

The test set for the TransCoder system

Ernest Davis
Dept. of Computer Science
New York University
davise@cs.nyu.edu

August 4, 2020

Abstract

The TransCoder system translates source code between Java, C++, and Python 3. The test set that was used to evaluate its quality is missing important features of Java, including the ability to define and use classes and the ability to call user-defined functions other than recursively. Therefore, the accuracy of TransCoder over programs with those features remains unknown.

1 Unsupervised learning for translating between programming languages

The TransCoder program (Lachaux et al., 2020) translates source code between the three programming languages Java, C++, and Python 3. It was built using techniques that have been developed for unsupervised machine learning of translators for underresourced natural language (Lample et al., 2017). The significance of “unsupervised” here is in contrast to earlier approaches to machine translation, which have always required having a corpus of “bitexts”; that is, text that have been translated by competent human translators from one language to the other. For underresourced languages, the available corpus of bitexts may be too small to support the automated learning of machine translators. In unsupervised learning, by contrast, all that is required are unrelated text corpora in the two languages plus a kernel of corresponding words — a small bilingual dictionary. Using ingenious machine-learning techniques, this can be bootstrapped to find more numerous and more complex correspondences and thus construct an effective translation program.

The corresponding procedure applied to translating programs between two different languages means that one starts with a corpus of programs in each of the two languages, which of course can be found online in enormous quantity, plus some basic correspondences. For example, the key word “for” means very much the same thing in all three programming language C++, Java, and Python (and many others) and a for-loop in one language can almost always be translated as a for-loop in the other two. Again, starting with these corpora and these basic correspondence, the machine learning system finds its way to translate programs in general in one language into the other.

I find it very remarkable, indeed quite counter-intuitive, that this works at all, in either domain, but good results have obtained in both. As regards the TransCoder, Roziere et al. (2020) write, in a Facebook AI Research blog,

In our evaluations, the model correctly translates more than 90 percent of Java functions to C++, 74.8 percent of C++ functions to Java, and 68.7 percent of functions from Java to Python. In comparison, a commercially available tool translates only 61.0 percent of functions correctly from C++ to Java, and an open source translator is accurate for only 38.3 percent of Java functions translated into C++.

The key phrase there, though, is “in our evaluations”. How was the system evaluated? What was the test set?

2 The Test Set for TransCoder

The Facebook blog (Roziere et al. 2020) does not mention the test set at all, and the technical paper (Lachaux et al. 2020) gives only the following short account:

GeeksforGeeks is an online platform¹ with computer science and programming articles. It gathers many coding problems and presents solutions in several programming languages. From these solutions, we extract a set of parallel functions in C++, Java, and Python, to create our validation and test sets. These functions not only return the same output, but also compute the result with similar algorithm.

The test set, with much other material, has now been published on github² so interested researchers can check it for themselves.

In supervised machine learning, the standard procedure, for good reasons, is to divide the labelled corpus randomly into a training set and a test set (plus, often, a validation set). This certainly cannot be done in unsupervised machine translation of natural language; the training set is a pair of monolingual corpora, but to evaluate translation, the use of bitexts is unavoidable. This is the model that has been followed in TransCoder; the corpus of programs from GeeksForGeeks has been used as a test set because it is a natural corpus of corresponding programs in different languages. In further studies of translation between programming languages, it might actually be possible to use the same monolingual datasets using the “computational accuracy” metric introduced in (Lachaux et al. 2002); namely, you take a program in Java, the system translates it into Python, and you test what fraction of the time the two programs give the same output on valid inputs. However, this is not what they did, perhaps because they wanted to compare the validity of computational accuracy with the more commonly used BLEU score, which necessarily requires bitexts.

The test set consists of six data sets: a validation set and a test set in each of Java, C++, and Python. I examined the test set of Java with some care; all the results below are taken from that

¹<https://practice.geeksforgeeks.org/>

²<https://github.com/facebookresearch/TransCoder>

set. I looked cursorily at the other files to make sure that they didn't seem to be extremely different in the respects that I will discuss.

