of each test case in the differential testing. The two heuristics are further summarized into a *Localize by Statistics* component, which is demonstrated with pseudo-code in Algorithm 1. A *suspicious score by statistics* is assigned to each line according to the calculated conditional possibilities, indicating how likely this line is incorrectly translated. The  $\theta_{punish}$  adds different weights to situations in Heuristic 1 and 2. A *baseScore* is added only for regularization reasons, avoiding negative values.

---

**Algorithm 1** Localize by Statistics
 

---

```

for each line ∈ translatedCode do
  passedCases, failedCases, allCases ← {}
  for each case ∈ findCasesThatCovered(line) do
    if isCasePassed(case) then
      passedCases ← passedCases ∪ {case}
    else
      failedCases ← failedCases ∪ {case}
    end if
  end for
  suspiciousScoreByStatistics = baseScore +  $P(\frac{n_p}{n_f}) * \theta_{punish}$ 
end for

```

---

Besides statistics, tHint also leverages the expertise of developers in the localization algorithm. Past debugging experiences, once internalized and processed through the developers' expertise, often lead to the empirical conclusion that certain parts of the code are more prone to translation errors. This empirical conclusion prioritizes checking the parts that are more prone to translation errors and thus contributes to the localization of translation errors. To capture such an empirical conclusion and extract it into helpful heuristics, we conducted a 40-minute round table discussion with three developers about their past debugging experiences. These developers represent varying levels of expertise—experienced, medium, and novice—which allows us to draw more generally applicable insights. Through the round table discussion, we identified other three heuristics.

- **Heuristic 3:** Control flow-related code, such as conditional statements and loops, is more prone to translation errors.
- **Heuristic 4:** Code that itself is of a specific type is more likely to be translated incorrectly compared to code within the scope of that specific type.
- **Heuristic 5:** Structurally simple code (without scope) is less prone to translation errors.

Those three heuristics are summarized into a *Localize by Expertise* component, which is shown with pseudo-code in Algorithm 2. A *suspicious score by expertise* is assigned to each line of the translated code, indicating how prone to translation errors each line is according to the past debugging experience of developers. Different values of  $\alpha$  are used in this *Localize by Expertise* component, assigning different weights to different heuristics. It is worth noting that we adjust weights in the *Localize by Expertise* component by both adding and multiplying operations, while in the *Localize by Statistics* component, only multiplying operations are used. So the localization tHint conducts are mainly based on statistics, being more objective.

---

**Algorithm 2** Localize by Expertise
 

---

```

for each  $line \in translatedCode$  do
   $susceptibleSyntaxUnit \leftarrow set$ 
   $suspiciousScoreByExpertise \leftarrow getScore(line)$ 
  for each  $case \in findCasesThatCovered(line)$  do
     $syntaxUnit, syntaxScope \leftarrow analyzeSyntaxByLine$ 
    if  $syntaxUnit \in susceptibleSyntaxUnit$  then
       $suspiciousScoreByExpertise = suspiciousScore + \alpha_1$ 
    end if
    if  $syntaxScope \in susceptibleSyntaxUnit$  then
       $suspiciousScoreByExpertise = suspiciousScoreByExpertise * \alpha_2$ 
    end if
  end for
end for

```

---

tHint conducts translation error localization via identifying lines with significantly higher *suspicious scores*. Specifically, an *overall suspicious score* is calculated for each line, adding the *suspicious score by statistics* and *suspicious score by expertise*. Lines exceeding a given threshold are flagged as potential translation errors. If no lines exceed the threshold, a simple anomaly detection, two standard divisions above the mean, is carried out to identify lines with comparatively higher *overall suspicious scores*.

## 4 Evaluation

In this section we evaluate tHint's performance by answering the following research questions (RQs):

- **RQ1:** What's the performance of tHint in manual debugging?
- **RQ2:** What's the performance of tHint in debugging with LLMs?
- **RQ3:** How do the numbers of test cases executed affect the performance of tHint?

RQ1 aims to illustrate how can tHint help with debugging by manual efforts of developers, without the help of other automatic tools. RQ2 aims to unveil how can tHint help with fixing translation errors by LLMs. After exploring two commonly seen debugging settings (manually and by LLMs), we target tHint's key component. RQ3 presents how different numbers of test cases executed affect the performance.

### 4.1 Experiment Setup

#### 4.1.1 Data Collection.

**A translation tool for data collection.** We focus on the Python to C++ scenario during the evaluation of tHint. Although the method itself is applicable across many programming languages,



we choose this scenario for the comparatively significant differences between the two languages' grammar. To prevent overfitting to a specific translation tool, we implement a generalized LLM-based one to construct datasets for evaluation. This translation tool only serves as a provider of <source, translated> code pairs. Considering the objectivity and fairness of our evaluation with tHint, this translation tool should not present poorly translated code pairs and at the same time avoid techniques not generally applicable. To this end, we choose GPT-3.5 as the base model. In-context learning [Min et al. 2022] and human-in-the-loop [Ge et al. 2023] strategy are used in prompt engineering.

Specifically, this translation tool consists of a translation step and a validation step. The translation step translates Python code to C++ code. The prompt used in this step consists of a paragraph describing the task and several examples, aiming to provide domain knowledge. A simplified demonstration of the prompt used in the translation step is shown in Figure 3. The validation step fixes translation errors in the translated C++ code if there are any. We design this validation step based on the assumption that querying the LLM repeatedly decreases the possibility of unreliable outputs. The prompt used is constructed similarly to that in the translation step. Several examples, basically tuples of source code, translated code, and fixed code, are provided in the prompt, following a description of the task. A simplified demonstration of the prompt used in the validation step is shown in Figure 4. Initially, examples contained in the prompts are randomly sampled from the official solutions of LeetCode and manually translated. To ensure the performance of our translation tool, we iteratively improve the prompts according to human feedback on the quality of the translations/validation. During this process, examples can be substituted, deleted, or added. We stop the iteration process until no obvious patterns of errors are found in randomly sampled 20 code pairs.




Fig. 3. A simplified demonstration of the prompt used in the translation step.

**Datasets.** We use the official Python solutions of LeetCode as the input of our translation tool. A spider is implemented for the purpose of data access. After 2 weeks of interaction with LeetCode's API, we get all Python solutions to 611 questions. Then they are translated into C++ by our translation tool and posted back to the LeetCode China webpage. By this, we can run the official test cases to determine the correctness of the translated code. 1/3 of the translated C++ solutions fail the corresponding test cases, indicating translation errors, in which compiler errors dominate.

(1) Descriptions of the task	You are an intelligent assistance of code. You check whether a given Python code and C++ code present the exact same functionality and fix translation errors in the C++ code..... Here are some examples, both positive and negative. Learn from positive examples and avoid errors in negative examples.		
(2) Examples	<b>Example A :</b> Python code = <pre>class Solution: def twoSum(self, nums, target):     nums_hash = {}     for i in range(len(nums)):         if target - nums[i] in nums_hash:             return [nums_hash[target - nums[i]], i]         nums_hash[nums[i]] = i</pre>	C++ code = <pre>#include &lt;vector&gt; #include &lt;unordered_map&gt;  using namespace std;  class Solution { public:     vector&lt;int&gt; twoSum(vector&lt;int&gt;&amp; nums, int target) {         unordered_map&lt;int, int&gt; nums_hash;         for (int i = 0; i &lt; nums.size(); ++i) {             if (nums_hash.find(target - nums[i]) != nums_hash.end()) {                 return {nums_hash[target - nums[i]], i};             }             nums_hash[nums[i]] = i;         }         return {};     } };</pre>	Checked C++ code = <pre>#include &lt;vector&gt; #include &lt;unordered_map&gt;  using namespace std;  class Solution { public:     vector&lt;int&gt; twoSum(vector&lt;int&gt;&amp; nums, int target) {         unordered_map&lt;int, int&gt; nums_hash;         for (int i = 0; i &lt; nums.size(); ++i) {             if (nums_hash.find(target - nums[i]) != nums_hash.end()) {                 return {nums_hash[target - nums[i]], i};             }             nums_hash[nums[i]] = i;         }         return {};     } };</pre>
(3) Query	Now, Python code ="the_python_code", Cpp code ="the_c++_code", Checked C++ code =?		

Fig. 4. A simplified demonstration of the prompt used in the validation step.

We aim to evaluate tHinte across a wide range of translation errors, particularly those causing runtime errors, where the code runs but its functionality is altered. To achieve this, we adopt a purposive sampling approach [Campbell et al. 2020]. We start by constructing a pool of <Python solution, translated C++ solution> pairs that exhibit runtime errors. Then, we identify the corresponding questions associated with these runtime-error solutions. Since there are typically 2-3 Python solutions per question, we expand the pool by including all Python solutions and their translated C++ counterparts for those questions. This ensures the pool covers translation errors that lead to runtime errors, as well as other conditions such as compiler errors, overflows, and correct translations. In total, the pool comprises 211 <Python solution, translated C++ solution> pairs.

The complexity of the translated code may affect the performance of debugging tools like tHinte. Hence, we categorize those 211 code pairs into different complexity levels. We use Complexity Score ( $S_{complex}$ ) to describe the complexity of translated C++ code. Three factors are considered: the difficulty level of the question defined by LeetCode ( $S_{difficulty}$ ), the acceptance rate of the Python solution ( $R_{accept}$ ), and the cyclomatic complexity [Ebert and Cain 2016] of the translated C++ solution ( $C_{cyc}$ ).  $S_{complex}$  is defined as:

$$S_{complex} = S_{difficulty} * 0.33 + R_{accept} * 0.33 + C_{cyc} * 0.33 \quad (2)$$

A  $S_{complex}$  typically falls within 0 to 10 and is further mapped to a Complexity Level with:

$$Complexity\ Level = \begin{cases} \text{Low,} & \text{if } S_{complex} < 4 \\ \text{Medium,} & \text{if } 4 \leq S_{complex} \leq 7 \\ \text{High,} & \text{if } S_{complex} > 7 \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Two datasets are constructed from those 211 code pairs and used for the evaluation of tHinte.

- **Dataset A:** All 211 <Python solution, translated C++ solution> code pairs. The Python solutions in those code pairs should be precise and correct, as they are official solutions from LeetCode. The C++ solutions may contain translation errors. There are 76 High complexity

pairs, 102 *Medium* complexity pairs, and 36 *Low* complexity pairs. This dataset is used to answer RQ1 and RQ3.

- **Dataset B:** Randomly sampled 30 <Python solution, translated C++ solution> code pairs from dataset A. There are 10 pairs for each Complexity Level. This dataset is used to answer RQ2.

For RQ1 and RQ3, to provide comprehensive and objective conclusions about the performance of tHinter, we use a dataset sufficiently large and includes a full range of complexity levels. RQ2, on the other hand, focuses more on the quality of code changes made by the LLM. Since this evaluation relies more on qualitative analysis and manual assessment, a smaller dataset with evenly sampled complexity levels is more appropriate.

#### 4.1.2 Metrics.

We use Reduction Ratio ( $R_{reduc}$ ), Perceived Helpfulness ( $H_{perceived}$ ), Fix Ratio ( $R_{fix}$ ), Attempt Ratio ( $R_{attp}$ ), and Perceived Fix Quality ( $Q_{fix}$ ) to measure the performance of tHinter.

$R_{reduc}$ ,  $R_{fix}$ , and  $R_{attp}$  describe the performance of tHinter from the **objective** side.  $R_{reduc}$  measures the ratio of lines excluded by tHinter, and is calculated as:

$$R_{reduc} = 1 - \frac{Len(localized)}{Len(translated)} \quad (4)$$

where  $Len(localized)$  and  $Len(translated)$  indicate how many lines are in the debugging suggestion tHinter gives and the translated code respectively. Higher  $R_{reduc}$  indicates a stronger ability to exclude possibly correctly translated lines during debugging. Thus developers avoid examining the translated code line by line and the debugging efficiency gets enhanced. Lower  $R_{reduc}$  works oppositely.  $R_{fix}$  measures the possibility of translation errors in the translated code being fixed by the LLM in a single query. It is calculated as:

$$R_{fix} = \frac{N_{fixed}}{N_{all}} \quad (5)$$

where  $N_{fixed}$  and  $N_{all}$  indicate the number of code snippets the LLM fixes and it should fix respectively. Higher  $R_{fix}$  represents a stronger ability to fix translation errors. Lower  $R_{fix}$  works oppositely.  $R_{attp}$  measures the possibility of the LLM finding translation errors in the translated code and attempting to fix them in a single query. It is calculated as:

$$R_{attp} = \frac{N_{attp}}{N_{all}} \quad (6)$$

where  $N_{attp}$  indicates the number of code snippets the LLM attempts to fix. The LLM only fixes code snippets when it realizes there are translation errors. Hence a higher  $R_{attp}$  indicates a higher possibility that a translated code gets fixed by the LLM. A lower  $R_{attp}$  works oppositely.  $R_{reduc}$  is used in RQ1 and RQ3.  $R_{fix}$  and  $R_{attp}$  are used in RQ2.