The bottom line: Key features of the programming languages are not represented at all in the test set. The evaluation therefore gives no information whatever about how well the translator handles those features.

Specifically, in the Java test set:

- None of the examples involve defining a class. Indeed, the keyword `class` (used in all three languages) does not appear in *any* of the test or validation sets.
- The only dynamic data structures that are used are those defined in a few standard libraries; and those are not very frequent. In a large fraction of the examples, the only data types are `int`, `char`, and `String`, and one- or two-dimensional arrays of `int`,
- All or almost all the function calls are direct recursive calls of a function calling itself, or calls to library functions. I did not observe any cases where one user defined function calls a different one; if there are any, they are few.
- The examples tend to be short. In the Python test set, there are 868 examples³ and a total of 9956 line breaks; that indicates an average of about 11 lines per example. "Line of code" is a less well defined measure in Java; but the number of semicolons is a reasonable proxy. The 868 examples include 8406 semicolons; thus, a similar measure.

To further characterize the Java language features used in the test set: Let us say that the following features, which would normally be taught in the first month or so of a Java programming class, are *elementary*:

- The data types `int`, `int[]`, `int[][]`, `float`, `double`, `bool`, `char`, and `String`. (Arrays of `float`, `double`, or `bool` are extremely rare.)
- Basic arithmetic, boolean, and assignment operators, array indexing, parentheses, and the function `String.charAt()`.
- The control key words `if`, `else`, `while`, `repeat`, `return` and the use of the open and close curly bracket.
- `System.out.print` and `System.out.println`.
- Function definition.

Then, of the first 100 examples in the Java test set:⁴

³Lachaux et al. states that the test sets have 852 examples. For the most part, an example constitutes one line in the text file I examined, and there were 868 lines. I did not investigate the reason for this discrepancy of 16. Perhaps there are 16 cases where an example consists of two function definitions, each of which is a line in the text file.

⁴This count was made rapidly manually and may well be off by a few, but it is unlikely to be very far off.

- 45 use only elementary features.⁵
- 14 use elementary features plus some basic functions from the `Math` package, such as `Math.max`, `Math.min`, `Math.abs`, `Math.sqrt`, `Math.pow`
- 2 use elementary functions plus recursion.
- 1 uses elementary functions plus recursion plus functions from the `Math` package.

38 use more sophisticated features. These include:

- Less common control words, such as `break`, `continue`, `case`, and `switch`. The exception handlers `try`, and `catch` occur, twice each, further on in the file. (The frequencies of these in the file as a whole are shown in table 1.)
- Bitwise operations.
- Other built-in functions such as `sort`, `equals` and `clone`
- Some functions or constants associated with wrapper classes such as `Character.isDigit`, `Integer.MaxValue`, `Arrays.sort`, `Arrays.binarySearch`, `Arrays.fill`, `Arrays.stream`, `Integer.toString`, and `Integer.parseInt`.
- Library classes and associated methods, such as `Vector<Integer>`, `HashMap<Integer,Integer>`, `Stack<Integer>`, `List<Integer>`, `LinkedHashSet<Integer>`, `Queue<Integer>`, and `StringBuffer`.

Any other kinds of features are extremely rare or non-existent in the test file. (A possible exception here is casting, which occurs at least occasionally in the Java file, and which is easy to miss in a quick manual scan.)

Table 1 shows the number of occurrences of various symbols and keywords in the Java test file.

3 Features of Java not tested

The evaluation that has been carried out entirely omits some of the most critical and common features of Java programming, most notably the ability to define classes with owned methods and to use objects in those classes. Also omitted are abstract classes, interfaces, generics (except for standardized uses of library classes), defining exceptions, dynamic data structures (again except for library classes), and calling functions/methods non-recursively.

There is good reason to suppose that the problem of these omitted features is considerably easier than the features that are included in the test file, especially the elementary features that constitute a large fraction of the test file.