$H_{perceived}$  and  $Q_{fix}$  describe the performance of tHinter from the **subjective** side.  $H_{perceived}$  measures the perceived helpfulness of tHinter from the perspective of debugging developers on a 1 to 5 scale, with 1 representing merely helpful and 5 strongly helpful. Higher  $H_{perceived}$  indicates a higher sense of helpfulness and satisfaction. Lower  $H_{perceived}$  works oppositely.  $Q_{fix}$  measures the subjectively assessed quality of changes made to the translated code during LLM based debugging. It is also on a 1 to 5 scale, with 1 representing extremely poor quality and 5 extremely high quality. Higher  $Q_{fix}$  indicates a stronger ability to facilitate the LLM debugging process. Lower  $Q_{fix}$  works oppositely.  $H_{perceived}$  is used in RQ1 and RQ3.  $Q_{fix}$  is used in RQ2.

#### 4.1.3 Manual Assessing Procedure.

Two subjective metrics,  $H_{perceived}$  and  $Q_{fix}$ , require manual assessment, which is prone to the subjectivity of the conductors. To guarantee validity, a guideline mapping the sense of helpfulness to detailed standards is discussed and shown in Table 2. Scores of  $H_{perceived}$  must be given largely based on this guideline. In addition, if a code snippet is correctly translated and tHinter barely presents valid information, a higher score of  $H_{perceived}$  should also be given. For  $Q_{fix}$ , scores must be given considering those three factors: 1) preserving the functionalities of the source code; 2) fixing the translation errors; and 3) not inducing new errors. The corresponding standards are shown in 3.

Table 2. Standards Used to Guide the Manual Assessing Process of  $H_{perceived}$ .

Scores	Representations	Explanations
1	Merely helpful	The localized lines <b>are irrelevant to</b> translation errors.
2	Somewhat helpful	The localized lines are <b>loosely related to</b> translation errors.
3	Helpful	The localized lines are <b>closely related to</b> translation errors.
4	Quite helpful	The localized lines <b>highlight symptoms</b> of translation errors.
5	Strongly helpful	The localized lines <b>directly present</b> translation errors.

During the manual assessment, two authors, C1 and C2, act as conductors. C1 is an experienced C++ and Python developer with over three years of industrial experience, while C2 is a mid-level Python developer with basic C++ knowledge. C1's expertise enables a thorough and proficient assessment, whereas C2 represents the perspective of a general translation tool user. Two conductors independently score all code pairs. If significant differences in their scores arise for a single code pair, the reasons are discussed and reviewed. This cross-validation process helps mitigate the impact of human subjectivity.

Table 3. Standards Used to Guide the Manual Assessing Process of  $Q_{fix}$ .

Scores	Representations	Explanations
1	Extremely poor	Changes <b>do not fix</b> translation errors, incur <b>new ones</b> and include <b>unnecessary paraphrasing</b> .
2	Poor	Changes <b>do not fix</b> translation errors and include <b>unnecessary paraphrasing</b> .
3	Fair	Changes are essentially <b>paraphrases</b> of the old code.
4	Good	Changes <b>fix</b> translation errors but contain <b>unnecessary paraphrasing</b> .
5	Extremely high	Changes <b>fix</b> translation errors, incur <b>no new ones</b> and do not include <b>unnecessary paraphrasing</b> .

#### 4.1.4 Experimental Environment.

We implement tHinter with 1741 lines of Python code. All experiments are conducted on a MacOS Sonoma 14.5 system with an Apple M2 Max chip, and 32GB RAM.

## 4.2 Performance in Manual Debugging (RQ1)

tHinter significantly reduces the number of lines developers need to check when debugging translated code. As shown in Figure 5(a), the average  $R_{reduc}$  is 0.71, meaning that, on average, 71%

of the code no longer requires manual inspection. Furthermore, for 50% of the samples, 63% to 79% of the lines in the translated code do not need to be examined line by line, with the first quartile ( $Q1$ ) of  $R_{reduc}$  being 0.63 and the third quartile ( $Q3$ ) being 0.79.

tHinter reduces more lines for *Low* complexity samples. The distribution of complexity for all samples is shown in Figure 6. Around 2 thirds (65.5%) of samples are in the *High* complexity group and *Medium* complexity group. This is consistent with the construction of dataset A. More complex code may be more easily incorrectly translated, leading to runtime errors. tHinter achieves the highest  $R_{reduc}$  in the *Low* complexity group. One possible reason is that less complex code may have a simpler structure, like fewer control flows. In this way a single test case could cover more lines in the translated code, resulting in more excluded lines and a higher  $R_{reduc}$ .




Fig. 5. tHinter’s Performance Evaluated by  $R_{reduc}$ .

tHinter presents an average of 3.18 in  $H_{perceived}$ , the place between **Helpful** and **Quite helpful**. This indicates developers are generally satisfied and consider tHinter effective.  $H_{perceived}$  for each complexity group remains stable, indicating stable performance due to a generally applicable method. However, C2 generally gives higher scores than C1. We find that is caused by a higher sense of helpfulness of tHinter for non-experts of both source and translated programming languages. C2, representing general users of translation tools, only has basic knowledge of C++. We find for C2 the most challenging part of debugging auto-translated code is determining where to start the examination. tHinter guides C2 to examine lines more possibly containing translation errors. Hence, a higher sense of helpfulness is achieved. Even when the suggestions by tHinter are merely/somewhat helpful, they still avoid C2 from line by line examination for lack of practice in C++.

Table 4.  $H_{perceived}$  of tHinter by two conductors (C1 and C2) across different complexity levels.

Conductors	Low ↑	Medium ↑	High ↑	Average ↑
<b>C1</b>	3.10	3.10	3.06	3.09
<b>C2</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>3.26</b>
<b>Overall</b>	3.17	3.18	3.17	3.18

**Summary:** tHinter significantly reduces lines developers check when debugging translated code. With tHinter, an average of 71 % of lines no longer require manual inspection. Developers generally consider tHinter satisfactory and helpful during debugging. It offers a larger sense of helpfulness to non-experts for tHinter guides them to examine where translation errors emerge more possibly.


### 4.3 Performance in Debugging with LLMs (RQ2)

**Baselines.** We unveil the ability of tHinte by contrasting debugging auto-translated code via the LLM with/without tHinte. Two prompts are constructed based on GPT-3.5.

- **With tHinte:** The source code, translated code, localized translation errors by tHinte, and a paragraph describing this debugging task are all included in the prompt. We use a standard zero-shot strategy, avoiding complex prompt engineering techniques affecting the results.
- **Without tHinte:** Only the source code, translated code, and description of the debugging task are included in the prompt.

**Results.** tHinte increases the possibility of translation errors being fixed by the LLM during a single query by 59%. According to Figure 6(a), with tHinte, the  $R_{fix}$  overall achieves 0.43, which is 59% higher than that without tHinte. This performance advantage can be partially explained with  $R_{attp}$ . As shown in Figure 6(b), with tHinte,  $R_{attp}$ s are significantly accelerated, overall and across different complexity groups. This indicates that potential translation errors localized by tHinte, essentially context information, help the LLM to understand the existence of translation errors and hence trigger the fixing attempts [Pan et al. 2024]. Without this, the LLM judges some incorrectly translated code snippets as correctly translated and stops the fixing attempts, eventually leading to a lower  $R_{fix}$ .


According to Figure 7(a) on average a 13% higher  $Q_{fix}$  is achieved with tHinte. This indicates tHinte increases the perceived quality of changes made by the LLM during debugging by 13%. Low complexity code snippets benefit from tHinte most (a 40% rise of  $Q_{fix}$ ). One possible reason lies in the usually shorter and simpler structure of Low complexity code snippets. tHinte facilitates the inference of the LLM by providing richer context information. Hence the translation errors are more easily noticed in a shorter and simpler structure and fixed by the LLM.



(a) Comparing of average  $R_{fix}$  with/without tHinte. (b) Comparing of average  $R_{attp}$  with/without tHinte.

Fig. 6. Fixing translation errors by the LLM with/without tHinte.

**Summary:** tHinte increases the likelihood of the LLM fixing translation errors in a single query by 59% and enhances the quality of changes made during debugging by 13%. By providing localized translation errors—essentially context information—the LLM is better equipped to recognize and correct translation errors.



(a) Overview of average  $Q_{fix}$  with/without tHint. (b) Comparing of average  $Q_{fix}$  with/without tHint within different Complexity Levels.

Fig. 7. Comparing of  $Q_{fix}$  with/without tHint during debugging by the LLM.

#### 4.4 Performance with Different Numbers of Test Cases Executed (RQ3)

**Baselines.** We evaluate the key component of tHint, the test case generation, by comparing the performance of tHint with different numbers of test cases.

- **10000 test cases:** All test cases generated are executed. Due to consideration of execution time, for those with over 10000 test cases, we set a cutoff of 10000.
- **200 test cases:** 200 test cases are randomly sampled from all test cases generated by tHint and executed.
- **50 test cases:** 50 test cases are randomly sampled from all test cases generated by tHint and executed.

**Results.** Comprehensively, more test cases benefit the performance of tHint. Metrics drop significantly when only 50 test cases are executed. More test cases, essentially a higher line coverage, explore the behavior of the translated code more comprehensively. This would result in pointing to translation errors from a finer granularity. This is also in line with why *Low* complexity code achieves the highest  $R_{reduc}$ . We also notice that comprehensively  $H_{perceived}$  achieves the highest with *Medium* complexity level code, no matter how many test cases are executed. After a discussion of C1 and C2, a loose conclusion can be drawn that a clear code structure benefits the performance of tHint. Appropriate abstraction and modularization, decoupling between functional modules, and a logical sequence of function calls contribute to this clarity. Such a well-structured code allows correctly translated lines to be more accurately excluded by tHint, thereby increasing the precision of localizing translation errors. Writing code with a clear structure often requires guidance from design patterns, which are typically not considered in overly simple code. Meanwhile, overly complicated code generally leverages more complicated algorithms and structures, difficult to understand for both humans and automatic methods. As a result, code at the *Medium* complexity level achieves the highest  $H_{perceived}$ .

**Summary:** More test cases, essentially higher line coverage, benefit the performance of tHint. This illustrates the reasonableness of the coverage guided test case generation strategy in tHint. This strategy allows tHint to explore the behavior of the translated code more comprehensively and localize translation errors from a finer granularity.

Table 5. Performance of tHinter with Different Numbers of Test Cases Executed.  $H_{per.}$  is short for  $H_{perceived}$ .

N.Test Cases	Overall		Low		Medium		High	
	$R_{reduc}$ ↑	$H_{per.}$ ↑	$R_{reduc}$ ↑	$H_{per.}$ ↑	$R_{reduc}$ ↑	$H_{per.}$ ↑	$R_{reduc}$ ↑	$H_{per.}$ ↑
10000	0.71	3.18	0.76	<b>3.17</b>	0.70	3.18	0.61	3.17
200	<b>0.73</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>0.77</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>0.73</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>0.63</b>	<b>3.18</b>
50	0.72	2.73	0.76	2.70	0.74	2.74	0.61	2.74

## 5 Case Studies

We summarize two typical types of translation errors and present how could tHinter help with the debugging process.

### 5.1 Nonequivalent Logic Flow

The Python solution to LeetCode question *finding trios with the lowest degree* defines a function *minTrioDegree*. This function first constructs an adjacency matrix  $g$  and a degree list  $degree$  to represent the graph and track the degree of each node. Then, it iterates over all possible trios  $(i, j, k)$  in the graph. If a trio is found (i.e., all three nodes are connected to each other), it calculates the degree of the trio and updates the minimum degree. Finally, it returns the minimum trio degree if a valid trio is found, or -1 if no trio exists. A chained comparison is used in the iteration process: **if  $g[i][k] == g[j][k] == 1$ :**

In the C++ version, this chained comparison is translated into **if ( $g[i][k] == g[j][k] == 1$ )**, which causes altered functionalities. In Python, this chained comparison checks both conditions:  $g[i][k] == 1$  and  $g[j][k] == 1$ . However, in C++ this expression is evaluated as two separate comparisons: first,  $g[i][k] == g[j][k]$ , which results in a boolean value (true or false), and then this boolean value is compared to 1. This leads to incorrect behaviors because the second comparison ( $true == 1$  or  $false == 1$ ) is not equivalent to checking if both  $g[i][k]$  and  $g[j][k]$  are equal to 1. To fix this translation error in C++, the chained comparison must be split into two separate conditions: **if ( $g[i][k] == 1 \ \&\& \ g[j][k] == 1$ )**.

tHinter directly pinpoints this translation error. After seeing the output of tHinter, the debugging developer immediately recognizes that the chained comparison has been incorrectly translated. Hence, no laborious line-to-line inspection is needed. This translation error is fixed within 3 minutes.

### 5.2 Nonequivalent Data Type

The Python solution to LeetCode question *finding the minimum speed* defines a function *minSpeedOnTime* that calculates the minimum speed required to travel a series of distances within a given time limit. The function uses binary search to determine the smallest possible speed that allows for the completion of the journey within the specified time. The check method calculates the total time required to cover the distances at a given speed and checks if it meets the time constraint.

However, translation introduces a risk of integer overflow. In the C++ version, variables such as  $t$  (representing time) and  $speed$  (representing speed) are stored as **integers**, the same as in the Python solution. Following multiplication operations like  $t * speed$  and  $t * 100$  can easily exceed the maximum value that an int can hold, leading to an overflow. This overflow results in incorrect calculations, causing the algorithmic logic to fail. Python automatically manages integer overflow by dynamically allocating more memory. This means that even if the values being calculated



become very large, Python will still handle them correctly without causing overflow. To fix this, variables should be stored as larger data types, such as **long long**.

tHinte highlights lines where multiplication operations are conducted with variable *t* and variable *speed*. This inspires the debugging developer to examine the data type of those variables and change the data type to **long long**.