⁵This is just a characterization of the language features used; some of the examples were fairly sophisticated algorithmically, considering the length of the code.

Symbol	Occurrences		Reserved word	Occurrences
Programs	868		for	1306
;	8406		if	1401
{	2428		else	369
}	2427		while	217
[5685		repeat	4
]	5685		return	1116
(7073		switch	3
)	7073		case	7
+	1741		break	79
-	1915		continue	31
*	493		try	2
/	243		int	4701
++	1503		double	105
--	200		float	43
			char	100
			bool	146
			Integer	310
			String	268
			sort	54
			equals	6

Table 1: Occurrences of symbols and reserved words in Java test set

Java and C++ are, in fact, extremely similar in how they handle, and how they name, the elementary features; and many other languages, including Python, are quite similar. Many of these features have been more or less standard in imperative and object-oriented languages since C, in 1970. For instance, table 2 shows the first elementary function in the test sets in the three languages.⁶

The Java and the C++ code are character-for-character identical in lines 2-7. They differ only in the form of the declaration of the function and the array argument, and in form of the outputting statements. The Python code is more different: the `for` statement has a different form, there are no type declarations, semi-colons are replaced by new lines, curly brackets are replaced by indentation. But a student who has learned to write this kind of code in Java or C++ can quickly learn to write it in the other languages; going from Python to the other two is a little more demanding but not very much so.

By contrast, there are large and fundamental differences in the ways in which the three languages handle (or fail to handle) typing, referencing and dereferencing, class hierarchies and inheritance, overloading, dynamic and static dispatching, memory management, and other deep language features. Translating a program that uses these in sophisticated ways from one language to another is by no means a cookie-cutter process; it can require careful inspection and analysis and significant redesign.

How well would TransCoder do on code that includes these untested features? We have simply no information. The training set almost certainly includes code with these features, so it is conceivable that TransCoder can do something with them. But it is a very safe bet that it would do less well on more sophisticated code, and a pretty good bet that it would lose some of its edge over the hand-crafted competition. (One disadvantage of computational accuracy as a measure as compared to BLEU is that producing correct code requires getting everything right; and as the code gets longer, that becomes increasingly unlikely, even without introducing more programming language features. BLEU, by contrast, is more or less scale-invariant.)

The real mystery is why, given the limited nature of the test set, the commercial transcompilers that were used for comparison do so poorly on it. One conjecture that seems plausible is that the translating the “sophisticated” examples in the test set requires building in correspondences between library functions in the different languages, and that the designers of the commercial transcompilers did not invest their energies in that aspect of the languages. But I have not attempted to determine whether that is in fact the correct explanation.

4 Conclusion

Despite all that, TransCoder remains a remarkable accomplishment; it still seems to me very surprising that it works at all, even over this limited class of programs. Nor can one fault the creators of TransCoders for having used this test set; it is not easy to find a large corpus of parallel programs. However, in evaluating the scope and significance of this accomplishment, it is critical to keep in mind the important limitations of the test set over which it has been evaluated. TransCoder has received a fair amount of attention and discussion in the broader community; it is safe to say that

⁶The title is the one given in the dataset. “Efficient” is a misnomer; this is an $O(n^2)$ algorithm to solve a problem that has an extremely easy $O(n)$ solution.

EFFICIENTLY COMPUTE SUMS OF DIAGONALS OF A MATRIX

Java

```
static void printDiagonalSums(int[ ][ ] mat, int n) {
    int principal=0 , secondary=0;
    for (int i=0; i<n; i++) {
        for (int j=0; j<n; j++) {
            if (i==j) principal+=mat[i][j];
            if ((i+j)==(n-1)) secondary+=mat[i][j];
        }
    }
    System.out.println("Principal_Diagonal: " + principal);
    System.out.println(" Secondary_Diagonal: " + secondary);
}
```