## 6 Threats to Validity

Here we present factors hindering the performance of tHinte, both within (internal threats) and outside of (external threats) the method.

**Internal Threats.** Firstly, tHinte does not apply to auto-translated code from languages not supported by LLVM, such as JavaScript or Verilog. However, since LLVM supports a wide range of programming languages, including nearly all commonly used ones, we believe this limitation will not significantly affect tHinte's effectiveness and usefulness. Secondly, tHinte relies on fuzzing to generate test cases, where the mutation incurs randomness. If the input is particularly complex, it may result in some test cases that do not fully satisfy the constraints, potentially leading to reduced effectiveness. The *localize by Expertise* component is not affected by this limitation and can continue to provide useful suggestions for debugging.

**External Threats.** Firstly, if the translated code is not valid but merely a string of special characters, it could, in rare cases, cause tHinte to crash. However, since such code typically fails to compile, tHinte would return a compiler error and remind developers to debug according to the error message. Secondly, tHinte's performance may vary across codes from different translation tools. Further evaluations of tHinte are needed to understand whether and how the performance of tHinte changes with translation tools following different technical paths. We will explore this in future work.

## 7 Related work

### 7.1 Differential Testing

Differential testing focuses on multiple systems with similar functionalities [McKeeman 1998]. It is difficult to determine the correct output given an input without prior knowledge. Differential testing solves this challenge by comparing the outputs from multiple counterpart software and thus provides an oracle [Evans and Savoia 2007]. To conduct differential testing, an essential step is the construction of test cases. Test cases can be constructed by human force [Jana and Shmatikov 2012] and automatic techniques such as mutation [Brubaker et al. 2014]. Coverage-guided test case generation is also leveraged to construct test cases exploring the behavior of the software under test comprehensively [Chen and Su 2015]. Differential testing has been widely adopted in defects uncovering [Brumley et al. 2007; Cadar et al. 2008; Chapman and Evans 2011; Srivastava et al. 2011; Yang et al. 2011; Argyros et al. 2016; Chen et al. 2016; Zhang and Kim 2017]. Besides software, differential testing can also target fundamental parts modern software build upon. For example, an automated fuzzer and a differential oracle are used to discover transient execution vulnerabilities in the CPU [Hur et al. 2022]. Deep learning libraries that are essential to many intelligent software can also be tested by fuzzing of neural architecture and defects are found by reports of inconsistency of outputs [Gu et al. 2022]. As the pair of codes before and after the translation tool should present the exact same functionalities, they can be regarded as counterpart software. Hence, differential testing is applicable in finding the translation errors incurred by translation tools.

## 7.2 Debugging

Human factors have always been playing important roles in software engineering tasks, including debugging [Gannon 1979]. Debugging is a human effort intensive task, usually taking over 50 % of the time and effort of a whole project [Brooks 1974]. During debugging, developers run the code and perform tasks manually multiple times [Agrawal 1991]. By these means, they collect information such as sequences of steps performed, histories of variable values, function call hierarchies [Auguston et al. 2002]. For the challenging nature of debugging lies in acquiring deep knowledge of the code [Zamfir and Candea 2010]. To facilitate debugging, an essential step is to understand the human behavior during it. Developer actions are tracked to explore their information collection process [Ko et al. 2006]. Eye-tracking techniques are adopted to illustrate how they comprehend codes and styles [Sharif and Maletic 2010; Binkley et al. 2013] as well as conducting code summarization [Rodeghero et al. 2014]. It is found that novice developers would debug more efficiently with the eye-gazing track information of experienced developers [Stein and Brennan 2004]. This might be because the gazing track information offers extra knowledge and suggestions. To avoid the trouble of manually debugging, automatic debugging approaches are proposed [Shapiro 1982; Weiser 1984; Fritzsos et al. 1991; Machado et al. 2013; Lou et al. 2020]. To name some of them as examples, automated identification of faulty constraints can significantly decrease development and maintenance efforts for variability models [Le et al. 2021]. Fed-DNN-Debugger debugs a client model by a nonintrusive metadata capture module and automated neural network model debugging module [Duan et al. 2023]. MRDebug debugs the target code by locating the root cause, analyzing several executions of the test case, and a Delta Debugging technique isolating the data relevant to bug triggering [Morán et al. 2024]. LLM can also be adopted in automatic debugging [Lee et al. 2024; Nam et al. 2024]. For example, Panda, inspired by how experienced developers debug, provides context information to LLMs and thus gets troubleshooting recommendations [Singh et al. 2024]. However, with the help of so many automatic tools, debugging remains human-effort intensive. A study with spectrum-based fault localization assistance finds that it may even weaken the ability to debug [Xie et al. 2016].

## 7.3 Code Translation

Translating code of one language to another is of crucial importance to many software engineering tasks, like code migration [Aggarwal et al. 2015]. To avoid the human-intensiveness of manual translation, translation tools are required. One typical methodology translation tools follow is machine translation. A neuron network is trained to generate the parallel code given the source code from another programming language [Koehn et al. 2007; Nguyen et al. 2013; Karaivanov et al. 2014; Aggarwal et al. 2015;]. However, such translation tool needs parallel code during the training process, which is hard to access. Hence, unsupervised method is also proposed [Rozière et al. 2020]. Most machine translation based translation tools rely on BLEU to measure the performance, which is more suitable for natural languages, hence, a new metric is also proposed [Eghbali and Pradel 2022]. LLMs can also be adopted in a variety of code intelligence tasks, including code translation [Roziere et al. 2023; Ross et al. 2023; Niu et al. 2023; Niu et al. 2023; Wan et al. 2024;], although translations by LLM can be faulty [Pan et al. 2024]. Evaluating the similarity of a code pair is essential to translation tools. To evaluate the similarity between a code pair from the same language, text based comparison is typically used [Baker 1995; Kamiya et al. 2002; Li et al. 2006;]. In a cross language context, both static and dynamic techniques are used [Nafi et al. 2019; Mathew and Stolee 2021].

## 8 Conclusion

In this paper, we present tHinteR, an automatic approach to localize translation errors in auto-translated code. It adopts differential testing and the core idea is to pinpoint lines in the translated code causing output differences with the source code. To avoid missing translation errors, tHinteR leverages a fuzzing-based approach to generate valid test cases exploring the behavior of the translated code comprehensively. Pass or fail results in the differential testing only indicate the existence of translation errors instead of the exact location. To conduct localization from execution results, a heuristics-based localization algorithm is designed, leveraging both statistics and developers's expertise. tHinteR is proven to be effective in both manual debugging and debugging with the LLM. Developers generally consider tHinteR helpful and satisfactory. To inspire future work, we open source tHinteR.

## References

- [1] Karan Aggarwal, Mohammad Salameh, and Abram Hindle. 2015. Using machine translation for converting *Python 2* to *Python 3* code. *PeerJ Prepr.* 3 (2015), e1459. <https://doi.org/10.7287/PEERJ.PREPRINTS.1459V1>
- [2] Hiralal Agrawal. 1991. *Towards automatic debugging of computer programs*. Purdue University.
- [3] George Argyros, Ioannis Stais, Suman Jana, Angelos D. Keromytis, and Aggelos Kiayias. 2016. SFADiff: Automated Evasion Attacks and Fingerprinting Using Black-box Differential Automata Learning. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, Vienna Austria, 1690–1701. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2976749.2978383>
- [4] Mikhail Auguston, Clinton Jeffery, and Scott Underwood. 2002. A Framework for Automatic Debugging. In *17th IEEE International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE 2002), 23-27 September 2002, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK*. IEEE Computer Society, 217–222. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE.2002.1115015>
- [5] Brenda S. Baker. 1995. On Finding Duplication and Near-Duplication in Large Software Systems. In *2nd Working Conference on Reverse Engineering, WCRE '95, Toronto, Canada, July 14-16, 1995*, Linda M. Wills, Philip Newcomb, and Elliot J. Chikofsky (Eds.). IEEE Computer Society, 86–95. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WCRE.1995.514697>
- [6] Dave W. Binkley, Marcia Davis, Dawn J. Lawrie, Jonathan I. Maletic, Christopher Morrell, and Bonita Sharif. 2013. The impact of identifier style on effort and comprehension. *Empir. Softw. Eng.* 18, 2 (2013), 219–276. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10664-012-9201-4>
- [7] Frederick P Brooks. 1974. The mythical man-month. *Datamation* 20, 12 (1974), 44–52.
- [8] Chad Brubaker, Suman Jana, Baishakhi Ray, Sarfraz Khurshid, and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2014. Using Frankencerts for Automated Adversarial Testing of Certificate Validation in SSL/TLS Implementations. *IEEE security & privacy* 2014 (2014), 114–129.
- [9] David Brumley, Juan Caballero, Zhenkai Liang, and James Newsome. 2007. Towards Automatic Discovery of Deviations in Binary Implementations with Applications to Error Detection and Fingerprint Generation. In *Proceedings of the 16th USENIX Security Symposium, Boston, MA, USA, August 6-10, 2007*, Niels Provos (Ed.). USENIX Association. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/16th-usenix-security-symposium/towards-automatic-discovery-deviations-binary>
- [10] Cristian Cadar, Daniel Dunbar, and Dawson R. Engler. 2008. KLEE: Unassisted and Automatic Generation of High-Coverage Tests for Complex Systems Programs. In *8th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation, OSDI 2008, December 8-10, 2008, San Diego, California, USA, Proceedings*, Richard Draves and Robbert van Renesse (Eds.). USENIX Association, 209–224. [http://www.usenix.org/events/osdi08/tech/full\\_papers/cadar/cadar.pdf](http://www.usenix.org/events/osdi08/tech/full_papers/cadar/cadar.pdf)
- [11] Steve Campbell, Melanie Greenwood, Sarah Prior, Toniele Shearer, Kerrie Walkem, Sarah Young, Danielle Bywaters, and Kim Walker. 2020. Purposive sampling: complex or simple? Research case examples. *Journal of research in Nursing* 25, 8 (2020), 652–661.
- [12] Peter Chapman and David Evans. 2011. Automated black-box detection of side-channel vulnerabilities in web applications. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS 2011, Chicago, Illinois, USA, October 17-21, 2011*, Yan Chen, George Danezis, and Vitaly Shmatikov (Eds.). ACM, 263–274. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2046707.2046737>
- [13] Yuting Chen, Ting Su, Chengnian Sun, Zhendong Su, and Jianjun Zhao. 2016. Coverage-Directed Differential Testing of JVM Implementations. In *Proceedings of the 37th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. ACM, Santa Barbara CA USA, 85–99. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2908080.2908095>
- [14] Yuting Chen and Zhendong Su. 2015. Guided Differential Testing of Certificate Validation in SSL/TLS Implementations. In *Proceedings of the 2015 10th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering*. ACM, Bergamo Italy, 793–804. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2786805.2786835>