C++

```
void printDiagonalSums (int mat[][MAX], int n) {
    int principal=0 , secondary=0 ;
    for (int i=0; i<n; i++) {
        for (int j=0; j<n; j++) {
            if (i==j) principal+=mat[i][j];
            if ((i+j)==(n-1)) secondary+=mat[i][j];
        }
    }
    cout << "Principal_Diagonal: " << principal << endl;
    cout << "Secondary_Diagonal: " << secondary << endl ;
}
```

Python 3

```
def printDiagonalSums (mat,n):
    principal = 0
    secondary = 0
    for i in range (0,n):
        for j in range(0,n):
            if (i== j):
                principal+=mat[i][j]
            if ((i+j)==(n-1))
                secondary+=mat [i][j]
    print("Principal_Diagonal:", principal)
    print("Secondary_Diagonal:", secondary )
```

Table 2: Comparison of an elementary function in Java, C++, and Python

none of this discussion was informed by an understanding of those limitations. It would have been better if the characteristics and limitations of the dataset had been laid out when TransCoder was first announced.

In recent years it has become all too common in AI to generate data sets and use them in evaluations without sufficiently examining and analyzing the actual data that they contain. When a new test set is being introduced, this is all the more important. In one particularly egregious recent instance, the CycIC dataset⁷ was created synthetically, and presented to the community as a benchmark, and tested against human subjects, and posted on the Allen AI leaderboard; and twenty systems competed on the leaderboard, with accuracies ranging from 14% to 94%; and their outcomes were presented at prestigious meetings in Powerpoint slides — without, apparently, anyone but me ever noticing that the data set contained multiple sets of minor variants of the same, ill-designed, problems repeated literally hundreds of times (Davis, 2020). We are all wearily familiar with the AI research paper full of *de rigeur* elaborate 20x20x20 tables of systems with various forms of ablation vs. datasets vs. metrics with SOTA in boldface, but not a single concrete example.⁸ These may be of value to the research teams competing on the specific problem, but to the wider scientific community, a table of ten examples where the system succeeds and ten where it fails is much more informative — and, please, not just the shopworn standards we have all seen hundreds of times. Conference and journal reviewers should insist on these. The gender and racial biases in text and image datasets collected from the web and in the programs that have been trained on them are notorious (Sweeney, 2013), (Buolamwini and Gebru, 2018) (Sun et al., 2019). If we want to build high-quality AI systems, to understand their scope and limits, and to explain to the world at large both the significance of the particular systems and the promise and challenges of AI generally, we need to carefully examine the datasets we are using to evaluate them.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Thomas Wies and Heng Ji for helpful feedback.

References

Joy Buolamwini and Timnit Gebru (2018). Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. *Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency*, 2018. 7791.

<http://proceedings.mlr.press/v81/buolamwini18a.html>

Ernest Davis (2020). “Question templates in the CycIC training set”.

<https://cs.nyu.edu/faculty/davise/papers/CYCQns.html>

Marie-Anne Lachaux, Baptiste Roziere, Lowik Chanut, and Guillaume Lample (2020). “Unsupervised translation of programming languages”. arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.03511

⁷<https://leaderboard.allenai.org/cycic/submissions/public/>

⁸Heng Ji (personal communication) estimates that more than 70% of the papers at ACL have no examples or qualitative analysis.

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.03511>

Guillaume Lample, Alexis Conneau, Ludovic Denoyer, and Marc'Aurelio Ranzato. (2017). "Unsupervised machine translation using monolingual corpora only." arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.00043.
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1711.00043>

Baptiste Roziere, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Lowik Chanussot, and Guillaume Lampel (2020). "Deep learning to translate between programming languages". *Facebook AI Research blog*.
<https://ai.facebook.com/blog/deep-learning-to-translate-between-programming-languages/>

Tony Sun et al. (2019). "Mitigating Gender Bias in Natural Language Processing: Literature Review"

Latanya Sweeney (2013). Discrimination in online ad delivery. *Queue* **11**(3): 10.
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1301.6822>.