- [15] Shaoming Duan, Chuanyi Liu, Peiyi Han, Xiaopeng Jin, Xinyi Zhang, Xiayu Xiang, and Hezhong Pan. 2023. Fed-DNN-Debugger: Automatically Debugging Deep Neural Network Models in Federated Learning. *Security and Communication Networks* 2023, 1 (2023), 5968168.
- [16] Christof Ebert and James Cain. 2016. Cyclomatic Complexity. *IEEE Softw.* 33, 6 (2016), 27–29. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MS.2016.147>
- [17] Aryaz Eghbali and Michael Pradel. 2022. CrystalBLEU: Precisely and Efficiently Measuring the Similarity of Code. In *44th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering: Companion Proceedings, ICSE Companion 2022, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, May 22-24, 2022*. ACM/IEEE, 341–342. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3510454.3528648>
- [18] Hasan Ferit Eniser, Hanliang Zhang, Cristina David, Meng Wang, Brandon Paulsen, Joey Dodds, and Daniel Kroening. 2024. Towards Translating Real-World Code with LLMs: A Study of Translating to Rust. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11514* (2024).
- [19] Robert B. Evans and Alberto Savoia. 2007. Differential testing: a new approach to change detection. In *Proceedings of the 6th joint meeting of the European Software Engineering Conference and the ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Foundations of Software Engineering, 2007, Dubrovnik, Croatia, September 3-7, 2007*, Ivica Crnkovic and Antonia Bertolino (Eds.). ACM, 549–552. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1287624.1287707>
- [20] Michael C. Feathers. 2004. Working Effectively with Legacy Code. In *Extreme Programming and Agile Methods - XP/Agile Universe 2004, 4th Conference on Extreme Programming and Agile Methods, Calgary, Canada, August 15-18, 2004, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 3134)*, Carmen Zannier, Hakan Erdogmus, and Lowell Lindstrom (Eds.). Springer, 217. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-27777-4\\_42](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-27777-4_42)
- [21] Andrea Fioraldi, Dominik Maier, Heiko Eißfeldt, and Marc Heuse. 2020. {AFL++}: Combining incremental steps of fuzzing research. In *14th USENIX Workshop on Offensive Technologies (WOOT 20)*.
- [22] Peter Fritzson, Tibor Gyimóthy, Mariam Kamkar, and Nahid Shahmehri. 1991. Generalized Algorithmic Debugging and Testing. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN'91 Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI), Toronto, Ontario, Canada, June 26-28, 1991*, David S. Wise (Ed.). ACM, 317–326. <https://doi.org/10.1145/113445.113472>
- [23] John D Gannon. 1979. Human factors in software engineering. *Computer* 12, 12 (1979), 6–7.
- [24] Yingqiang Ge, Wenyue Hua, Jianchao Ji, Juntao Tan, Shuyuan Xu, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2023. Openagi: When llm meets domain experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.04370* (2023).
- [25] Jiazhen Gu, Xuchuan Luo, Yangfan Zhou, and Xin Wang. 2022. Muffin: Testing Deep Learning Libraries via Neural Architecture Fuzzing. In *44th IEEE/ACM 44th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2022, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, May 25-27, 2022*. ACM, 1418–1430. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3510003.3510092>
- [26] Qing Huang, Zhenyu Wan, Zhenchang Xing, Changjing Wang, Jieshan Chen, Xiwei Xu, and Qinghua Lu. 2023. Let's Chat to Find the APIs: Connecting Human, LLM and Knowledge Graph through AI Chain. In *38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2023, Luxembourg, September 11-15, 2023*. IEEE, 471–483. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE56229.2023.00075>
- [27] Jaewon Hur, Suhwan Song, Sunwoo Kim, and Byoungyoung Lee. 2022. SpecDoctor: Differential Fuzz Testing to Find Transient Execution Vulnerabilities. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, Los Angeles CA USA, 1473–1487. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3548606.3560578>
- [28] Suman Jana and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2012. Abusing File Processing in Malware Detectors for Fun and Profit. In *2012 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*. IEEE, San Francisco, CA, 80–94. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2012.15>
- [29] Toshihiro Kamiya, Shinji Kusumoto, and Katsuro Inoue. 2002. CCFinder: A Multilingual Token-Based Code Clone Detection System for Large Scale Source Code. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* 28, 7 (2002), 654–670. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2002.1019480>
- [30] Svetoslav Karaivanov, Veselin Raychev, and Martin T. Vechev. 2014. Phrase-Based Statistical Translation of Programming Languages. In *Onward! 2014, Proceedings of the 2014 ACM International Symposium on New Ideas, New Paradigms, and Reflections on Programming & Software, part of SPLASH '14, Portland, OR, USA, October 20-24, 2014*, Andrew P. Black, Shriram Krishnamurthi, Bernd Bruegge, and Joseph N. Ruskiewicz (Eds.). ACM, 173–184. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2661136.2661148>
- [31] Amy J. Ko, Brad A. Myers, Michael J. Coblenz, and Htet Htet Aung. 2006. An Exploratory Study of How Developers Seek, Relate, and Collect Relevant Information during Software Maintenance Tasks. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* 32, 12 (2006), 971–987. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2006.116>
- [32] Philipp Koehn, Hieu Hoang, Alexandra Birch, Chris Callison-Burch, Marcello Federico, Nicola Bertoldi, Brooke Cowan, Wade Shen, Christine Moran, Richard Zens, Chris Dyer, Ondrej Bojar, Alexandra Constantin, and Evan Herbst. 2007. Moses: Open Source Toolkit for Statistical Machine Translation. In *ACL 2007, Proceedings of the 45th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, June 23-30, 2007, Prague, Czech Republic*, John Carroll, Antal van den Bosch, and Annie Zaenen (Eds.). The Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://aclanthology.org/P07-2045/>
- [33] Charles W Krueger. 1992. Software reuse. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 24, 2 (1992), 131–183.

- [34] Viet Man Le, Alexander Felfernig, Mathias Uta, David Benavides, José A. Galindo, and Thi Ngoc Trang Tran. 2021. DIRECTDEBUG: Automated Testing and Debugging of Feature Models. In *43rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering: New Ideas and Emerging Results, ICSE (NIER) 2021, Madrid, Spain, May 25-28, 2021*. IEEE, 81–85. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE-NIER52604.2021.00025>
- [35] Cheryl Lee, Chunqiu Steven Xia, Jen-tse Huang, Zhouruixin Zhu, Lingming Zhang, and Michael R Lyu. 2024. A Unified Debugging Approach via LLM-Based Multi-Agent Synergy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.17153* (2024).
- [36] Zhenmin Li, Shan Lu, Suvda Myagmar, and Yuanyuan Zhou. 2006. CP-Miner: Finding Copy-Paste and Related Bugs in Large-Scale Software Code. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* 32, 3 (2006), 176–192. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2006.28>
- [37] Yiling Lou, Ali Ghanbari, Xia Li, Lingming Zhang, Haotian Zhang, Dan Hao, and Lu Zhang. 2020. Can automated program repair refine fault localization? a unified debugging approach. In *ISSTA '20: 29th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis, Virtual Event, USA, July 18-22, 2020*, Sarfraz Khurshid and Corina S. Pasareanu (Eds.). ACM, 75–87. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3395363.3397351>
- [38] Pedro Machado, José Campos, and Rui Abreu. 2013. MZoltar: Automatic Debugging of Android Applications. In *Proceedings of the 2013 International Workshop on Software Development Lifecycle for Mobile*. ACM, Saint Petersburg Russia, 9–16. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2501553.2501556>
- [39] George Mathew and Kathryn T. Stolee. 2021. Cross-language code search using static and dynamic analyses. In *ESEC/FSE '21: 29th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, Athens, Greece, August 23-28, 2021*, Diomidis Spinellis, Georgios Gousios, Marsha Chechik, and Massimiliano Di Penta (Eds.). ACM, 205–217. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3468264.3468538>
- [40] William M McKeeman. 1998. Differential Testing for Software. *Digital Technical Journal* 10, 1 (1998), 100–107.
- [41] Sewon Min, Xinxu Lyu, Ari Holtzman, Mikel Artetxe, Mike Lewis, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. Rethinking the role of demonstrations: What makes in-context learning work? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.12837* (2022).
- [42] Jesús Morán, Antonia Bertolino, Claudio de la Riva, and Javier Tuya. 2024. Automatic Debugging of Design Faults in MapReduce Applications. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* 50, 4 (2024), 956–978. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2024.3369766>
- [43] Kawser Wazed Nafi, Tonny Shekha Kar, Banani Roy, Chanchal K. Roy, and Kevin A. Schneider. 2019. CLCDSA: Cross Language Code Clone Detection using Syntactical Features and API Documentation. In *34th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2019, San Diego, CA, USA, November 11-15, 2019*. IEEE, 1026–1037. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE.2019.00099>
- [44] Daye Nam, Andrew Macvean, Vincent J. Hellendoorn, Bogdan Vasilescu, and Brad A. Myers. 2024. Using an LLM to Help With Code Understanding. In *Proceedings of the 46th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2024, Lisbon, Portugal, April 14-20, 2024*. ACM, 97:1–97:13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3597503.3639187>
- [45] Anh Tuan Nguyen, Tung Thanh Nguyen, and Tien N. Nguyen. 2013. Lexical statistical machine translation for language migration. In *Joint Meeting of the European Software Engineering Conference and the ACM SIGSOFT Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/FSE'13, Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation, August 18-26, 2013*, Bertrand Meyer, Luciano Baresi, and Mira Mezini (Eds.). ACM, 651–654. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2491411.2494584>
- [46] Changan Niu, Chuanyi Li, Vincent Ng, Dongxiao Chen, Jidong Ge, and Bin Luo. 2023. An Empirical Comparison of Pre-Trained Models of Source Code. In *45th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2023, Melbourne, Australia, May 14-20, 2023*. IEEE, 2136–2148. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00180>
- [47] Rangeet Pan, Ali Reza Ibrahimzada, Rahul Krishna, Divya Sankar, Lambert Pougum Wassi, Michele Merler, Boris Sobolev, Raju Pavuluri, Saurabh Sinha, and Reyhaneh Jabbarvand. 2024. Lost in translation: A study of bugs introduced by large language models while translating code. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering*. 1–13.
- [48] Paige Rodeghero, Collin McMillan, Paul W McBurney, Nigel Bosch, and Sidney D'Mello. 2014. Improving automated source code summarization via an eye-tracking study of programmers. In *Proceedings of the 36th international conference on Software engineering*. 390–401.
- [49] Steven I. Ross, Fernando Martinez, Stephanie Houde, Michael J. Muller, and Justin D. Weisz. 2023. The Programmer's Assistant: Conversational Interaction with a Large Language Model for Software Development. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces, IUI 2023, Sydney, NSW, Australia, March 27-31, 2023*. ACM, 491–514. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3581641.3584037>
- [50] Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, et al. 2023. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950* (2023).
- [51] Baptiste Rozière, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Lowik Chausson, and Guillaume Lample. 2020. Unsupervised Translation of Programming Languages. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, Hugo Larochelle, Marc Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin (Eds.). <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/ed23fbf18c2cd35f8c7f8de44f85c08d-Abstract.html>

- [52] Wojciech Samek, Thomas Wiegand, and Klaus-Robert Müller. 2017. Explainable artificial intelligence: Understanding, visualizing and interpreting deep learning models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.08296* (2017).
- [53] Ehud Yehuda Shapiro. 1982. *Algorithmic program debugging*. Yale University.
- [54] Bonita Sharif and Jonathan I. Maletic. 2010. The Effects of Layout on Detecting the Role of Design Patterns. In *Proceedings 23rd IEEE Conference on Software Engineering Education and Training, CSEE&T 2010, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA, 9-12 March 2010*. IEEE Computer Society, 41–48. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CSEET.2010.23>
- [55] Vikramank Y. Singh, Kapil Vaidya, Vinayshekhar Bannihatti Kumar, Sopan Khosla, Balakrishnan Narayanaswamy, Rashmi Gangadharaiah, and Tim Kraska. 2024. Panda: Performance Debugging for Databases using LLM Agents. In *14th Conference on Innovative Data Systems Research, CIDR 2024, Chaminade, HI, USA, January 14-17, 2024*. www.cidrdb.org. <https://www.cidrdb.org/cidr2024/papers/p6-singh.pdf>
- [56] Varun Srivastava, Michael D. Bond, Kathryn S. McKinley, and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2011. A security policy oracle: detecting security holes using multiple API implementations. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI 2011, San Jose, CA, USA, June 4-8, 2011*, Mary W. Hall and David A. Padua (Eds.). ACM, 343–354. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1993498.1993539>
- [57] Randy Stein and Susan Brennan. 2004. Another person’s eye gaze as a cue in solving programming problems. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Multimodal Interfaces, ICMI 2004, State College, PA, USA, October 13-15, 2004*, Rajeev Sharma, Trevor Darrell, Mary P. Harper, Gianni Lazzari, and Matthew A. Turk (Eds.). ACM, 9–15. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1027933.1027936>
- [58] Marc Szafraniec, Baptiste Rozière, Hugh Leather, Patrick Labatut, François Charton, and Gabriel Synnaeve. 2023. Code Translation with Compiler Representations. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=XomEU3eNeSQ>
- [59] Yao Wan, Yang He, Zhangqian Bi, Jianguo Zhang, Hongyu Zhang, Yulei Sui, Guandong Xu, Hai Jin, and Philip S. Yu. 2024. Deep Learning for Code Intelligence: Survey, Benchmark and Toolkit. *CoRR* abs/2401.00288 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2401.00288> arXiv:2401.00288
- [60] Mark Weiser. 1984. Program slicing. *IEEE Transactions on software engineering* 4 (1984), 352–357.
- [61] Justin D. Weisz, Michael J. Muller, Steven I. Ross, Fernando Martinez, Stephanie Houde, Mayank Agarwal, Kartik Talamadupula, and John T. Richards. 2022. Better Together? An Evaluation of AI-Supported Code Translation. In *IUI 2022: 27th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces, Helsinki, Finland, March 22 - 25, 2022*, Giulio Jacucci, Samuel Kaski, Cristina Conati, Simone Stumpf, Tuukka Ruotsalo, and Krzysztof Gajos (Eds.). ACM, 369–391. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3490099.3511157>
- [62] Xiaoyuan Xie, Zicong Liu, Shuo Song, Zhenyu Chen, Jifeng Xuan, and Baowen Xu. 2016. Revisit of Automatic Debugging via Human Focus-Tracking Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Software Engineering*. ACM, Austin Texas, 808–819. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2884781.2884834>
- [63] Xuejun Yang, Yang Chen, Eric Eide, and John Regehr. 2011. Finding and understanding bugs in C compilers. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI 2011, San Jose, CA, USA, June 4-8, 2011*, Mary W. Hall and David A. Padua (Eds.). ACM, 283–294. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1993498.1993532>
- [64] Zhen Yang, Fang Liu, Zhongxing Yu, Jacky Wai Keung, Jia Li, Shuo Liu, Yifan Hong, Xiaoxue Ma, Zhi Jin, and Ge Li. 2024. Exploring and Unleashing the Power of Large Language Models in Automated Code Translation. *Proc. ACM Softw. Eng.* 1, FSE (2024), 1585–1608. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3660778>
- [65] Cristian Zamfir and George Candea. 2010. Execution Synthesis: A Technique for Automated Software Debugging. In *Proceedings of the 5th European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys ’10)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 321–334. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1755913.1755946>
- [66] Tianyi Zhang and Miryung Kim. 2017. Automated Transplantation and Differential Testing for Clones. In *2017 IEEE/ACM 39th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, Buenos Aires, 665–676. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE.2017.67>

Received 20 February 2007; revised 12 March 2009; accepted 5 June 2009